

Call for Sites Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA) 2020 - 2021

New Site Assessment Document

December 2021

Assessment Criteria

- Access
- Suitability
- Stream and surface water flooding issues
- Needs of rural village
- Heritage and landscape aspect
- Suitable, Available, Achievable?

Sites

- 01 – Cherry Tree Nursery The Mount Flimwell
- 03 - Junction of London Road and A268 north
- 04 - Land adjacent to Seacox Cockers
- 05 - Land North of Broom Hill
- 09 - Land at Cherry Tree Field
- 10 - Land at Steelands Farm

Assessment Criteria

Access

- GREEN - Adjacent to public roads and domestic services (i.e. utilities and main drainage), accessible for waste removal and requiring no additional infrastructure. Adequate existing maintained roads.
- YELLOW – Within 100m of public roads. Requires some additional infrastructure.
- RED – More than 100m from public roads. Requires upgrade to road or new road.

Suitability

All areas must be green, for example, for Suitability to be green overall.

- GREEN
 - Topography – site is mainly level.
 - ROW – no rights of way on or accessing the site.
 - Utilities – no power pylons or lines, no telephone poles or lines.
- YELLOW
 - Topography – Site has slope but less than 15 degrees.
 - ROW – limited or potential ROW on or accessing site which may involve legal issues.
 - Utilities – some resiting of utilities' equipment may be needed. Site does not have power line crossing it.
- RED
 - Topography – site requires considerable landscaping or levelling.
 - ROW – major rights of way problems
 - Utilities – utilities equipment is unlikely to be removed from site. Site has power line crossing it.

Stream and surface water flooding issues

- GREEN – No issues with ground water and surface water drainage. In Flood Zone 1 or better
- YELLOW – Poorly drained soil which may require SuDS (Sustainable Draining System). In Flood Zone 1 or better.
- RED - Poorly drained soil which may require SuDS (Sustainable Draining System). In Flood Zone 2 or 3.

Needs of rural village

- GREEN
 - Sustainability – Site has public transport passing by. There are cycle paths and footpaths adjacent to site. The site is within 5 minutes' walk of shops. Site is adjacent to or within the current development boundary. Site is easily absorbed by village (10 or less houses).

- Local infrastructure - There is an existing (primary) school with places within 10 minutes' walk on footpaths. There is a GP surgery within 10 minutes' walk on footpaths.
- Recreational facilities – There are existing recreational facilities (e.g. playground, village hall) within 10 minutes' walk on footpaths.
- Parking - The site can deliver on-site parking for the development. The additional homes would put little pressure on village parking and congestion.
- **YELLOW**
 - Sustainability – Site has public transport within 5 minutes' walk. There are no cycle paths or footpaths but they could be provided. Site is adjacent to current development boundary. Site is a reasonable size for village (11-25 houses).
 - Local infrastructure - There is an existing (primary) school with places within 20 minutes' walk on footpaths. There is a GP surgery within 20 minutes' walk on footpaths.
 - Recreational facilities - There are existing recreational facilities (e.g. playground, village hall) within 20 minutes' walk on footpaths.
 - Parking - The site can deliver on-site parking to a limited extent. The additional homes would put some manageable pressure on the village parking and congestion.
- **RED**
 - Sustainability – Site has public transport within 10 minutes' walk. There are no cycle paths or footpaths and it would be difficult or impossible to provide them. Site is well away from current development boundary. Site is too big for village (more than 25 houses).
 - Local infrastructure - There is an existing (primary) school with places within a 30-minute car or bus journey. There is a GP surgery within a 15-minute car or bus journey.
 - Recreational facilities - There are existing recreational facilities (e.g. playground, village hall) within a 15-minute car or bus journey.
 - Parking - The site is unable to deliver on-site parking. The additional homes would significantly increase pressure on the village parking and congestion.

