

SITES APPENDICES

- i Suitable and Developable Sites (Green)
- ii Suitable but not Currently Developable Sites (Amber)
- iii Sites Excluded following Site Appraisal (Red)
- iv Sites Rejected at Outset and Excluded from Survey
- v Large Site Permissions not yet completed
- vi Sites Form A – Initial Site Surveys of Suitability
- vii Sites Form B – More Detailed site Surveys of Constraints, Availability and Achievability

NB Settlement maps must be read in conjunction with the SHLAA Main Report and relevant Appendices.

The SHLAA is an 'evidence-base' document which does not allocate land for housing nor pre-empt or prejudice any future Council decisions about particular sites. It is an aid to plan making and not a statement of Council policy.

Sites Appendix i: Suitable and Developable Sites (Green)

BA3

North Trade Road

Site Details

Location

Settlement:

Battle

Address:

North Trade Road

Parish:

Battle

Ward:

Battle Town

South Coast Sub Region:

No

Brownfield or Greenfield?

B

Size (Ha)

0.4

Current Land Use

South half of site already developed for housing. North side remains undeveloped and is grassland.

Wholly within development boundary

☒

Partially within development boundary

☐

Abut development boundary

☐

Outside development boundary

☐

Policy Context and Identified Needs

Local Plan allocation for housing.
Housing: Some 140 dwellings to be built up to 2026.
Housing Needs Survey: Signfiicant local need.
Employment Strategy & Land Review: 3,000 sq.m required. Retail Study: additional 1,000 sq.m needed.
Education:Early years facilities needed.
PPG17 Audit: New swimming facility, new allotment site in south Battle. Qualitative improvements to existing natural/semi natural sites + green spaces.
Battle LATS: Improve accessibilitv bv alternatives to car. car parking improvements needed.

Planning History

- Local Plan Allocation - Policy BT3.
- RR/2004/822/P approved in 2004 for re-development of the front half of this site (former Sunnyrise Nurseries) with 24 dwellings (S278 legal agreement - highways. S106 planning obligation - schooling and provision of footpath on North Trade Road). Development currently under construction.
- There is no planning history relating to the undeveloped rear half of the site.

Environmental Factors

AONB. Adjacent Wet Woodland and Ancient Woodland crosses North-East boundary. Listed building close West boundary.

ESCC Landscape Assessment Capacity to Accept Change - Housing:

Moderate

On-Site Appraisal

Summary of Constraints identified from On-Site Appraisals

Steep gradient down to site.

Layout/design parameters

Potential Mitigation Measures:

Highways and Accessibility Issues

Access to nearest	Distance from
Convenience Food Shop	est. 1.4km (Battle Shopping Area)
Primary School	est. 1.7km (Battle & Langton CE Primary School)
Bus Route:	est. 20m (if access via Sunny Rise)
Railway Station	est. 2.8km (Battle)
Main Doctors Surgery	est. 1.6km (Martins Oak Surgery)

On-Site Access Issues

Access point to northern section from Sunnyrise - gap left in completed development on southern half.

Utilities and Infrastructure

Gas Cables:

No high pressure gas mains impacting on site.

SFRA Issues (+ Southern Water Advice where sought):

None

Contamination Issues:

No apparent issues

Other Factors / Constraints

Availability / Ownership Constraints:

None known. (source: LAA NI154 Report).

Awaiting Relocation of Current Use:

No

Level of Developer Interest:

High

Recommendations for How Constraints Could Be Overcome:

PHOTO TO BE ADDED

Viability Assessment

e.g; cost factors, market factors based on HMP site archetypes

Archetype 1 - Small Edge of Settlement Greenfield Site
Discussion at Housing Market Partnership (22.2.2010) suggests this type of site is likely to be viable.

Development Opportunities

Total Residential Units

14 (source: LAA N1154 Report)

Affordable Units

In line with standard

Indicative Density (units per ha)

35

Availability/Timescale

Available Now?

How long to fully develop the site?

14 within 5 years (source LAA NI154 Report).

Available within 5 Years?

14 (source: LAA NI154 Report).

Timescale: Before 2011

Timescale: 2012-2016:

14 expected 2012/13 (source: 2009 AMR)

Timescale: 2017-2021:

Timescale: 2022-2026:

Timescale: After 2026:

Conclusions

Yes, in line with allocation. South half already developed. Northern section still to be developed.

