

Sandhurst Neighbourhood Development Plan 2024 to 2038



**Consultation Statement to accompany the
Submission Version Sandhurst Neighbourhood Plan**

April 2025

**Prepared by the Sandhurst Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group
on behalf of Sandhurst Parish Council**

Contents

1	Introduction	3
2	Summary of engagement and consultation activities, issues and outcomes	4
	Stage I: Engaging the local community to understand main issues - 2022 to 2023	4
	Stage II: Developing a Vision and Objectives and gathering further evidence – 2023 to 2024	12
	Stage III: Drafting the Pre-Submission Neighbourhood Plan - 2024	16
	Stage IV: Pre-Submission (Regulation 14) Draft Neighbourhood Plan Consultation	17
	Stage V: Submission Version Neighbourhood Plan	21
3	Conclusion.....	22
	Appendix A: List of those consulted at Regulation 14 (Pre-Submission stage).....	23
	Appendix B: Summary of comments received at Pre-Submission Regulation 14 consultation and response from the Steering Group.....	25

1 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1. The policies contained in the Sandhurst Neighbourhood Development Plan (the SNDP) have been developed following extensive interaction and consultation with the community and businesses within the area.
- 1.2. This Consultation Statement sets out the story of how the Neighbourhood Plan has been developed and, in accordance with Regulation 14 of Neighbourhood Development Planning (General) Regulations 2012 (as amended):
 - details of the persons and bodies who were consulted about the proposed neighbourhood development plan;
 - how they were consulted;
 - a summary of the main issues and concerns raised by the persons consulted; and
 - how these issues and concerns have been considered and, where relevant, addressed in the proposed Neighbourhood Plan.

The Sandhurst Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group

- 1.3. Sandhurst Parish Council is the qualifying body officially responsible for the Neighbourhood Plan. A Steering Group, comprising local councillors and volunteers from the community, was set up to lead on the development of the SNDP with each member take the lead on a particular topic. Members of the Steering Group were:

Chair: Katherine O'Neil

Vice Chair: Julie Griggs

Members: Godfrey Bland (dec), Teresa Breckon (to 22 June 2024), Robert (Bob) Dowling, Christina Exall, Ashley Goodhew, Frances Holland, Hilary Lamb, Jill Oliphant-Robertson, Denis O'Neil, Ellen Neville, Melanie (Mel) Phillipson (to May 2024), Richard (Dick) Stevenson, Caroline Wood. Additional support was provided by other members of the community during the course of the Plan.

2 SUMMARY OF ENGAGEMENT AND CONSULTATION ACTIVITIES, ISSUES AND OUTCOMES

2.1. A high-level summary of the engagement and consultation activity is shown in *Table 1*:

Table 1: High level summary of the key milestones

Date	Milestone	Key activities
2022	Launching the Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Designating the neighbourhood area • Setting up a Steering Group • Issuing community questionnaire
2023	Identifying Key themes Engagement and evidence gathering	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Visioning Event • Developing the objectives for each of the key themes • Engagement with the primary school • Commissioning Housing Needs Survey • Developing Design Guidance
2024 to 2025	Pre-Submission Draft Plan Submission Plan Examination Referendum	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SEA/ HRA Screening of the emerging draft plan • First round of formal consultation at Regulation 14 • Amendments to the Neighbourhood Plan and Design Guidance made following consultation • Submitting documents to TWBC and Regulation 16 consultation • Examination • Plan would then be 'made', if successful at referendum

2.2. The sections below describe, in fuller detail, the engagement and consultation process which took place during the Plan preparation. This is divided into four stages:

Stage I: Engaging the local community to understand main issues

Stage II: Developing a Vision and Objectives and planning policies

Stage III: Developing the emerging planning policies and supporting evidence

Stage IV: The Pre-Submission (Regulation 14) Draft Neighbourhood Plan

Stage V: Finalising the Submission (Regulation 16) Neighbourhood Plan

Stage I: Engaging the local community to understand main issues - 2022 to 2023

2.3. The parish of Sandhurst was formally designated as a neighbourhood area in September 2014. While an early attempt to develop neighbourhood was started, this did not progress. It was not until mid-2021 that the Parish Council undertook some initial engagement locally as to whether there was an appetite to progress the project. There were mixed views at the time and so work did not continue.

2.4. In August 2022, however, almost a year later, the Parish Council looked to embark on the development of a neighbourhood plan and volunteers from the community came forward to support the project.

- 2.5. An initial meeting was held among interested parties to explore how a Steering Group might be established and to discuss the scope of the work ahead (*Image 1*).

Image 1: Initial meeting to discuss the scope of the neighbourhood plan project



- 2.6. The first meeting of the initial Steering Group was held on the 25 September 2022 with eight people attending and a four further expressing an interest to join.
- 2.7. It was felt that an important first task would be to officially launch the project with parishioners and to start to gather views from the community about what they felt about the parish and issues of importance to them. To that end, a 'Kick-off' event was held at the Old School Hall in Sandhurst village on Saturday 22 October 2022.
- 2.8. A flyer (*Image 2*) and associated poster were produced to promote the event. These were distributed in the local shop, the petrol station, on Parish notice boards and were also delivered to every home in the parish. In addition, and to attract families along, the Social Club was hired for a showing of the film 'Sing 2'. On the flyer were a set of simple questions designed to start gathering people's views.

Image 2: Copy of the flyer used to promote the Kick Off event



- 2.9. The event was used to introduce people to the project including the purpose of neighbourhood planning and what it can and cannot achieve. The last parish-wide survey had been undertaken in 2014, and the findings of this, some of which (e.g. traffic volume) were still considered valid, were shared. A presentation was also provided by a member of the neighbouring parish of Lamberhurst, who had recently completed their own neighbourhood plan.

Image 3: A poster promoting the event and image from the event itself



- 2.10. A post-it note exercise was undertaken, asking people to share what they liked about the parish and what could be improved. The results of this were combined with the responses received to the quick survey on the flyers. (Image 4).

2.11. Approximately 60 residents attended and a report of the Kick Off event can be found in the Evidence Base on the Parish Council website.

Image 4: A volunteer makes boxes for people to return their surveys to



2.12. A summary of likes, dislikes and areas for improvement is shown below.

Likes

1. Community spirit	41
2. Countryside living	27
3. Quiet and safe	15
4. Community infrastructure	15
5. Footpaths	11
6. Beauty	3

Dislikes

1. Speeding	31
2. Traffic	16
3. Public transport	10
4. Anti-social behaviour	7
5. Lack of community spirit	5
6. Opposed to development	4
7. School run	3
8. Pedestrian safety	3

'Dreams' for the future

1. Environmentally friendly housing	5
2. Small scale development	3
3. Improve infrastructure	3
4. Safe cycling	2

- 2.13. Following the event, a first official meeting of the Steering Group took place in November 2022 and by January 2023, 15 people had joined. The Steering Group comprised a mix of parish and borough councillors and also volunteers from the community. A work programme was established and some overarching themes, based on the experiences of other groups and the feedback to date formed the basis of Working Groups to be established (*Figure 1*).

Figure 1: Initial Working Groups to be established



- 2.14. Each theme was explored by a Working Group formed from the Steering Group. At the first meeting of each, a presentation was given to introduce neighbourhood planning and outlined the scope of work that might be considered and the evidence that could be gathered.
- 2.15. A broad engagement strategy was drawn up to identify key groups within the parish to consult with. It covered:
- General communication activities – that would be undertaken on a rolling basis to keep people informed of the plan and progress, for instance the development of a mailing list, drop in events, social media, displays and articles in the village magazine.
 - Targeted engagement – to identify the different demographic groups around the parish and the best mechanisms to engage them.
 - Topic based engagement – to identify, by theme, specific interest groups and individuals who could most helpfully input.
- 2.16. Key activities during this period were:
- 2.17. **Engagement with the primary school:** In March 2023, the children were shown a Minecraft presentation and invited to create their own designs for the parish, either through words or pictures. In parallel, parents were approached informally for their input.

Image 5: Primary school children share their wishes



2.18. **Design Guidance for the Parish commissioned:** Locality Technical Support was received to assist the Steering Group in preparing detailed Design Guidance for the Parish. This strand of work was led by the Housing and Design Working Groups, with support from external consultants, AECOM. The consultants visited the parish and undertook a walkabout with Working Group members to understand the key issues and familiarise themselves with the character of the place.

2.19. In March 2023, a meeting was held with residents to share AECOM’s findings to date and to discuss aspects of the emerging Design Guidance (*Image 6*).

Image 6: Design Guidance workshop



2.20. **Transport and Economy SWOT analysis:** This Working Group shared their thinking to date – based on feedback from the Kick-off event and other local knowledge and research, at a workshop held at the Mission Church (*Image 7*). Fifteen residents attended and collectively prepared a SWOT (strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats) analysis for this aspect.

Image 7: Images from the Transport and Economy workshop



- 2.21. **Housing Working Group:** Using the Locality Technical Support fund, the Housing Working Group commissioned ACEOM to prepare a Housing Needs Assessment for the parish. This would follow the government methodology to set out likely housing need over the plan period.
- 2.22. **Community and Environment Feedback meeting:** A short questionnaire was issued in March 2023 for feedback regarding community facilities (*Image 8*). In April 2023, a local workshop was held to share the results of their investigations to date and seek input. Over 25 residents attended (*Image 8*) and the findings were used to input into their overall workings.

Image 8: Images from the Community and Environment workshop



- 2.23. **Economy Working Group:** A survey was issued by the group to circa 90 businesses operating in the parish with a view to ascertaining:
- The type of business, e.g. agriculture, trade and tourism
 - Where the business operates from, and whether additional workspace will be needed in the next five years
 - How many people are employed, and how they travel to work
 - Factors which would support business in the village, e.g. additional housing, availability of flexible workspace/business hub, improved Broadband/4G/5G, change of use of existing buildings
 - The local issues important to the business, and the factors influencing whether it will remain in Sandhurst
- 2.24. **Village Stall:** On May election day of that year, the Steering Group took a stall by the Village Green outside the Old School Hall Polling Station. This was a valuable way to further promote the project, with good footfall and attendance.
- 2.25. During this initial period, the following aspects of the project were established:
- **Website:** A section dedicated to the SNDP was established on the Sandhurst Parish Council website: <https://sandhurstparish.co.uk/neighbourhood-plan/>
 - **Facebook updates:** Local Facebook pages were used to issue updates on the project.
 - **Posters, banners and flyers:** These were posted at strategic times at various locations around the Parish (including shops, public house, bus shelters, churches) in the project, to promote the workshops and other activities.
 - **Social events:** Periodically undertaken for the Steering Group and Working Group members to encourage team spirit.
- 2.26. **Meetings with key stakeholders:** Meetings with key individuals and organisations took place throughout the project including:
- **TWBC officers:** In the context of the emerging Local Plan, close contact has been maintained with planning officers to keep up-to-date with progress.
 - **High Weald National Landscape:** To ensure that the aims and objectives of the National Landscape unit were integrated into the SNDP.
 - **Local organisations:** Updates were shared to provide information and gain feedback.
 - **Kent County Council:** Contact with with some of the teams at KCC including Highways and the Rights of Way teams.