Heritage and landscape aspect

- **GREEN**
 - Archaeological sites – there is no evidence of archaeological features, groundworks or deposits listed in the Ticehurst Parish Historic Environment Report (from ESCC).
 - Historic buildings – there would be no impact on the Ticehurst Conservation Area. There are no listed buildings near the site.
 - Biodiversity – there would be little or no impact on the biodiversity of the site. There are no natural features needing protection as listed in the Ticehurst Parish Biodiversity report (from Sussex Biodiversity Record Centre).
 - AONB – there would be little or no impact on the High Weald landscape setting.
- **YELLOW**

- Archaeological sites – there are some sites nearby but not on site, as listed in the Ticehurst Parish Historic Environment Report (from ESCC).
- Historic buildings - there would be little or no impact on the Ticehurst Conservation Area and little or no impact on nearby listed buildings.
- Biodiversity – there would be medium impact on the biodiversity of the site. There are a few natural features needing protection as listed in the Ticehurst Parish Biodiversity report (from Sussex Biodiversity Record Centre).
- AONB – there would be medium impact on the High Weald landscape setting.
- RED
 - Archaeological sites – there is an archaeological site on the proposed development site, as listed in the Ticehurst Parish Historic Environment Report (from ESCC).
 - Historic buildings – there would be some impact on the Ticehurst Conservations Area. There are listed buildings very close to the site.
 - Biodiversity – there would be a major impact on the biodiversity of the site. There are many natural features needing protection as listed in the Ticehurst Parish Biodiversity report (from Sussex Biodiversity Record Centre).
 - AONB – there would be a major impact on the High Weald landscape setting

Assessment

Suitable

Is the site suitable for the type of development proposed?

A site is considered to be suitable if there are no insurmountable physical or environmental factors which would restrict development. Whether or not a factor is insurmountable is a matter of judgement but often depends if it can be mitigated. Constraints which would rule out development include any potential negative impact on a national environmental designation such as a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) or the site falling within the functional floodplain (Flood Zone 3a or 3b)

Available

Is the site available for development?

A site is available if there is evidence that a landowner or developer is willing to sell or develop the site at a known point in the future, and within the plan period. Any legal or ownership issues should also be taken into account, such as multiple ownership

Achievable


Is the site economically viable?

A site is considered 'achievable' when there is evidence that it is economically viable and there is a reasonable prospect that the particular type of development will be developed on the site at a particular point in time.



Positive impact

Neutral impact



Negative impact




Site 1	
Address	Cherry Tree Nursery Union Street, Flimwell Grid ref 571900/131200
Site Area	0.87 ha
Description	 <p>Greenfield site on edge of village. Submitted by landowner as part of the neighbourhood plan “call for sites” in December 2016.</p>
Owner and contact	<p>R. Lyndsey and Pasenguard Ltd.</p> <p>Trevor Lawrence, Agent, 14 Nelmes Way, Hornchurch, Essex RM11 2QZ</p> <p>Tel: 01708-454149 Email: jackielawrence21@hotmail.com</p>
Amount of development	<p>12 or 13 dwellings, including up to 5 affordabl</p> <p>Indicative layout submitted.</p>
SHLAA status	Not in SHLAA
Planning policy	The site has been the subject of several planning applications from 2002 onwards. In 2013, an outline application (RR/2013/2094/P) for 11 houses (including four affordable) was refused on the grounds that it was outside the