BA31 Land at Glengorse Farm (North), Glengorse

Site Details

Location

Settlement:

Battle

Address:

Land at Glengorse Farm, Glengorse

Parish:

Battle

Ward:

Battle Town

South Coast Sub Region:

No

Brownfield or Greenfield?

G

Size (Ha)

9.25

Current Land Use

Mostly equestrian use

Wholly within development boundary

☐

Partially within development boundary

☐

Abut development boundary

☒

Outside development boundary

☐

Policy Context and Identified Needs

Housing: Some 140 dwellings to be built up to 2026.
Housing Needs Survey: Signfiicant local need.
Employment Strategy & Land Review: 3,000 sq.m required. Retail Study: additional 1,000 sq.m needed.
Education:Early years facilities needed.
PPG17 Audit: New swimming facility, new allotment site in south Battle. Qualitative improvements to existing natural/semi natural sites + green spaces.
Battle LATs: Improve accessibility by alternatives to car, car parking improvements needed.

Planning History

●Former school site.
●Planning permission for change of use of chapel to offices in 1994 (RR/94/0475/P).
●Planning permission for change of use of main building from school to offices in 1992 (RR/91/0618/P).
●Planning permission for stable complex in 1991 (RR/90/2452/P).
●Two applications on land to south of 24 Glengorse: RR/87/0599 (refused in 1987) for 2-storey block of flats to provide 10 flats and RR/88/1717 (appeal dismissed in 1988) for 3 dwellings. (issues - harmful to AONB and unacceptable extension of built-up area of Battle).

Environmental Factors

AONB. Strategic Gap. Right of Way along Western boundary.

ESCC Landscape Assessment Capacity to Accept Change - Housing:

Low - Moderate

On-Site Appraisal

Summary of Constraints identified from On-Site Appraisals

Owner may not be willing to sell vehicular access, so would need to ensure with Highway Authority that use of 'Glengorse' would be acceptable.

Layout/design parameters

Northern most part of site could deliver sustantial contribution to housing figures. Formal/informal playspace not available in locality.

Potential Mitigation Measures:

Provision of open green space integral to any development.
Development site is kept to the north with tree buffer provided to give

Highways and Accessibility Issues

Access to nearest

Distance from

Convenience Food Shop

est. 340m (Tesco Express)

Primary School

est. 1.8km (Battle & Langton CE Primary School)

Bus Route:

est. 80m (if access from Glengorse)

Railway Station

est. 700m (Battle)

Main Doctors Surgery

est. 690m (Battle Health Centre)

On-Site Access Issues

Access from Glengorse, subject to Highway Authority views. In Jan 2010 ESCC Highways commented "Access is preferred through the existing 'Estate' access road although alternative turning provision should be considered as access will be off existing turning circle. Any proposed development should connect to the existing footway network and cycle provision should also be taken into consideration. Glengorse, at present, suffers from commuter parking and therefore as part of this development a relevant traffic management scheme should be explored. Glengorse can be utilised for a number of dwellings. It is impossible to accurately estimate how many as a model would be required to ascertain the impact on Hastings Road which may lead to junction modifications. I agree that Glengorse itself could be widened to accommodate significant increased traffic. I would suggest that detailed investigations are undertaken to work out how many units could feasibly be provided without having an adverse effect on the existing highway network. No issues from a highway safety perspective."

Utilities and Infrastructure

Gas Cables:

No high pressure gas mains impacting on site.

SFRA Issues (+ Southern Water Advice where sought):

Flood Surface Water Less (tiny area across boundary - south-east corner). Southern water not consulted as too insignificant.

Contamination Issues:

Environmental Health (March 2010)
Confirmed "No issues"

Other Factors / Constraints

Availability / Ownership Constraints:

None.

Awaiting Relocation of Current Use:

TBC

Level of Developer Interest:

High - Identified via external consultation

Recommendations for How Constraints Could Be Overcome:

PHOTO TO BE ADDED

Viability Assessment

e.g; cost factors, market factors based on HMP site archetypes

Archetype 9 - Development on peripheral land in equestrian use
Discussion at Housing Market Partnership (22/02/2010) suggests this site would be viable.

Development Opportunities

Total Residential Units

Submitter "60"

Affordable Units

28

Indicative Density (units per ha)

30ph

Availability/Timescale

Available Now?

No - not in development boundary so policy constrained.

How long to fully develop the site?