Stage II: Developing a Vision and Objectives and gathering further evidence – 2023 to 2024

- 2.27. Following on from the initial surveys and other evidence gathering, the Steering Group was in a position to establish a vision and objectives for the SNDP.
- 2.28. On 7 June 2023, a Sandhurst Neighbourhood Plan Visioning and Objectives Event, with wine and cheese, was held at the Mission Church, with 35 residents attending. It was promoted through the village magazine, the Parish Council website, social media and on posters throughout the parish.

Image 9: The visioning and objectives event



- 2.29. The event provided an opportunity for each of the Working Groups to summarise their findings to date. This was followed by an interactive exercise inviting participants to set out words and phrases describing how they would wish the parish to be by the end of the Plan period. Attendees worked in groups and effectively produced a set of vision statements, that were then discussed and voted on by the entire group. A combination of the findings was ultimately used to draft the overarching vision statement for the plan, which has been slightly enhanced as the process has progressed, to take account of further feedback.
- 2.30. Following this, a series of objectives – couched under the Working Group themes – were considered that could then be used to overarch the emerging policies and any associated projects.
- 2.31. A report of the Visioning and Objectives workshop is available in the evidence base.

Additional evidence gathering by topic area

- 2.32. **Community Facilities:** In addition to the work undertaken with school children and other groups, the Working Group undertook an audit of local parish facilities (*Image 10*) considered to be particularly important to safeguard. Each facility was considered in terms of how it might be improved in the future, should funding be available. This group also, with guidance from

the Parish Council, explored the idea of developing a Village Hub that local people had often spoken about and that would ultimately form a policy of the plan.

Image 10: Example community facilities audit proforma

Community facilities / infrastructure assessment	
Completed by:	Date:
Name of community facility	
Address / location	
Ownership	
Description and current purpose	
Any designations (listed building, community asset etc)	
Current planning applications	
Distinct character and importance of village	
Brief history (anything to add to above)	
Quality / condition	
Adequacy / limitations	
Capacity seated / other activities – sufficient / insufficient	
Disabled access	
Disabled facilities	
Proximity to settlement / accessibility by foot, cycle, car	
Parking facilities (number of spaces including disabled parking)	
Safety / safeguarding considerations	
Aspirations to be realised which could be facilitated by growth of village	
Sustainable building – energy conservation, heating, lighting, other – current	
Sustainable building – energy conservation, heating, lighting, other – potential	
Other comments	
(Continued over if more space needed ...)	

2.33. **Design Working Group:** In February 2024, AECOM were in a position to sign off the final Design Guidance and Codes document (*Image 11*) (drafting finalised in October 2023).

Image 11: Sandhurst Design Guidance and Codes



- 2.34. In addition to this work, the group undertook an audit of the parish's heritage assets to ascertain if there were any that might be appropriate to identify as non-designated heritage assets (NDHAs). An audit and walkabout were completed, using guidance taken both from Historic England and TWBC in relation to how to assess assets. A list was drawn up and evidence provided for each. The group contacted owners to let them know of the proposal to list their assets as NDHAs and what this would mean for them. Only a few did not wish their property to be included, and the Steering Group respected this view.
- 2.35. A final key area of work for this group was to consider the importance of environmental design. This was a key thread running through all the feedback to date, i.e. how the neighbourhood plan could be used to encourage development to be as sustainable as possible in terms of its design, insulative properties, energy generation and water efficiency. The Centre for Sustainable Energy's 'How Green Is Your Plan' guidance was reviewed to understand what could be achieved locally to enable this.
- 2.36. **Economy Working Group:** Despite the large distribution list, the business survey did not receive a great response but it did provide information to support improved business infrastructure, such as broadband, support for the idea of village hub and support for those seeking business start-up space or additional space at home for homeworking. It was considered that the policies relating to safeguarding of employment were adequate in the TWBC Local Plan, hence the focus for the SNDP was on homeworking and smaller-scale provision.
- 2.37. **Environment working group:** The group undertook an audit of potential local green spaces in the parish, building on the work undertaken by TWBC in their emerging Local Plan and using the guidance published by Locality. A long-list of spaces was drawn up, with input from the community, and each was visited to assess it against the national criteria. Owners of each of the spaces was contacted at the Pre-Submission stage, to explain what the designation would mean and to seek comments.
- 2.38. Similarly, the group were keen to identify important views and viewpoints in the parish, not least given its location in the High Weald National Landscape. Again suggestions were sought

and each view visited to ascertain whether it could be viewed from a public location and whether it was felt to be important enough to include.

- 2.39. Learning from neighbouring parishes, and inspired by the guidance of the High Weald (Management Plan), the group were keen to protect their dark skies. The CPRE online mapping tool was used to demonstrate the prevalence of dark skies in the area.
- 2.40. Finally, supporting biodiversity was a key motivation locally, supported by the local engagement. The Working Group were particularly keen to identify features of the natural landscape that were not necessarily designated, but which were considered important locally and within the national landscape setting. Members of the Working Group undertook an audit of important hedgerows, for instance, to map out this vital network of wildlife corridors, which linked up woodland and other spaces, including through the settlements themselves.
- 2.41. **Housing Working Group:** The Steering Group had carefully considered the option of allocating housing sites through the neighbourhood plan. Since the TWBC new Local Plan was well-advanced and included sufficient sites within the parish to meet local need, it was agreed that the SNDP would not allocate sites. However this could be revisited upon adoption of the new Local Plan and as part of a potential future review of the SNDP. Instead, the group decided to focus on the type of housing that should be supported locally, to meet local housing needs. To that end, a Housing Needs Assessment was commissioned by AECOM and this was published in early 2024 (*Figure 12*).

Image 12: Housing Needs Assessment



Stage III: Drafting the Pre-Submission Neighbourhood Plan - 2024

- 2.42. Following this, over the early part of 2024, work started on preparing the draft Neighbourhood Plan document and policies. Planning consultants were commissioned to support this drafting stage, taking the evidence and findings from the Working Groups and assisting them in formulating policy ideas. This was an iterative process, requiring regular meetings with the Steering Group to discuss each policy and where additional evidence might be required.
- 2.43. In March 2024, having considered the scope of the policies, the draft emerging Plan was sent to TWBC officers so that it could be screened to ascertain the need or not for a Strategic Environmental Assessment and/or Habitats Regulations Assessment. The screening Determination Statements were published in May 2024, setting out that neither would be required. Copies are included in the Evidence Base and the Basic Conditions Statement.
- 2.44. At this time, TWBC Officers also provided some high-level feedback on the plan, which was incorporated.
- 2.45. This was a concentrated period of effort in order to get the document ready to go to consultation by early summer.

Stage IV: Pre-Submission (Regulation 14) Draft Neighbourhood Plan Consultation

- 2.46. The Steering Group finalised the Pre-Submission draft in May 2024, in readiness for the Regulation 14 consultation, which was held between 25 June 2024 and 20 August 2024. The consultation period was extended to take account of the fact that it ran into the summer.
- 2.47. The SNDP and supporting evidence were uploaded onto the [Parish Council website](#) and the consultation was advertised to the local community in the following ways:
- The Annual Parish Meeting was used to provide a focal point for the consultation, an overview of the Plan and its policies and to promote the formal period of consultation
 - Hard copies of the documentation was available to view at the Old School Hall
 - An online survey was created to enable people to provide feedback. Hard copies of the survey were available on request
 - An article was placed in the village magazine
 - Posters were printed and posted at locations around the parish
 - Social media updates were posted on Facebook
 - The Local Green Space owners were written to and meetings convened if requested
 - The owners of the proposed NDHAs were written to and meetings convened if requested
 - A public meeting on 25 June at the Old School Hall to present the plan, take questions and provide feedback (*Image 13*).

Image 13: Promoting the Pre-Submission Regulation 14 consultation



The Regulation 14 consultation

- 2.48. The community were invited to submit comments using the online / paper survey, or by email. In total, 16 responses were provided by members of the community.
- 2.49. The Steering Group wrote to statutory consultees and other organisations who had an interest in the Plan. A list of the consultees contacted is contained in Appendix A and responses were received from the following:
- Tunbridge Wells Borough Council

- Kent County Council
 - Clarendon Homes
 - Natural England
 - Town and Country Housing
 - National Highways
 - Strategic Planning, Kent and East Sussex
 - King and Johnston Homes Ltd.
- 2.50. Representations received at the Pre-Submission Consultation were recorded by topic/policy and carefully considered by Steering Group members and in discussion with officers at TWBC. A summary of the comments and responses from the Steering Group, are set out in Appendix B. Full copies of the responses are available on the TWBC SDNP website. The following paragraphs provide a summary, by topic area, of the comments received during this process and how these were integrated into the Submission Version SNDP.
- 2.51. **General comments:** The comments were very much supportive of the Plan overall. Many respondents have raised concerns about the amount of development proposed for Sandhurst, notably some 'live' sites. There was a real desire to retain the much-valued landscape and minimise negative impacts associated with development, notably in relation to traffic, which was a major concern particularly among resident responses. The SDNP is not seeking to allocate homes in addition to those set out in the emerging Local Plan. It cannot alter those allocations either, as that would need to be done through the Local Plan process. The emphasis of the SNDP has been, therefore, to influence these proposals, for instance through design and layout, while protecting spaces and areas that are important to the community or for local flora and fauna.
- 2.52. Formatting-related comments have been addressed in the Submission version document. The conformity references have also been updated to accord with the most recent National Planning Policy update (December 2024), to help future-proof the plan. This has led to some minor amendments, for instance the references to First Homes, which has been softened at a national level.
- 2.53. References to Sandhurst have been amended to make clear when this relates to the parish and when to the village.
- 2.54. The SNDP has been reviewed to ensure that it meets accessibility requirements.
- 2.55. The new Local Plan continues to progress in parallel with the SNDP and paragraphs have been updated to provide the latest situation on this and with reference to the most recently published Local Development Scheme.
- 2.56. **Challenges, Vision and objectives:** Strategic Planning, Kent and East Sussex provided commentary on the need to include further text around the challenges associated with flooding and drainage and this has been included.
- 2.57. The vision and objectives were considered clear and effective. A number of minor points were raised largely to assist in ensuring greater clarity. KCC in particular wished to see further inclusion of the public rights of way network, which has been included here.