	<p>development boundary for Flimwell, therefore in open countryside, and would have a detrimental impact on the AONB</p> <p>Rother Core Strategy planning policies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> EN6 (Flood Risk Management) and EN7 (Flood Risk and Development) <p>Ticehurst NP planning policies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> R1 – Conserve Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty H1 – Spatial Plan H2 – Housing site allocation 	
Access	A new vehicular access would be required onto the busy A268 Flimwell to Hawkhurst road.	
Suitability	The site is mainly level, there are no rights of way and no utility features on the site.	
Stream and Surface Water Flooding Issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No issues so compliant with Rother District CS policies EN6 (Flood Risk Management) and EN7 (Flood Risk and Development). In low flood risk Zone One. 	
Needs of rural village	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site is outside the Flimwell development boundary (which is 350m away across the A21). The site is on the bus route between Ticehurst and Hawkhurst. There is a footpath to Flimwell cross-roads The primary school and GP surgery at Ticehurst can only be reached by car or bus. The closest recreational facilities are at Flimwell crossroads, a 10-minute walk, but with the busy A21 to cross in order to reach them. There would be adequate car parking on site. 	
Heritage and Landscape impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are no archaeological sites listed in the Ticehurst Parish historic environment report. There are several listed buildings nearby but the development would have little impact on them. Biodiversity Report needed – applicant submitted a habitat survey. The previous planning application determined that there would be a major impact on the AONB landscape 	
Assessment	Site is suitable	Yes
	Site is available	Yes
	Site is achievable	Yes
Conclusions	There are two major problems with the site : it is a considerable distance from the Flimwell development boundary; and it would have a major impact	




	<p>on the AONB. An outline planning application for this site with less houses was refused in 2013, primarily for the above reasons.</p> <p>Site could be allocated?</p>
--	---

Site 3	
Address	Junction of London Road and A268 (North)
Site Area	2.36 ha
Map	 <p>Green field site on the outskirts of Flimwell outside the Flimwell development area. Late submission of this land was sent in to the call for sites TNP 2016 but not considered. It is understood that Quantum Homes have an option on the site. The plans to widen the A21 have often been mapped across the field and as such it could not be determined that the site is achievable.</p>
Owner and Contact	Bill Martin?
Amount of Development	Could provide up to 60 homes, based on the size of the plot.
SHLAA status	Not considered in SHLAA
Planning Policy	
Access	Gateway and dropped kerb on to the A268 would need to be altered due to poor sight lines on a fast road with brow of the hill to the east.
Suitability	Land slopes NE to SW - there was an historic right of way into Bedgebury along the boundary of site.
Stream and Surface Water Flooding issues	No issues apparent so compliant with RDC EN6 EN7 Low flood risk.
Needs of rural village	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site has public transport passing on B2087/A268. There is a very restricted footpath on the main road passing the site to the A21. • The site is outside Flimwell development boundary. • Primary school and GP surgery would need to be accessed by car or bus. Village shops within 3km, 25 minutes' walk. • Playground and village hall within 5 minutes' walk on western side of A21 • Site can deliver on-site parking.


Heritage and Landscape Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Listed building on cross-roads on southern side of the A268 No archaeological sites listed in parish historic environment report. In open countryside within High Weald AONB. 	
Assessment	Site is suitable	No
	Site is available	Yes
	Site is achievable	No
Conclusions	Site should not be allocated.	

Site 4	
Address	Land adjacent to Seacox Cockers
Site Area	0.23 ha
Map	 <p>Green field site outside the Flimwell development boundary - current application on the site is recommended for refusal by the Parish Council RR/2021/2521/P for two pairs of semi-detached properties. Enforcement proceedings for breaching existing tree preservation order are active.</p>
Owner and Contact	Robert Lyndsey
Amount of Development	Current application is for four dwellings
SHLAA status	Not considered in SHLAA process
Planning Policy	No issues so compliant with RDC EN 6 and EN 7 Low flood risk.
Access	Poor access and visibility on to the fast A268 from east and west.
Suitability	Site has two distinct tiers, rising in height half way through the site to the south.
Stream and Surface Water Flooding issues	No issues so compliant with RDC EN 6 and EN 7 Low flood risk.
Needs of rural village	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site has public transport passing on B2087/A268. There is a very restricted footpath on the main road passing the site to the A21. The site is outside Flimwell development boundary. Primary school and GP surgery would need to be accessed by car or bus. Village shops within 3km, 30 minutes walk. Playground and village hall within 10 minutes walk on western side of A21 <p>Site can deliver on-site parking.</p>


Heritage and Landscape Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are no archaeological sites listed in the Ticehurst Parish historic environment report. • Properties directly to the east might be listed. 	
Assessment	Site is suitable	Yes
	Site is available	Yes
	Site is achievable	Yes
Conclusions	Site should not be allocated.	