TBC

Available within 5 Years?

Yes

Timescale: Before 2011

Submitter "Yes - the land is available now"

Timescale: 2012-2016:

Timescale: 2017-2021:

Timescale: 2022-2026:

Timescale: After 2026:

Conclusions

Yes. Although within AONB and strategic gap, site is also adjacent to development boundary, close to shop, not far from train station, within sector 5 of area noted in Strategy Directions as an area preferable for development. Whole site not appropriate for development but areas within northern part of the site are worth further investigation, particularly as provides access for adjacent sites (e.g BA28 and BA23).

Sites Appendix i: Suitable and Developable Sites (Green)

BA33 Land r/o 19 and 21 Virgins Lane

Site Details

Location

Settlement:

Battle

Address:

Land r/o 19 and 21 Virgins Lane

Parish:

Battle

Ward:

Battle Town

South Coast Sub Region:

No

Brownfield or Greenfield?

G

Size (Ha)

0.34

Current Land Use

Grassland

Wholly within development boundary

☒

Partially within development boundary

☐

Abut development boundary

☐

Outside development boundary

☐

Policy Context and Identified Needs

Housing: Some 140 dwellings to be built up to 2026.
Housing Needs Survey: Signficiant local need.
Employment Strategy & Land Review: 3,000 sq.m required. Retail Study: additional 1,000 sq.m needed.
Education:Early years facilities needed.
PPG17 Audit: New swimming facility, new allotment site in south Battle. Qualitative improvements to existing natural/semi natural sites + green spaces.
Battle LATs: Improve accessibility by alternatives to car, car parking improvements needed.

Planning History

●19 & 21 Virgins Lane on the road frontage built under RR/2004/1586/P (approved August 2004). The access road between these two houses is within SITE BA33. Numerous outline refusals including a dismissed appeal relating to residential development of the land to rear of 19 & 21 Virgins Lane (RR/2001/2850). Most recently:
●RR/2006/700/P - outline for 3 detached dwellings to be served by an extension to the existing access. This was refused in May 2006 (reasons - harmful to AONB & character of area and setting of Town, doubt as to whether required visibility splays could be provided.
●RR/2003/3371/P Approved erect 2 detached dwellings and access road

Environmental Factors

AONB

ESCC Landscape Assessment

Capacity to Accept Change - Housing:

Low

On-Site Appraisal

Summary of Constraints identified from On-Site Appraisals

Change in ground levels. Possible overlooking from existing dwellings. Retention of boundary trees/hedges. Position of access restricts layout.

Layout/design parameters

Need to respect privacy/overlooking for existing and prospective occupiers. Need to follow general design guidance ref. distances between dwellings.

Potential Mitigation Measures:

Care with boundary treatments, distances, position of windows and parking areas.

Highways and Accessibility Issues

Access to nearest	Distance from
Convenience Food Shop	est. 870m (Battle shopping area)
Primary School	est. 1.1km (Battle & Langton CE Primary School)
Bus Route:	est. 145m
Railway Station	est. 2.2km (Battle)
Main Doctors Surgery	est. 970m (Martins Oak Surgery)

On-Site Access Issues

Existing road into site between the 2 new frontage houses. ESCC advise in Jan 2010 as follows "No highway objection to the proposed access point in principle although if site is to be adopted then a 1:9 gradient is the max for a carriageway which may prove difficult (this would be added cost for developer). Visibility of 2.4m x 45m would need to be provided but easily achievable. Would consider up to 25 dwellings as acceptable. As part of site a footway should be provided along the southern boundary of the site along with a crossing to connect with the existing footway on the opposite side of Virgins Lane."

Utilities and Infrastructure

Gas Cables:

No high pressure gas mains impacting on site

SFRA Issues (+ Southern Water Advice where sought):

None

Contamination Issues:

Environmental Health (March 2010)
Historic - Barrack Farm

Other Factors / Constraints

Availability / Ownership Constraints:

No

Awaiting Relocation of Current Use:

No

Level of Developer Interest:

High - Identified via external consultation

Recommendations for How Constraints Could Be Overcome:

PHOTO TO BE ADDED

Viability Assessment e.g; cost factors, market factors based on HMP site archetypes

Archetype 3 - Development on Garden land
Discussion at Housing Market Partnership (22/02/2010) suggests site viability will be dependent on access constraints and likely mix on site.