- 2.58. **Spatial Strategy:** The approach was supported. Discussions with TWBC had led to the agreement that the SNDP would not seek to allocate sites, although this could be reconsidered at a future review of the plan. Some residents expressed concern about the quantum of development proposed for Sandhurst in the Submission Local Plan (SLP), but this sits outside the scope of the SNDP. One respondent was concerned that the Plan was not seeking to allocate sites, which might limit its influence going forward. This was noted, however the Steering Group had agreed not to allocate sites in the context of the fact that this is being done via the SLP.
- 2.59. The proposed Limits to Built Development (LBD) in the SLP were included in the Figure supporting Policy S1, but the plan makes clear that the existing (adopted) LBD remains in place until the adoption of the new Local Plan, at which point the new LBD will come into effect. Policy S1 seeks to set out broad principles that should be considered by future applications, be they strategic allocations, or windfall development.
- 2.60. **Housing:** TWBC raised some queries about Policy S2 on Housing mix, largely in relation to the text around First Homes. Whilst still supported as a type of affordable housing, this clause (Aiii) has been amended to reflect changing national policy on this matter.
- 2.61. TWBC also asked whether the SNDP would support provision of housing for older people in the Parish. If so, a permissive policy/supporting text would be beneficial. It is considered that the opening part of Clause A enables this. Clause B supports housing to suit older people's needs and there is further support for housing for older people in both the HNA and at paragraphs 5.8 and 5.9 of the supporting text.
- 2.62. **Character, heritage and design:** Policy S3 (Character of development) was amended to make the clauses clearer and more strongly worded, notably on the advice of TWBC. Incorrect references to the Conservation Area Appraisal (which does not yet exist) have been removed and instead the Sandhurst Design Guidance is signposted. It should be noted that the Sandhurst Design Guidance and Codes is not a supplementary planning document. Rather it forms an integral part of the SNDP. It has been further amended to reflect comments from TWBC, notably the Conservation Officer, to remove errors, improve the sense of place and provide more local illustrations.
- 2.63. Policy S4 (Energy Efficiency and Design) received support from all parties. Strategic Planning, Kent and East Sussex provided text relating to flooding and drainage, which has been incorporated. It was felt that a standalone policy was not required on this matter as the topic had not been raised as a priority by local people and the TWBC policies are considered to be adequate here. The emphasis of the policy is supporting activities that will help to alleviate surface water. Other minor drafting revisions have been made upon the guidance of TWBC to strengthen the policy.
- 2.64. Policy S5 (Conserving heritage assets) remains largely as drafted, although the ordering has been amended to make it easier to read and apply. Notable inclusions are the references to rural lanes and routeways and farmsteads and oast houses, on the advice of TWBC. These are considered to be notable heritage assets in the area. The routeways also provided a dual wildlife corridor role. The owners of the NDHAs were written to. A further asset was proposed by TWBC (the rebuilt smock mill). The owner was approached directly, given the late stage of

this nomination and they preferred not to be included. The SG discussed this and respected that decision.

- 2.65. **Employment in Sandhurst:** Policy S6 (Supporting flexible workspaces and opportunities for homeworking) in this section was supported. The only minor amendment has been to support such development not only in the village but the wider parish, which would also comply with NPPF para 89.
- 2.66. **Environment and Green Space:** The policies in this section were very much supported. Minor amendments have been made to Policy S7 (Green and blue infrastructure and delivering biodiversity net gain) on the advice of TWBC to strengthen the implementation of the clauses. Specific references to NPPF paragraphs in the supporting text have been removed to futureproof the document. The map supporting this policy showing the parish is quite hard to read, however this is a drawback of reproducing in Word format. Ultimately the layers for the SNDP will be sent to TWBC for inclusion on their online interactive map, which will make things easier to read.
- 2.67. Policy S8 (Local Green Space) was largely supported. Two owners raised the following specific objections:
- Clarendon Homes objected to the inclusion of the space at the new Miller's Meadow site (LGS1). The Steering Group discussed this and consider that this is partially within the proposed extension to the LBD and, the site having been built out, is considered to provide an important space here for those residents living close by. The Steering Group were minded to continue to seek to designate the space.
 - King and Johnston Homes Ltd. objected to the inclusion of LGS2 on the basis that there this no public access to the site and that it is not demonstrably special. The Steering Group reviewed the site and have amended the justification slightly. However, the site is retained for designation as it is considered to be demonstrably special from a wildlife perspective. The space was planted with trees a few years ago and provides a habitat for a range of bird species. There are also slow worms on the site. There are two waterways on the fringes of the land, which provide a space for frogs, toads, newts and other species. There are waterways at the site, created to take away excess water that needed to be pumped from the foundations of one of the nearby properties (some 50+ years ago), due to natural springs present across this area. It is thought that these springs (and associated watercourses) gave the street here its name.
- 2.68. Some informal comments were received by the Steering Group during the consultation about a further space in the parish. This was reviewed but considered not to meet the NPPF requirements.
- 2.69. Policy S9 (Locally significant views) was well supported. Feedback from the community raised a further view along Sponden Lane that should be included. The Steering Group visited the location and agreed that it should be identified in the policy. Mapping and associated description and photo have been provided.
- 2.70. Policy S10 (Dark skies) was well supported.

- 2.71. **Transport and Movement:** The policies here were supported. Policy S11 (Improving safe movement and promoting active modes of travel) has been amended slightly – notably to remove the reference to ‘major’ development being the trigger for clause A, on the advice of TWBC. Additional references are made to the public rights of way network and support for enhancing the network. TWBC raised a concern about Policy S12 (Public car parking) in relation to whether it conflicted with Policy S11 and the push for sustainable travel. The Steering Group discussed this and whilst active travel remains the priority, there has to be a level of realism applied in a rural area where some people may not have a choice but to use cars to move around. The emphasis is therefore on shifting mindsets, but over a longer term.
- 2.72. **Community facilities:** The policy S13 (A Village Hub for Sandhurst) was supported, although there is some discussion clearly to be had about the precise nature of what this might be. The policy is intended as a hook to enable the project as a planning application arises.
- 2.73. Policy S14 (Improving opportunities for community and cultural facilities, sport and recreation) received support and has been amended to include additional detail, notably around the sort of provision for teenagers, that would be supported locally.

Stage V: Submission Version Neighbourhood Plan

- 2.74. Following the changes made to the SNDP as a result of the Regulation 14 consultation, the Submission Version was formally submitted to TWBC who, once satisfied that the correct set of documents have been received, will undertake the Regulation 16 consultation. The document will then proceed to Examination and, assuming a favourable outcome, to referendum.

3 CONCLUSION

- 3.1. The Steering Group has undertaken a very thorough engagement programme in order to develop the Sandhurst Neighbourhood Plan. It has set out a comprehensive vision and objectives and guiding principles. In developing the policies to achieve the vision and objectives, the Group has actively engaged with a wide range of stakeholders and the Plan has evolved accordingly.
- 3.2. Feedback from the Regulation 14 consultation has enabled the Plan to be shaped into its final version, to submit to TWBC.
- 3.3. This report fulfils the requirements for the Consultation Statement, set out in Regulation 15(2) of the Neighbourhood Development Planning (General) Regulations 2012 (as amended).
- 3.4. Gratitude is extended to everybody who has contributed to the Plan's development, either as a valued member of the Steering Group or as someone who has taken the time to contribute their views and opinions. This has been invaluable in helping to shape the scope and content of the Sandhurst Neighbourhood Plan.

APPENDIX A: LIST OF THOSE CONSULTED AT REGULATION 14 (PRE-SUBMISSION STAGE)

- Local Residents
- Local Businesses
- Local organisations
- Statutory Consultees:

TWBC (Planning)
Rother DC (Planning)
Kent County Council (Planning)
KCC (Rights of Way)
KCC Flooding and Drainage
East Sussex CC (Planning)
KCC (Historic Environment Record Manager, Planning & Environment Division)
KCC (Heritage Conservation Manager and County Archaeologist, Planning and Environment)
Director of Property & Infrastructure
Sustainable Communities Project Officer (Kent Adult Social Services – West Kent)
Social Care Health and Wellbeing, Strategic Commissioning (Accommodation Solutions)
The Coal Authority (not contacted as not relevant to the area)
Homes England
Natural England
Environment Agency
Historic England
Network Rail
National Highways
Marine Management Organisation (not contacted as not relevant to the area)
Water supplier (SE)
Sewers (Southern)
Gas (Cadent Gas)
Electric (UK Power Networks)
National Grid
BT
NHS West Kent CCG

Local Green Space owners:

1. Clarendon Homes
2. Sandhurst Parish Council
3. Town and Country Housing
4. Kent County Council
5. King and Johnston Homes Ltd.

Neighbouring Local Councils:

Bodiam Parish Council
Salehurst and Robertsbridge Parish Council
Hawkhurst Parish Council
Benenden Parish Council
Rolvenden Parish Council
Newenden Parish Council
Northiam Parish Council
Ewhurst Parish Council

APPENDIX B: SUMMARY OF COMMENTS RECEIVED AT PRE-SUBMISSION REGULATION 14 CONSULTATION AND RESPONSE FROM THE STEERING GROUP

Responses received from:

1. Tunbridge Wells Borough Council
2. Kent County Council
3. Map showing Millers Meadow Green Space (part of submission from Ref 9, Clarendon Homes)
4. Natural England
5. Resident
6. Resident
7. Resident
8. Resident
9. Clarendon Homes
10. Resident
11. Town and Country Housing
12. National Highways
13. Strategic Planning, Kent and East Sussex
14. Survey (residents) – 12 responses
15. King and Johnston Homes Ltd.

A summary of the relative support for each policy by those responding to the survey is provided in Table A.

Table B provides a summary of the responses received from all those received.