Site 5	
Address	Land North of Broom Hill
Site Area	2.90 ha
Map	 <p>Green field site outside the Flimwell development boundary - land slopes from NE to SW - sits wet - as exhibited by marsh type vegetation.</p>
Owner and Contact	
Amount of Development	Unknown as present.
SHLAA status	Not considered in SHLAA
Planning Policy	
Access	Poor access on to B2087
Suitability	Land appears to have drainage issues.
Stream and Surface Water Flooding issues	It would appear that there may be a flood issue
Needs of rural village	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site has public transport passing on B2087. There is no footpath on the main road passing the site and linking Ticehurst and Flimwell. The site is outside Flimwell development boundary – although the boundary is on the other side of the road. • Primary school is 5 minutes' walk and GP surgery is 10 minutes' walk, but there is no footpath for most of the way along a busy B-road. Village shops within 2km, 15 minutes' walk.

	Playground and village hall within 10 minutes' walk. Site can deliver on-site parking.	
Heritage and Landscape Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are no archaeological sites listed in the Ticehurst Parish historic environmental report 	
Assessment	Site is suitable	
	Site is available	
	Site is achievable	
Conclusions	Site should not be allocated	

Site 9	
Address	Land at Cherry Tree Field
Site Area	1.43 ha
Map	 <p>Considered as an exception site in the past. Limitations due to the Bewl – Darwell water pipes around the edge of the site. Site is high and dominant in comparison with other properties in the area.</p>
Owner and Contact	Stapleton-Smith family
Amount of Development	Limited due to pipe line - should be single storey in design
SHLAA status	
Planning Policy	
Access	Access would be steep
Suitability	Reducing dominance of the plot would be problematical
Stream and Surface Water Flooding issues	No issues so compliant with RDC EN 6 and EN 7 Low flood risk.
Needs of rural village	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site has public transport from nearby B2087 bus stop. There is a good footpath on the road passing the site to the village centre The site is outside Ticehurst development boundary. Primary school and GP surgery are within walking distance.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Village shops within 15 minute walk • Playground and village hall within 10 minutes walk • Site can deliver on-site parking. 	
Heritage and Landscape Impact	Impact on landscape would be significant	
Assessment	Site is suitable	Yes
	Site is available	Yes
	Site is achievable	Yes
Conclusions	If allocated very limited single storey dwellings suitable – max 10	

Site 10	
Address	Land at Steelands Farm Ticehurst
Site Area	2.46 ha
Map	 <p>Well screened site of old and unattractive farm buildings. It is believed that an application on the site has been refused in the past.</p>
Owner and Contact	Stapleton-Smith family
Amount of Development	Limited to footprint of the current buildings
SHLAA status	
Planning Policy	
Access	Good
Suitability	Suitable for conversion to farm industrial site of small lets or demolition and dwellings designed as converted farm homestead.
Stream and Surface Water Flooding issues	No issues so compliant with RDC EN 6 and EN 7 Low flood risk.
Needs of rural village	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site has public transport from nearby B2087 bus stop. • There is a good footpath on the road passing the site to the village centre • The site is outside Ticehurst development boundary.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Primary school and GP surgery are within walking distance. • Village shops within 15 minute walk • Playground and village hall within 10 minutes walk • Site can deliver on-site parking. 	
Heritage and Landscape Impact	There are no archaeological sites listed in the Ticehurst Parish historic environment report.	
Assessment	Site is suitable	Yes
	Site is available	Yes
	Site is achievable	Yes
Conclusions	If allocated by RDC best suited to rural industrial use or limited farm stead dwellings – max 6	