Development Opportunities

Total Residential Units

6? (officer)

Affordable Units

40%

Indicative Density (units per ha)

30

Availability/Timescale

Available Now?

Maybe. In theory it is not constrained as falls within development boundary.

How long to fully develop the site?

2 years maximum

Available within 5 Years?

Yes reasonable prospect of being developed, although maybe difficult to achieve much more then 6 unless

Timescale: Before 2011

Yes

Timescale: 2012-2016:

Timescale: 2017-2021:

Timescale: 2022-2026:

Timescale: After 2026:

Conclusions

Yes, already within development boundary. But numbers of units will not be large unless developed alongside BA1 which is constrained by multiple ownership.

BO3

Land at Roundwood, Broad Oak

Site Details

Location

Settlement:

Rural: Broad Oak

Address:

Land at Roundwood, Northiam Road, Broad Oak

Parish:

Brede

Ward:

Brede Valley

South Coast Sub Region:

No

Brownfield or Greenfield?

Part Brownfield

Size (Ha)

1.07

Current Land Use

Residential gardens and one property (Elgienne).

Wholly within development boundary

☒

Partially within development boundary

☐

Abut development boundary

☐

Outside development boundary

☐

Policy Context and Identified Needs

Broad Oak recommended for 10-50 dwellings in Core Strategy, plus a need for employment uses. Parish Action Plan seeks recycling, improved public transport, tree planting, sowing of wildflowers and the creation of local nature reserves. PPG17 study identified shortage of amenity open space and need for new allotment as a high priority.

Planning History

Relevant history:

- Dismissed appeal RR/94/2067/P (outline: 4 dwellings) and refused outline RR/98/1474/P for demolition storage building & erect 2 dwellings on land to north of site at Roundwood (reasons - out of character, harmful to AONB & neighbouring residential amenities, highway safety concerns).
- Unimplemented A/74/0103 (outline: 9 dwellings- land at Roundwood & Elgienne - formerly Little Quarry) included site BO3 as well as subsequently developed frontage plots.

Environmental Factors

AONB, nearby ancient woodland and nearby SNCI. BAP habitats (Ghyll woodland and wet woodland at eastern boundary across road).

ESCC Landscape Assessment Capacity to Accept Change - Housing:

Moderate

On-Site Appraisal

Summary of Constraints identified from On-Site Appraisals

Access, Trees, Views to WNW.

Layout/design parameters

Heavily dependent on access point, and on whether adjacent sites (BO7, BO8 and BO5) are included in a more comprehensive development.

Potential Mitigation Measures:

Sandwiched between two large areas of ancient woodland, the site offers opportunity to link network of connected habitats.

Highways and Accessibility Issues

Access to nearest

Distance from

Convenience Food Shop

est. 355m

Primary School

est. 520m (Brede Primary School)

Bus Route:

on road frontage

Railway Station

est. 11.5km (Robertsbridge)

Main Doctors Surgery

est. 660m (Broad Oak Surgery)

On-Site Access Issues

ESCC Highways comment in Jan 2010 "40 mph - 120m of visibility required. The only location where adequate visibility can be achieved is from BO8, though there wold be a need to remove trees/vegetation overhanging highway to ensure the visibility to the south. Mitigation measures should include improved footways along Northiam Road."

Utilities and Infrastructure

Gas Cables:

No high pressure gas mains impacting on site

SFRA Issues (+ Southern Water Advice where sought):

Flood surface water less at eastern boundaries. Southern Water site specific advice (11/12/2009) "Problem area. No capacity in local sewer. However redevelopment may offer scope for reduction in flows - developer should investigate" SW general advice "Where existing capacity is not currently available, development will need to be phased with the provision of the necessary infrastructure"

Contamination Issues:

No apparent issues.

Other Factors / Constraints

Availability / Ownership Constraints:

No

Awaiting Relocation of Current Use:

No - existing use is residential.

Level of Developer Interest:

Submitter "High, subject to housing policy"

Recommendations for How Constraints Could Be Overcome:

PHOTO TO BE ADDED

Viability Assessment

e.g; cost factors, market factors based on HMP site archetypes

Archetype 7 - Redevelopment of Existing Properties in Large Grounds
Discussion at Housing Market Partnership (22/02/2010) suggests this type of site is likely to be viable.

Development Opportunities

Total Residential Units

Submitter "30"

Affordable Units

In line with standards

Indicative Density (units per ha)

at least 30ph

Availability/Timescale

Available Now?