Sandhurst Neighbourhood Development Plan
Consultation Statement

Table A: Summary of survey findings

	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	NEUTRAL	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	TOTAL
Policy S1: Location of development	46.15% 6	15.38% 2	7.69% 1	0.00% 0	30.77% 4	13
Policy S2: Meeting local housing needs	30.77% 4	38.46% 5	23.08% 3	0.00% 0	7.69% 1	13
Policy S3: Character and design of development	46.15% 6	46.15% 6	0.00% 0	7.69% 1	0.00% 0	13
Policy S4: Energy efficiency and design	30.77% 4	61.54% 8	7.69% 1	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	13
Policy S5: Conserving heritage assets	69.23% 9	23.08% 3	0.00% 0	7.69% 1	0.00% 0	13
Policy S6: Supporting flexible workspaces and opportunities for homeworking	53.85% 7	38.46% 5	0.00% 0	7.69% 1	0.00% 0	13
Policy S7: Green and blue infrastructure and delivering biodiversity net gain	61.54% 8	23.08% 3	7.69% 1	7.69% 1	0.00% 0	13
Policy S8: Local green spaces	46.15% 6	46.15% 6	7.69% 1	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	13
Policy S9: Locally significant views	38.46% 5	38.46% 5	0.00% 0	23.08% 3	0.00% 0	13
Policy S10: Dark skies	61.54% 8	38.46% 5	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	13
Policy S11: Improving safe movement and promoting active modes of travel	61.54% 8	23.08% 3	15.38% 2	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	13
Policy S12: Publicly accessible parking	46.15% 6	38.46% 5	7.69% 1	0.00% 0	7.69% 1	13
Policy S13: A village hub for Sandhurst	46.15% 6	38.46% 5	15.38% 2	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	13
Policy S14: Improving opportunities for community and cultural facilities, sport and recreation	46.15% 6	46.15% 6	0.00% 0	7.69% 1	0.00% 0	13

Table B: Summary of responses received at Regulation 14 consultation

Ref	Who?	Page/para/ policy	Comments/ Proposed change	SG response
1.	1	General	Ahead of the next iteration of the SNDP, TWBC offers to meet with the NDP group if they would like to go through the issues and points raised through these comments.	Request accepted. Meeting agreed.
2.	1	General - Reference to policies in TWBC SLP	Note that some policies in the SLP will be subject to amendment through the on-going examination process and Main Modifications consultation in due course.	Noted and amendments will be made in due course to reflect this.
3.	1	General – reference to ‘the village’	Does this mean Sandhurst Village? Suggest this is noted or referenced throughout as Sandhurst Village for sake of clarity.	Yes, but will be amended for clarity.
4.	2	General – Minerals and Waste	The County Council, as Minerals and Planning Authority, confirms that within the plan area, there are no safeguarded waste management facilities. With regards to safeguarded minerals, there are safeguarded sandstones (of various types) and some Sub-Alluvial River Terrace Deposits (sands and gravels) to which the Neighbourhood Plan does not refer. One of the housing allocations from the emerging Tunbridge Wells Local Plan (hatched in red in the plan below reproduced from the Neighbourhood Plan) is coincident with a safeguarded mineral - the Tunbridge Wells Sand Formation. The Neighbourhood Plan makes no reference to this	Include reference in intro text.

Ref	Who?	Page/para/ policy	Comments/ Proposed change	SG response
			<p>fact and the need to address mineral safeguarding.</p> <p>A part of the Tunbridge Wells Local Plan process, the County Council concluded that the mineral safeguarding issues are not objectionable. Given that the very extensive nature of the sandstone formations, which are met by two quarries operating in East Sussex and the economic market demands at this time which are low to non-existent, the County Council has no land-won mineral safeguarding concerns for the Neighbourhood Plan but would recommend consideration and reference to this matter.</p>	
5.	8	General	<p>the document is very well-presented, clearly written, concise and accessible - my congratulations to those who contributed to it, wrote the text and bashed it into its final shape, not an easy job! There were just a couple of things I found confusing or unclear: the term "windfall" on page 14 in relation to development is a usage new to me, and it would have been helpful to include it in the Glossary; and the map on page 37 was just on too small a scale to be of use. Also, the key did not identify some of the areas: what are the pale pink and dark orange ones</p>	Noted- make amends as suggested.
6.	5	General	<p>1. Before building in the countryside, build in vacant properties first instance.</p>	1. National policy issue

Ref	Who?	Page/para/ policy	Comments/ Proposed change	SG response
			<p>2. Should be mandatory for new builds to have solar panels and heat pumps.</p> <p>3. Grey water system should be fitted to all new builds to reduce water consumption as we live in a drought prone area.</p> <p>4. All new builds should have off-road parking for minimum of two cars.</p>	<p>2. Policy S4 supports proposals that include such features.</p> <p>3. Policy S4 supports proposals that include such features.</p> <p>4. The Plan supports off-road parking in new development, as per the Local Authority car parking standards.</p>
7.	7	Non policies	As Village Magazine may stop, can we have a village directory of services on the website?	For PC to consider.
8.	13	Non Policies	<p>We note the inclusion of ‘well-maintained infrastructure for water and drains’ on page 60 of the Plan, and the reference to Southern Water on page 12 that this may relate to. For further information please see our Clean Rivers and Seas investment map available here: https://experience.arcgis.com/experience/e9a1db8d193d4cd582d550285a3aeb44/page/Map/?views=Investment-plans This shows £1.27million of investment is planned for delivery during 2025-2030 at Sandhurst wastewater treatment works in order to address the root causes of problems resulting in storm overflows discharging too frequently at this location. Although the Neighbourhood Plan relates to the Sandhurst Parish, Hawkhurst Parish is also mentioned, and the link above also shows that a further £2.12million is planned over the same period to address the root cause of spill overflow – which in</p>	Include reference.

Ref	Who?	Page/para/ policy	Comments/ Proposed change	SG response
			this case is too much rainfall getting into the sewer network. Sustainable urban drainage solutions will therefore be particularly key for any development across Hawkhurst Parish. We hope this additional information is helpful to you.	
9.	14	Non policies	Traffic calming along the A268 and Bodiam Road as well as options for the introduction of a crossing point near to the school are very important. Can they be in the Highways Improvement Plan?	SPC has liaised with KCC and MP to move towards traffic calming measures
10.	14	Non policies	Traffic calming along A268 is desperately needed	See above.
11.	14	Non policies	Improve public transport links. Reinstate bench seating around the established mature tree sited at Lower Green.	SPC has established link with borough councillor and MP to pursue need for transport links. Currently investigating the possibility of a link to Etchingham (Rail link) and Tenterden. SPC looking to replace bench in the near future
12.	14	Non policies	Get KCC to implement the speed limit reductions as a matter of priority	Noted.
13.	4	General	No specific comments	Noted.
14.	9	Housing	Consider that the Plan should be bringing forward housing. See also response provided via SurveyMonkey along same vein.	Noted – this was discussed by the Steering Group, who did not wish to pursue site allocations at this time. This is being undertaken at the strategic level.
15.	10	General	photo attached and he thought it merited inclusion as part of the village heritage. It may be	Add into the plan.

Ref	Who?	Page/para/ policy	Comments/ Proposed change	SG response
			the tree shown as '1977 Oak Tree" on p. 36. Certainly it is the one on the cover 47 years later. Bicentenary or Silver Jubilee, I don't know, but if the former, maybe 1776 would be a better date. Your choice.	
16.	11	General	No comment.	Noted.
17.	12	General	No comment.	Noted.
18.	1	Cover page - "Setting the Pattern for future development in Sandhurst"	Amend to Sandhurst Parish	Agreed and amended.
19.	1	Foreword - "All who live in Sandhurst appreciate...."	Amend to parish	Agreed and amended.
20.	1	General – NPPF refs	A revised NPPF is currently being consulted on. Any implications from the proposed changes on the SNDP should be considered.	Noted and will be reflected.
21.	1	1.1: "...forming part of the development plan for Tunbridge Wells borough...."	Note that this will only be the case once the NDP has been successful at referendum and subsequently "made" by TWBC.	Noted although leave as is, as it's written as if it is.
22.	1	1.3: "The SNDP policies form part of the development plan for Tunbridge Wells borough"	As above.	Noted.
23.	1	1.7: Paras 29 and 30 of NPPF	Split text so it is clear what is para 29 and what is para 30 of NPPF. Will also need to update references to current NPPF consultation.	Noted

Ref	Who?	Page/para/ policy	Comments/ Proposed change	SG response
24.	1	1.8: The Kent Minerals and Waste Local Plan 2013-2030 (adopted 2016, modified in 2020).	It may be worth noting this is currently subject to further review and examination (submitted for examination in May 2024).	Amend
25.	1	1.9: There are also a series of Supplementary Planning documents which form part of the Development Plan.	This to be corrected – SPDs are material planning considerations but do not form part of the Development Plan.	Amend
26.	1	1.10: LP history	Update to note hearing sessions on the proposed changes took place in June/July 2024 and any further updates which occur ahead of submitting the SNDP. For instance, the Borough Council are currently preparing for a further consultation on additional evidence base documents and an updated Gypsy, Traveller, and Travelling Showpeople Accommodation Assessment (GTAA). It is likely further hearing sessions will commence in relation to this.	Amend as suggested
27.	1	1.11: The latest Local Development Scheme (December 2023) sets out the proposed timetable for the emerging Local Plan and states that the intention is to adopt the	This requires an update – the latest LDS is dated June 2024 and updates the timetable for adoption of the Borough Local Plan.	Amended to latest (now October 2024)

Ref	Who?	Page/para/ policy	Comments/ Proposed change	SG response
		new Local Plan towards the end of 2024.		
28.	1	1.13: The SLP seeks to deliver, across the borough, a minimum of 12,006 dwellings and 14 hectares of employment (Use Classes B (Business use) and E (Commercial use)) land, together with supporting infrastructure and services over the plan period (Policy STR 1).	This requires an update as the emerging Local Plan is now being progressed with a 10 year rather than a 15 year Housing Land Supply. This means that TWBC is committed to a partial early review of the Local Plan to seek ways of meeting growth needs for the period beyond the 10 years post adoption of the Local Plan. The emerging Local Plan is now seeking to deliver 10100 dwellings over the 10 years post adoption. Furthermore, it is worth keeping in mind the revised method for calculating housing need, proposed through the ongoing NPPF consultation, would lead to a significant increase in the number of houses the early review will have to plan for across the borough.	Amended
29.	1	1.13: National Landscape	Please note there is a new, updated High Weald Management Plan dated 2024 – 2029 , which should be the reference used.	Amended.
30.	1	1.19: Sustainability of the Neighbourhood Plan – “Copies of the Screening Determination statements are available on the Sandhurst Parish Council website.”	TWBC suggests that these documents are hyperlinked in the SNDP.	Included links.

Ref	Who?	Page/para/ policy	Comments/ Proposed change	SG response
31.	2	Chapter 3 (vision)	Objectives should have specific reference to the PRoW network and the role of the ROWIP. It is requested that the County Council PRoW and Access Service is directly involved in future discussions regarding projects that will affect the PRoW network. The County Council can then advise on the design and delivery of these projects, ensuring that new routes successfully integrate with the existing PRoW network. The County Council would welcome future engagement with the Parish Council to consider local aspirations for access improvements and potential funding sources for the delivery of these schemes.	PROW mentioned explicitly here now. Further detail to go into the relevant chapter.
32.	1	4.3: 2nd bullet point: Prioritising the reuse of brownfield sites (TWBC SLP Policy STR3) and only permitting greenfield development on the edge of the settlement in exceptional circumstances, with clear and strict guidance on what is appropriate	It needs to be recognised that the NPPF AONB policy (para 183) applies the test of exceptional circumstances to major development in the AONB only, not all development. The NDP text therefore conflicts with national advice and TWBC suggests this is amended accordingly.	Amend to refer to major development only.
33.	1	4.4: Text about Limits to Built Development	Is the SNDP proposing to include the LBD approved in the emerging SLP? This should be clarified in this para (it is in the policy box) – if it is, reference to TWBC 2016 LBD should be deleted so as not to confuse the reader of the SNDP.	As per our policy. Adopted ones until the SLP is adopted.

Ref	Who?	Page/para/ policy	Comments/ Proposed change	SG response
34.	14	S1	Sharp Hill Farm site - disagree with proposed development as there is already an issue with traffic safety at this location. Additional vehicles turning out of and into the development would be dangerous as it is a hazardous point to join the A268. At this point people increase speed as they leave Sandhurst and the 30 mph zone and enter the national speed limit. There is known crash history at this point. This site is extending the length of the village, rather than making a nuclear hub. If one of the aspirations is to create a hub, then this policy will be more successful if people can access it from a quiet location rather than walking along a busy A road. If houses are located just off a busy road they are more likely to drive to Hawkhurst than walk to the Sandhurst village hub.	Noted, but this is considered as part of the Local Plan and hence outside the scope of the NDP.
35.	14	S1	We disagree with the proposed development of Sharp Hill Farm. There is already an issue with traffic safety at this location. This issue would be exacerbated by creating further housing whose principle means of access and egress is directly on A268. At the moment Sandhurst suffers from being a long thin village, by creating further development at this end of the village you are exacerbating this, creating a sense of suburban sprawl.	See above.
36.	14	S1	Disagree with the proposed development at Sharp Hills Farm. There is already an issue with traffic speeding through the 30 speed zone. Further tuning into or out of the development onto the A268 has been known to be hazardous. There is a known crash risk around the 30 zone at the edge of the village.	See above.

Ref	Who?	Page/para/ policy	Comments/ Proposed change	SG response
			Due to Sandhurst's shape being a thin village lots of the residence have there roads or drives joining the A268. Sites should make use of other roads in the village for access to minimise traffic movements on A268.	
37.	7	S2	Yes to all.	Noted.
38.	14	S2	I actually believe the social housing figure should be higher and in mixed tenure.	The figures are based on the findings of the HNA, which is detailed in the justification.
39.	14	S2	Note: for both 2/ 3 bedroom houses - the possibility of older/ disabled persons requiring a bedroom and bathroom on the ground floor. (Allows for carers/ guests on first floor.	Text inserted to support this as required.
40.	1	Section 6	Many of the comments made in this section were made by the Borough Council's Conservation and Urban Design Officer where a number of issues were raised in relation to it and the Design Codes and Guidelines (see these comments at the end of the table). It may be helpful to organise a meeting with TWBC officers to go through these issues ahead of the next iteration of the SNDP. Separate comments have also been made by other officers in this section, such as by the Sustainability Manager in relation to Policy S4.	Noted and meeting arranged to discuss the Design Guide. The Guidance has been amended accordingly by AECOM.
41.	1	6.1: Supporting the LP	It is not clear what plan the reference to policy EN4 is referring to. Is the NDP group assuming the SLP will be adopted by the time the SNDP is made? Policy EN4 is heritage but the chapter intro discusses design overall.	Remove explicit reference.

Ref	Who?	Page/para/ policy	Comments/ Proposed change	SG response
42.	1	Fig 4	<p>Character areas are fully supported, however, why are 'recent developments' and 'cul de sac developments' separate character typologies? The photos on page 21 of the Design Guidelines and Codes document itself refer to 'cul de sac neighbourhoods – older developments, and 'cul de sac neighbourhoods – recent developments'.</p> <p>Additionally, it is not entirely clear from the colour coding what the farmsteads area is. Is it everything outside the settlements? It is not clear why residential properties are within the farmsteads character area if not farmhouses or farm workers cottages. The farmsteads SPD should also be referenced here. If the conservation area is one of the character areas, careful thought is needed to characterise it, as even the core village is varied in character.</p>	Noted and meeting arranged to discuss the Design Guide. The Guidance has been amended accordingly by AECOM.
43.	1	6.10 S3 and S4	<p>These policies would be appropriate for all development, rather than 'where appropriate'.</p> <p>Consider rewording to say that both policies should be considered together.</p> <p>As the historic environment is acknowledged in both policies, which is good, something could be added at the beginning to explain how they interlink.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>This is included at 6.10.</p> <p>Add into supporting text.</p>
44.	1	S3 A	<p>The word 'responds' in the first sentence should have 'to' after it, to relate it to 'surrounds'.</p> <p>Sentence two – 'minimises' should be 'minimise'</p>	Typo – amend both
45.	1	S3 B(i)	Remove reference to a Sandhurst CA appraisal.	Removed.

Ref	Who?	Page/para/ policy	Comments/ Proposed change	SG response
46.	1	S3 B(ii)	The wording suggests street scene improvements are only wanted on the A268 and Bodium Road. This is fine if it is the intended aim, but if not, more general wording could be considered such as 'This applies particularly to...'	Agree that wording would be helpful here.
47.	1	S3 B	It would be good to see more references to cycling and cycling infrastructure provision in this section. For example, criterion B (vii) should also reference the safety of cyclists. Also, the part of speech of the first word in each of the numbered subsections needs a bit of rethinking as it is inconsistent. For example, starting with a verb in iii and iv and then a pronoun in v. They should follow on from the sentence in the introduction.	Added in. Noted – clarity to be improved.
48.	1	S3 B(v)	The term 'protect the buildings' is a bit ambiguous. 'Protect the heritage significance of buildings' would be more compliant with the NPPF.	Agree and amend.
49.	1	S4 B	Consider adding the word 'significant' before 'detrimental impact' in the first sentence.	Agree
50.	1	S4 C	Very pleased to see the reference to the HE retrofit guidance, although, this sentence could do with breaking up into shorter sentences to increase clarity.	Noted and amend for clarity.
51.	1	S4 "Incorporating on-site energy generation from renewable sources such as solar panels, ground source heating and energy generation etc."	Reference is made to renewable energy, but it would be clearer if specific reference was made to renewable / low carbon heating systems. Ground source heat may not be appropriate for all properties. It would be good to see air source heat referenced.	Amended.
52.	1	S4: "Reducing water consumption using water	Reference could be made to smart water butts, to help alleviate drainage issues during periods of	Agree and include here and in the justification.

Ref	Who?	Page/para/ policy	Comments/ Proposed change	SG response
		re-use measures including rainwater harvesting, surface water harvesting and/or grey water recycling systems. Personal water consumption per day for new build should not exceed 120l.”	significant rainfall. This adaptation measure could help reduce susceptibility in new developments to surface water flooding, especially with increases in impermeable surfaces associated with development.	
53.	1	S4: Installation of energy efficiency measures such as loft and wall insulation and double glazing.	Reference could be made to utilising a ‘fabric first approach’, aligning with TWBC’s emerging Local Plan Policy EN3.	Agree and add in
54.	1	S4	Reference should ideally be made to the provision of infrastructure and power supply to enable EV charging points at new developments.	The provision of EV charging points is a national requirement. Nevertheless added in.
55.	7	S4	All essential for 21 st century – energy, efficiency, design. Can PC signpost to a specialist consultant as we have many old properties in the parish	Climate Action Group at the parish level exists to assist with this and investigate solutions.
56.	13	S4 and S14	Policy S4: Energy, Efficiency and Design We would strongly support the inclusion of additional sustainable design principles in this policy, in particular the addition of sustainable urban drainage considerations to section B. We also recommend amending section B(v) in line with the Building Regulations optional standard for water efficiency for water stressed regions. We request the addition of the wording below to Policy S4 section B: • existing flow routes and drainage features	Clause B amended to incorporate suggestions. B(v) – text amended as suggested. S14 – text added as suggested.

Ref	Who?	Page/para/ policy	Comments/ Proposed change	SG response
			<p>within the site should be identified and preserved e.g. ditches, seasonally dry watercourses, historic ponds.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Integrate sustainable drainage measures to minimise and control surface water run-off. SuDS measures should be designed to take appropriate account of local conditions. We also recommend amending Section B(v) to read: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reducing water consumption using water re-use measures including rainwater harvesting, surface water harvesting and/or grey water recycling systems. Personal water consumption per day for new build should not exceed the Building Regulations recommended standard for water efficiency in water stressed regions. We make the surface water management recommendations because: As acknowledged in the draft neighbourhood plan, more resilient and efficient homes are essential – conserving both energy and water. We also need to ensure that design of developments will not mean that rainwater continues to run off homes and surfaces so fast that it causes flooding. Southern Water supports all policy requirements which seek to ensure that surface water is appropriately managed, as close to source as possible. In terms of future flood risk, better rainwater management through SuDS is the preferred approach to avoid placing added pressure on drainage networks during heavy rainfall. We strongly support the requirement to include SuDS within all development. This is also in line with the requirements of paragraph 167(c) of the NPPF (2023). Building Regulations H3 provides a drainage hierarchy 	<p>Proposal for new policy on utilities infrastructure – it is considered that this is adequately accommodated in strategic and local policy.</p>

Ref	Who?	Page/para/ policy	Comments/ Proposed change	SG response
			<p>whereby surface water should first discharge to a soakaway or other infiltration system where practicable, with discharge to the combined sewerage system a last resort. Development will not be allowed to drain surface water to the foul sewer, and Southern Water will resist new connections of surface water to the combined sewer this is in line with our surface water management policy here: https://www.southernwater.co.uk/media/l23dbon0/surface-water-management-policy-120724.pdf Measures should support the attenuation of flows of surface water run-off from rainfall, as well as surface water infiltration into the ground wherever possible in the local environment. Infiltration tests will inform the developer as to the feasibility of infiltration SuDS alongside other measures such as water recycling, swales and tree pits. Developers of any locations with high groundwater should also ensure they install a watertight foul system in their development. Whilst some parts of the wastewater network were originally designed to accommodate surface water, the expansion of towns and cities, and ‘urban creep’, contributes to increases in surface water run-off. As stated in Water UK’s 21st Century Drainage Programme; “The country’s built environment is constantly changing and “urban creep” – home extensions, conservatories and paving over front gardens for parking – can all add to the amount of water going into our sewers and drains. Green spaces that would absorb rainwater are covered over by concrete and tarmac that will not. In fact, studies</p>	

Ref	Who?	Page/para/ policy	Comments/ Proposed change	SG response
			<p>show that “urban creep” results in a larger increase in predicted flooding than new housing, because it adds more rainwater to these systems’. As set out in Defra’s Storm Overflows Discharge Reduction Plan “Water companies must remove rainwater from the combined sewer system as part of effectually draining their areas. This should include limiting any new connections of surface water to the combined sewer network, and any new connections should be offset by disconnecting a greater volume of surface water elsewhere within the network”. This aligns with Southern Water’s work to address problems caused by excess surface water in our sewerage network in order to protect water quality in rivers and sea. For more information please see – https://www.southernwater.co.uk/our-performance/storm-overflows/storm-overflow-task-force and https://www.southernwater.co.uk/media/kdlbe4on/storm-overflows_faq.pdf Even as we deliver this work, development continues to increase surface water run-off. For communities to be resilient to the evolving impacts of climate change into the future, we need planning policy to ensure that development does not increase flood risk elsewhere. Regarding Section B(v) and paragraph 6.19 of the Neighbourhood Plan, we make this recommendation because: Whilst not acting as the statutory water supplier to Sandhurst, Southern Water’s business plan is referred to in paragraph 6.19 as the evidence base for proposing a water use target of 120lpppd. Although we do not</p>	

Ref	Who?	Page/para/ policy	Comments/ Proposed change	SG response
			<p>supply water to Sandhurst we hope our response here is helpful, and we would refer you to the Building Regulations optional standard for water efficiency for water stressed areas. This is the minimum standard most consider appropriate to the ‘serious water stress’¹ status of the South East, although the Government plans to tighten² this Building Regulations standard further. High standards of water efficiency in new developments also equate to greater long-term sustainability. ¹</p> <p>Water_stressed_areas___final_classification_2021.odt (live.com) ²</p> <p>https://database.waterwise.org.uk/knowledge-base/building-regulations-water-efficiency-review/ https://www.gov.uk/government/news/ambitious-roadmap-for-a-cleaner-greener-country This Building Regulations standard is therefore the one to refer to, and is adopted by most local and neighbourhood plans (and would most likely be referred to by any Examiner of the Plan). As the Government plans to tighten the standards, Southern Water generally recommends allowing for this in any policy wording to avoid potential for confusion in future. S14: Improving Opportunities for Community and Cultural Facilities, Sport and Recreation Where there is an opportunity for communities to develop and incorporate public examples of sustainable urban drainage approaches this should help to mitigate flood risk locally. As SuDS will be so important to resilient communities into the future, we propose the amendments below to the wording of this policy.</p>	

Ref	Who?	Page/para/ policy	Comments/ Proposed change	SG response
			<p>We request the addition of the wording below to section A:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposal would take appropriate opportunities to enhance the local environment through the delivery of multi-functional outdoor spaces that incorporate sustainable urban drainage measures. Our reasons for this request are explained in more detail below: Southern Water supports all policy requirements which seek to ensure that surface water is appropriately managed, as close to source as possible. In terms of future flood risk, better rainwater management through SuDS is the preferred approach to avoid placing added pressure on drainage networks during heavy rainfall. We strongly support the requirement to include SuDS within all development. This is also in line with the requirements of paragraph 167(c) of the NPPF (2023). Building Regulations H3 provides a drainage hierarchy whereby surface water should first discharge to a soakaway or other infiltration system where practicable, with discharge to the combined sewerage system a last resort. Development will not be allowed to drain surface water to the foul sewer, and Southern Water will resist new connections of surface water to the combined sewer this is in line with our surface water management policy here: https://www.southernwater.co.uk/media/l23dbon0/surface-water-management-policy-120724.pdf As stated in Water UK’s 21st Century Drainage Programme; “The country’s built environment is constantly changing and “urban creep” – home extensions, conservatories and paving over front 	

Ref	Who?	Page/para/ policy	Comments/ Proposed change	SG response
			<p>gardens for parking – can all add to the amount of water going into our sewers and drains. Green spaces that would absorb rainwater are covered over by concrete and tarmac that will not. In fact, studies show that “urban creep” results in a larger increase in predicted flooding than new housing, because it adds more rainwater to these systems’. As set out in Defra’s Storm Overflows Discharge Reduction Plan “Water companies must remove rainwater from the combined sewer system as part of effectually draining their areas. This should include limiting any new connections of surface water to the combined sewer network, and any new connections should be offset by disconnecting a greater volume of surface water elsewhere within the network”. This aligns with Southern Water’s work to address problems caused by excess surface water in our sewerage network in order to protect water quality in rivers and sea. For more information please see – https://www.southernwater.co.uk/our-performance/storm-overflows/storm-overflow-task-force and https://www.southernwater.co.uk/media/7459/storm-overflows_faq.pdf Even as we deliver this work, development continues to increase surface water run-off. All development proposals should therefore include adequate drainage provision and seek to reduce flood risk and contribute to flood alleviation. New Policy to support the provision of infrastructure Southern Water may have to provide additional water or wastewater infrastructure to serve new and</p>	

Ref	Who?	Page/para/ policy	Comments/ Proposed change	SG response
			<p>existing customers or meet stricter environmental standards. It is likely that there would be limited options with regard to location, as the infrastructure would need to connect into existing networks. Planning policies should therefore support infrastructure proposals and we therefore propose an additional policy for inclusion within the Plan: New and improved utility infrastructure will be encouraged and supported in order to meet the identified needs of the community subject to other policies in the plan. We could find no policies to support the general provision of new or improved utilities infrastructure in the current draft of the Plan. The NPPF (2023) paragraph 28 establishes that communities should set out detailed policies for specific areas including 'the provision of infrastructure and community facilities at a local level'. Also the National Planning Practice Guidance states that 'Adequate water and wastewater infrastructure is needed to support sustainable development'. Although the Neighbourhood Forum is not the planning authority in relation to wastewater development proposals, support for essential infrastructure is required at all levels of the planning system.</p>	
57.	14	S4	<p>Sensitive handling of historic buildings will be key to achieving Sandhurst's aim of energy efficiency: because approx 50% of buildings in the Conservation Area are Listed.</p>	<p>Noted and the purpose of this clause is to ensure that.</p>
58.	1	6.21 S5	<p>It is also pleasing to see the word 'celebrated' here. However, (and this has been a debate with Historic England over TWBC's policy), it should be NPPF</p>	<p>Amended</p>

Ref	Who?	Page/para/ policy	Comments/ Proposed change	SG response
			compliant – the ‘where possible’ should be taken out of the second sentence	
59.	1	6.22	There is another reference to a Sandhurst CA appraisal here.	Remove reference to the CA, as it does not exist. Refer instead to the Design guidance and Codes.
60.	1	6.25	It is good to have a local list from the NDP group, however, the list seems short. What about the farm buildings that are not statutorily listed, the rebuilt smock mill and rural lanes?	The owners of the smock mill were contacted and preferred not to be included. The SG has respected this. Make reference to the farmsteads/ oast houses in the policies and the need to adhere/refer to the TWBC guidance on this.
61.	1	6.27	It feels repetitive to have ‘addition’ and ‘additional’ in the same sentence. Maybe change to ‘other’? It is also worth saying that these include historic farmsteads and archaeological finds.	Agree and amend.
62.	1	6.29	paragraph feels out of context being within the non-designated heritage assets section.	Moved
63.	1	6.30	TWBC are not sure what the 2018 TWBC update refers to. Otherwise, an audit of listed buildings state of repair by the NDP group would be very much appreciated.	Text removed.
64.	1	S5 B	This is a repeat of the NPPF and could do with a little more locally distinctive wording. Perhaps refer to the character areas?	The policy has been amended.

Ref	Who?	Page/para/ policy	Comments/ Proposed change	SG response
65.	1	S5 C	This sounds good, but it is outside the scope of planning policy and more of a heritage at risk proactive policy. It would be unlikely to stand unless it refers to development proposals.	This has been removed from the policy but retained in the supporting text.
66.	1	S5 D	Another reference to a Sandhurst CA appraisal.	This has been removed and reference made the Sandhurst Design Guidance and Codes. Supporting text includes reference to PC potential to work with TWBC to prepare a CA for Sandhurst, building on the Design Guidance work.
67.	1	S6 (i)	<p>This policy needs further consideration and appropriate conditions as it currently is not clear. It needs some guidance on what scale is appropriate and where. There is no mention of impact on environmental considerations – landscape, ecology, heritage etc.</p> <p>What would the approach be to the wider Parish? It is possible there could be suitable opportunities outside the village as well.</p>	<p>Village has been amended to parish, in line with NPPF para 89.</p> <p>Additional criteria added in relation to landscape, ecology and heritage.</p>
68.	1	S7 D	Consider strengthening the policy and the appropriateness of the number phrases which allow for developers to get out of the requirements. For example, ‘where possible’, ‘appropriate for their scale’, and ‘unless this is clearly not possible’.	Noted and amended wording to make it stronger
69.	2	S7	Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SuDS): The County Council, as Lead Local Flood Authority, recommends that this section and relevant policies could be strengthened to consider/require the use of	This is now included in Policy S4.

Ref	Who?	Page/para/ policy	Comments/ Proposed change	SG response
			Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) as outlined in section 14 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) for new development proposals. The multiple benefits that SuDS can provide which include additional amenity and biodiversity benefits are well documented and would seem to align with this section of the Neighbourhood Plan.	
70.	7	S7	Yes to all points.	Noted.
71.		S7	Our carbon footprint is shared between buildings and agriculture: we should seek to reduce carbon emissions in both.	Noted. The policies collectively seek to achieve this.
72.	1	S8	Two of the proposed local green space designations are the same as proposed in the TWBC SLP. The other proposed local green spaces were not assessed for designation as part of the SLP. TWBC has no issue with these being pursued through the SNDP.	Noted and reference made to this.
73.	3	S8 Millers Meadow	Map supplied	Noted and amended in the document
74.	9	S8	<p>Objection to green space. The land is not a public space and never has been. It does have a public footpath running down the west of the site, but the field itself is in private ownership and does not meet the criteria necessary to be included as a public Open Green Space. We shall be contesting the inclusion of our land in the Plan for this purpose.</p> <p>Clarendon state they were not contacted.</p>	<p>The SG carefully considered the representation but has decided to retain the space, amending the map to mirror the one supplied by Clarendon.</p> <p>Clarendon have since passed the maintenance of the area in question on to a residents' group who would be looking to preserve the area for wildlife.</p> <p>LGS can be in private ownership. This space is considered to be important</p>

Ref	Who?	Page/para/ policy	Comments/ Proposed change	SG response
				<p>locally for those parishioners in this part of Sandhurst village.</p> <p>Clarendon were contacted at the start of the Regulation 14 stage, which is permissible. There will be further opportunity for them to submit their views.</p>
75.	15	S8	<p>Objection for the inclusion of the Old Orchard as a protected Local Green Space. See response for full detail, but objections include:</p> <p>No public access Private land Incorrect reference to a gill stream</p>	<p>The Steering Group has reviewed the inclusion of this site against the NPPF criteria. It is acknowledged that that site is privately owned and has no public access. However public access is not a requirement for designating a local green space. The group consider that the space does have significant wildlife value. It is considered that there is a watercourse here and feedback from the community suggests that this is the origin of the name of the Lane.</p> <p>Overall, it is considered to meet the NPPF criteria.</p>
76.	1	p. 42	Check para numbering	Noted.
77.	14	S9	The rural view from Sponden Lane towards Hopehouse Lane should be included within this list of locally significant views.	The SG visited the view and consider that it should be included.

Ref	Who?	Page/para/ policy	Comments/ Proposed change	SG response
			<p>The view from Sponden Lane towards Hopehouse Lane should be included in this list as a significant view.</p> <p>The view from Sponden Lane towards Hopehouse Lane should be included within this list of locally significant views. It is comparable to the views you have identified - on a clear day you can see the wind turbines in Rye.</p>	
78.	2	Chapter 9 - general	<p>PRoW: The County Council considers that the draft Neighbourhood Plan could include stronger references to PRoW and to include a map of the PRoW network (the Parish Council should hold a copy of the Definitive Map, if not, please contact the County Council) within the parish to clearly show the benefits and opportunities the asset offers. However, the Parish Council should be aware that the County Council is the Highway Authority for PRoW and its role is to enable successful partnership working by continuing to deliver improvements to the PRoW network in Sandhurst. Joint working can help to ensure significant benefits, whilst its omission could result in loss of access to additional funding opportunities.</p>	<p>Figure 13 shows the extent of the public right of way network. Ultimately the maps will be digitally uploaded on the TWBC interactive map, which also contains the PROW. It also mentions the Public rights of way improvement plan.</p>
79.	7	S10	<p>Keep street lights to a minimum to protect nocturnal wildlife.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
80.	14	S10	<p>The existing dark sky policy prohibits a pedestrian crossing in the village which could be seen as a cause for concern</p>	<p>Less of a 'dark sky' issue rather a highways safety concern. This would be something for discussion with KCC as the Highways Authority.</p>

Ref	Who?	Page/para/ policy	Comments/ Proposed change	SG response
81.	1	S11 9.1	<p>Note that KCC is working on the emerging LTP5 and is currently undertaking a second public consultation on this.</p> <p>KCC is also working on a Kent Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (KCWIP). Although, the current proposals do not affect Sandhurst Parish.</p> <p>Consider the phrasing of the last two sentences in this paragraph. It suggests the promotion of horse-riding infrastructure is a higher priority than cycle infrastructure. This is better reflected in para 9.7 and as such para 9.1 could be adjusted.</p>	<p>Noted and added in to the text.</p> <p>Added in.</p> <p>Noted and rephrased.</p>
82.	1	S11 A	<p>TWBC considers this should apply to all developments, not just major.</p>	<p>The word major has been removed.</p>
83.	2	S11	<p>Point 'D' mentions proposals for new bridleways, however, the County Council would request that the PRoW Network be specifically mentioned.</p> <p>Furthermore, the County Council requests the inclusion for the definition of a Right of Way, alongside an explanation of the acronym. The County Council suggests the following text: A way over which the public have a right to pass and repass, including Public Footpaths, Public Bridleways, Restricted Byways and Byways Open to All Traffic.</p> <p>The PRoW Network, as a whole, should be included in the Neighbourhood Plan as it provides important access and connectivity. Also, it reflects the extent to</p>	<p>Added in.</p> <p>Added to Glossary.</p> <p>Figure 13 shows this. See also previous response ref 72.</p>

Ref	Who?	Page/para/ policy	Comments/ Proposed change	SG response
			which the PRoW network meets the likely future needs of the public in contributing towards more sustainable development. The County Council would advise partnership working to enable potential links along WC295 into East Sussex and Bodiam, which is a popular tourist destination. Lastly, all policies regarding Sustainable Transport, Connectivity and Access, and Infrastructure Provision should include reference to the PRoW network.	
84.	6	S11	Consider safety around the school, village shop, petrol station and Oaks Forstal. Could there be a Go Slow notice up Oaks Forstal? Most residents are elderly. We used to have up to 1989.	Noted. This would fall outside the scope of planning policy, but is included in Section 13.
85.	14	S11	There needs to be mention of a proposal to develop a Masterplan for cycleways and footpaths, with KCC. and Highways. Maybe as a 'project'. Under para. 9.7, a further improvement might be to extend the 30mph limit through Linkhill, to replace the 40mph limit. S12: Para. 9.16: Increasing parking at the playing fields means that the stretch of A268 between the school and the playing fields may need a slight narrowing. This to accommodate a cycle way and pedestrian pathway. (Refer above notes to S11)	Add an extra bullet to the Section 13. 9.7 – add as an example into para 9.9, which concerns speed limits. 9.16 – add additional detail into the supporting text.
86.	14	S11	Policy S11 work with Local Authorities to improve public transport links to and from Sandhurst	Noted – this is included as an associated action.
87.	8	9.7	May I suggest some additional points here: - the footway around Linkhill between Marsh Quarter and Ethnam Lane is indeed increasingly congested by naturally thickening hedgerows, which we would not want to replace, of course,	Add into 9.7 bullet 5

Ref	Who?	Page/para/ policy	Comments/ Proposed change	SG response
			<p>with the fences that residents and the parish would find it much easier and cheaper to maintain, so I am not sure what the answer is here. I regularly walk this way from Ethnam Lane to the playing fields and I have to stop whenever I hear a vehicle coming from the Rye direction in order not to be blown about by backdraft if it is a large vehicle or a smaller one breaking the 40mph speed limit. The footway is so constricted, not only by the hedges but also by the amount of debris thrown up by the traffic, that there is barely enough for one person and certainly not two to walk abreast.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the debris problem becomes much worse further along the road in the section beyond Lomas Lane where the debris has now virtually replaced the footway in places. Several years ago, we were encouraged to see workmen clearing the debris from the footway, only to leave it piled up on the kerbside, presumably for collection at some point - but it never was collected and has now become a grass-covered bank making the area to walk in even more constricted. - the section of the footway from Ethnam Lane to Marsh Quarter is also made more dangerous by the fact that some of it is falling away. I realise that this is a major engineering issue and will require a costly solution. Is this not a KCC Highways responsibility, or perhaps TWBC - if so, 	

Ref	Who?	Page/para/ policy	Comments/ Proposed change	SG response
			<p>what is their position on this and can the situation be explained in the Development Plan?</p> <p>- as a member of the Linkhill Road Group, which after years of campaigning (following 27 serious accidents in 7 years on the Linkhill bends) was finally successful in achieving a 40mph limit, flashing slow down signs and other safety improvements on our section of the A268 in 2012, I measured the sight lines to right and left for the entrance to Ethnam Lane, Stone Pit Lane and my and other driveways in relation to the Highway Code's stopping distances. In the case of Stone Pit Lane and my own driveway, trying to turn right (towards the village) is as hazardous as trying to turn right (towards Rye) from Ethnam Lane. If vehicles stick to the speed limit, there is just about sufficient stopping distance but if they break the limit, the risk of collision is increased.</p> <p>At the time of our campaign, the Police were against a limit, one senior officer telling me that he regularly went through the Linkhill bends at 60mph and considered this safe. I told him that, according to the Highway Code, at 60mph he would hit me leaving my driveway, having looked right, left and right and neither seeing nor hearing a vehicle coming from either direction.</p> <p>Fortunately our arguments eventually won the day. The value of the speed limit and the other measures has been shown by the fact that there</p>	

Ref	Who?	Page/para/ policy	Comments/ Proposed change	SG response
			have been no serious collisions since the day it came into effect.	
88.	2	Public transport	<p>PRoW: The County Council recommends the inclusion of the following phrase: In areas where there would be significant effect on PRoW, the network must also be included in the landscape planning of the infrastructure as a whole. Where PRoW would be directly affected by development proposals, plans should clarify intentions for positively accommodating, diverting, or enhancing paths. The policy should state that planning applications must not adversely affect the existing PRoW network. It is requested that additional text is inserted into the Neighbourhood Plan, stipulating that applicants for new developments engage with the County Council PRoW and Access Service at the earliest opportunity. This would allow the County Council to review proposals for access improvements and consider appropriate developer contributions for PRoW network enhancements.</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Plan policy should reflect County Council policy to improve and upgrade the PRoW network where it links with amenities, public transport nodes, work and education to increase the attractiveness of walking, cycling and riding as an alternative to driving. There is an omission throughout the Neighbourhood Plan of any map showing the PRoW network within the Parish – this should be included within the Plan.</p>	<p>Added.</p> <p>The policy does seek to achieve this.</p> <p>Figure 13 shows the public rights of way.</p>

Ref	Who?	Page/para/ policy	Comments/ Proposed change	SG response
			<p>The Neighbourhood Plan policy should also include that new developments incorporate good sustainable transport connections within the community with high quality walking and cycling infrastructure available, which can link local amenities together.</p> <p>It is critical therefore that wording is included to secure funding to ensure the highly regarded PRow links are not degraded. Developer contributions, where these meet necessary legal tests and relate to a specific development, can be used to upgrade existing routes or create new path links that address network fragmentation issues. Consideration should be given to the investment of planning obligation contributions into the PRow network. Rural lanes provide useful connections for Non-Motorised Users (NMUs) travelling between off-road PRow. The potential for additional vehicle traffic along these country lanes is therefore a concern, as increased movements could introduce safety concerns for NMUs and potentially deter public use of the PRow network.</p> <p>New development provides opportunities to secure investment in the PRow network, which could enhance opportunities for active travel and outdoor recreation across the Parish. Developer contributions are used to upgrade existing routes or create new path links that address existing network fragmentation and issues highlighted by the public. Consideration should therefore be given to the investment of planning obligation contributions to</p>	<p>We consider this is intrinsic to the policy.</p> <p>Text has been added to Clause D.</p> <p>The PC will consider this as part of their Highways Improvement Plan. Section 13 also includes highways and Prow related projects.</p>

Ref	Who?	Page/para/ policy	Comments/ Proposed change	SG response
			support the PRoW network through any proposed development.	
89.	7	Public transport	Please organise and build bus shelters asap. We need a bus service Tenterden, Cranbrook to connect to Cranbrook Grammar School, county of Maidstone.	Noted. There is a section on public transport, although this largely sits outside planning policy. Additional bus shelters could be requested by the PC as part of any developer contributions.
90.	1	S12 9.13	TWBC is concerned that there could be a conflict here with active travel aspirations.	Noted, but as per text, it would be unreasonable in a rural parish to enable car use, at least in the short term, for those needing it. This does not alter the ambition for a shift in travel methods generally.
91.	6	S12 B	Parents parking in yard (Two Chimneys?) for school access	This is an enforcement issue and sits outside the scope of the neighbourhood plan.
92.	1	S13	It might be helpful to set out a bit more clearly what is proposed as part of the village hub. It is a bit vague at the moment and also who should be responsible/manage it?	Noted, but at an early stage. Would be a community hub run by the community for the community.
93.	8	Village Hub	I was wondering whether the possibilities of partnerships with the owners of the petrol station and village shop (now in partnership with Morrisons), the teashop, the social club and the pub (soon to be a tapas bar) were considered by the steering group in relation to a village hub? I'm thinking of the way in which the Hawkhurst Kino is now the provider of the public toilet for the Highgate area. Presumably the Kino gets some benefit from users passing through its cafe - or is there a grant of some kind for this kind of	This was considered as an option by the PC, but plans for elements of this have moved on. Further engagement is needed locally to understand what the hub could provide.

Ref	Who?	Page/para/ policy	Comments/ Proposed change	SG response
			public/private partnership which might be relevant here? Also, Hawkhurst U3A had free use of the Royal Oak's meeting rooms for years during less busy hours, as I understand it only paying for teas and coffees etc to be laid on by the pub. Were the shop, teashop, club and pub owners involved in the plan consultation at any stage, did they come to any of the meetings, and have they been specifically invited to comment and, if not, might it be worth doing so?	
94.	14	S13	The grouping together of the village school, the shop and the garage forms the ideal location for a village hub. There is a little plot behind (and owned by) the shop: a green courtyard surrounded by tall trees that might be suitable for a courtyard development of single storey buildings, that might include a cafe and other activities.	Noted. The PC/community will need to consider this as part of what might be included in the village hub.
95.	1	10.3 and bullet points	It might be helpful to add a bit more detail with what type of facilities is required or desired. Facilities for teens is very vague.	PC looking for fitness outdoor gym and a teen shelter and also a 'rig' (teenage climbing frame)
96.	1	S14	Criteria c of this policy is a bit muddled and could benefit from being re-worded and also needs to consider how it sits with the emerging SLP policy.	This has been reworded.
97.	14	S14	Policy S14 is very important to keep our younger residents engaged and willing to stay in the village.	Noted.
98.	1	12.2 bullet 3	Please see the TWBC June 2024 LDS for the Council's approach to CIL. Text in SNDP to be amended accordingly.	Amend
99.	1	Policies maps	The NDP group should send the shapefiles for these maps to TWBC alongside the Regulation 15 submission of the SNDP. This will be required for the layers to be included on any relevant interactive maps	Noted and will be sent

Ref	Who?	Page/para/ policy	Comments/ Proposed change	SG response
			<p>produced by the Borough Council. Once the Plan is 'made', this will also help development management officers assess planning applications within the neighbourhood area.</p> <p>If any changes are required between the examination and referendum stages, amended shapefiles should also be sent to TWBC.</p>	
		Design Guidelines and Codes		
100.	1	General	As it stands, the document provides no coding, just guidance. It is fine for the document to just be guidance, and while much of it is useful, some of the guidance is quite general, and elements are confusing with some inaccuracies. It is an engaging piece of work, but will need developing before it can be used as a fully working document.	Amended by AECOM
101.	1	p. 13	Under 'Conservation Areas and Listed Buildings', the paragraph refers to 'Hartley' instead of 'Sandhurst'.	Amended by AECOM
102.	1	p.15	There are further references to Hartley on this page.	Amended by AECOM
103.	1	p.19	<p>Recent developments – the wording in this is awkward, e.g. 'those developments'? There is also talk of the Marsh Quarter Lane development as under construction, but later says 'proposes'. Also see the comment above on that it is not clear why these are not within the 'cul de sac' character area.</p> <p>Residential properties are mentioned – are these farmhouses or farm workers cottages? Figure 17 shows an early 20th century bungalow, this may need further explanation.</p>	Amended by AECOM

Ref	Who?	Page/para/ policy	Comments/ Proposed change	SG response
104.	1	p.21 photos	<p>Figures 10 and 11 – it is worth amending to say that the properties front on to an informal road with no verges, leading to the green, rather than fronting directly on to the green.</p> <p>We would consider some of the cul de sac developments to be harmful to the significance of the conservation area, and in places the listed buildings where the setting is affected. Therefore, the appropriateness of using photo examples of these should be reconsidered.</p> <p>Whilst there may be active frontages, there is also leaked space and ill-defined defensible space etc. Cul de sac streets offering visual interest and variety is debatable.</p> <p>Figure 15 needs more context as to why this is a positive development – preserves green assets, but also complementary architectural style?</p>	Amended by AECOM
105.	1	p.24	<p>These photos are not very representative of the special historic and architectural character of the parish.</p> <p>The first image references kent peg tiles. The tiles on the house in the picture are not kent peg tiles.</p> <p>The second photo is an oast house (stowage and kiln), not a hipped roof and oast. Hipped roof stowage and square kiln with pyramidal roof would be a better description.</p> <p>The dormer in the third photo is an awkward modern form that is not usually supported in conservation areas. Same with the 7th photo – mansard roofs are not typical and slate roofs are rare.</p>	Amended by AECOM

Ref	Who?	Page/para/ policy	Comments/ Proposed change	SG response
			The 8th photo is labelled as a 'Scandinavian style roof', which is likely to be a unique rather than locally distinctive house style	
106.	1	p.25	<p>The photo of the house with black weatherboarding does not appear to have any barn-like features to it, and so it is not a clear example of where black weatherboarding may be appropriate for use as external cladding.</p> <p>The stone in the last photo is sandstone, not limestone. Limestone is not used as a building material in the Borough.</p> <p>What is meant by 'buffed' red brick? Are the materials really heterogenous? We could safely say homogeneous as the clay for the bricks and tiles would have been local so the same colour, and then black or white weatherboarding. The bricks in the last photo are the same, but some are vitrified rather than being a different brick.</p> <p>The examples of porches are not good examples architecturally. Referring to the summary table on page 27: few of the photo examples on these pages demonstrate the vernacular.</p>	Amended by AECOM
107.	1	p.28	<p>'Natural boundary treatments should prevail over hard surfaces' would make more sense as 'natural boundary treatments should prevail over hard boundary treatments'. Also, could it be clarified that gates and high timber fences that are closeboarded should be avoided? Some open gates, such as five bar, are appropriate.</p> <p>The penultimate box on this page is not supported. It is encouraging the type of forced 'variety' that we</p>	

Ref	Who?	Page/para/ policy	Comments/ Proposed change	SG response
			need to avoid in new developments which would then end up as pastiche. The guide should reference the best of the village's built environment, not the variety in totality, some of which is lower quality. 'Compliment' on this page should be 'complement'. 'Street lighting' should just be 'lighting'.	
108.	1	p.47	The phrase 'overly monotonous building elevations should be avoided...' is unclear as a guideline. How and why?	Amended by AECOM
109.	1	p.48	It may be helpful to include a colour palette within guidelines. See the High Weald Colour Study document . The third bullet point lists Kentish tiles and clay tiles. Kentish tiles are clay tiles, so the distinction is questionable. It is also questionable whether 'Old red brick of heterogenous colouring' is a recognisable characteristic. 'Red hungtiles' is not a known term. The 5th bullet point should specifically reference the High Weald Colour Study. Why list grey as an appropriate colour? There is little structure or background to the colour guidance. Why is moss growth favoured on roofs?	
110.	1	p.51	Figure 53 – it may not be sensible to encourage plant growth on buildings as it can damage the fabric of the building.	Amended by AECOM
111.	1	p.52	This should reference the TWBC Farmsteads SPD, not the overarching Kent Guidance. There are specific layouts that are more prevalent in the High Weald and this could be made clearer. This also seems to discuss only conversion, not new build.	Amended by AECOM

Ref	Who?	Page/para/ policy	Comments/ Proposed change	SG response
			Some of this is good, but it needs work to be clearer as guidance. For example, 'wall treatment should reflect the existing materials of the building'?	
112.	13	General	Although we support the inclusion of sustainable urban drainage requirements within the Guidance, we ask that these are included directly within the policies of the Neighbourhood Plan (as per our representations on the Plan).	See Ref 56
113.	14	General	DG 9: Eco design principles for existing homes: While with new-build, there is bound to be professional advice involved, this also needs to be true for retrofit. For example: to improve the windows either through renewal (item 2) or draft proofing (item 4), will lead to reduce dventilation in the building - risking mould growth, poorer air quality. If these works are to be done, there needs to be a ventilation system included in the retrofit (not mentioned).	Noted. The Plan itself makes reference to Historic England's guidance on retrofitting.

Sandhurst Neighbourhood Development Plan
Consultation Statement