Maybe - although site within development boundary and submitted by interest who controls site. Access is an issue

How long to fully develop the site?

2 depending on planning restrictions

Available within 5 Years?

Yes, reasonable prospect of coming forward although access is a possible issue..

Timescale: Before 2011

Yes

Timescale: 2012-2016:

Timescale: 2017-2021:

Timescale: 2022-2026:

Timescale: After 2026:

Conclusions

May have potential for residential, possibly alongside other uses (open space, employment). Access is a constraint requiring further confirmation.
No capacity in local sewer, although redevelopment may offer scope for reduction in water/sewerage flows and developer would be required to investigate. As existing sewerage capacity is not currently available, development will need to be phased with the provision of the necessary infrastructure.

BO6

Land West of the Rainbow Trout

Site Details

Location

Settlement:

Rural: Broad Oak

Address:

Chitcombe Road,
Broad Oak

Parish:

Brede

Ward:

Brede

South Coast Sub Region:

No

Brownfield or Greenfield?

Greenfield

Size (Ha)

0.43

Current Land Use

Vacant pasture

Wholly within development boundary

☐

Partially within development boundary

☐

Abut development boundary

☒

Outside development boundary

☐

Policy Context and Identified Needs

Core Strategy proposes allocating 10-50 houses in Broad Oak. AiRS Housing Needs Survey suggests local housing need. Core Strategy also suggests a need for more employment in Broad Oak.
PPG17 study Identified shortfall in amenity open space and recommended new allotment as high priority.

Planning History

●Refused outline RR/79/1925 - 20 flats in four two-storey blocks, 8 bungalows and 21 garages - (reasons - out of character, existing land uses should remain, detrimental to AONB).
●Refused outline A/72/1242 - 10 pairs of semi-detached bungalows.
●Refused outline A/72/1628 - 2 pairs of semi-detached bungalows.

Environmental Factors

AONB.

ESCC Landscape Assessment Capacity to Accept Change - Housing:

None - Low

On-Site Appraisal

Summary of Constraints identified from On-Site Appraisals

Landscape, visual impact.

Layout/design parameters

Frontage scheme preferable.

Potential Mitigation Measures:

Additional tree planting to screen site. Replace loss of hedgerow at road frontage.

Highways and Accessibility Issues

Access to nearest

Distance from

Convenience Food Shop

est. 170m

Primary School

est. 400m (Brede Primary School)

Bus Route:

est. 160m

Railway Station

est. 10.6km (Robertsbridge)

Main Doctors Surgery

est. 560m (Broad Oak Surgery)

On-Site Access Issues

Site adjacent to highway with immediate access. Visibility is good.

Utilities and Infrastructure

Gas Cables:

No high pressure gas mains impacting on site

SFRA Issues (+ Southern Water Advice where sought):

None

Contamination Issues:

Environmental Health (March 2010)
Confirmed "No issues"

Other Factors / Constraints

Availability / Ownership Constraints:

TBC

Awaiting Relocation of Current Use:

No

Level of Developer Interest:

Need to confirm with exception site project.

Recommendations for How Constraints Could Be Overcome:

PHOTO TO BE ADDED

Viability Assessment

e.g; cost factors, market factors based on HMP site archetypes

Archetype 1 - Small Edge of Settlement Greenfield Site
Discussion at Housing Market Partnership (22.2.2010) suggests this type of site is likely to be viable.

Development Opportunities

Total Residential Units

Estimate up to 7 from frontage development

Affordable Units

Could be suitablefor high proportion allocation of exception site.

Indicative Density (units per ha)

up to 30ph

Availability/Timescale

Available Now?

No - requires change in policy to extend development boundary.

How long to fully develop the site?

Available within 5 Years?

Yes - progressing as exception site.

Timescale: Before 2011

Timescale: 2012-2016:

Timescale: 2017-2021:

Timescale: 2022-2026:

Timescale: After 2026:

Conclusions

Yes. Potential for exception site. RDC acquiring.
Proximity to village centre services is an advantage. Landscape is a disadvantage - planting at south boundary may mitigate.

BO7

Land at Roundwood, Broad Oak

Site Details

Location

Settlement:

Rural: Broad Oak

Address:

Land at Roundwood, Northiam Road, Broad Oak

Parish:

Brede

Ward:

Brede Valley

South Coast Sub Region:

No

Brownfield or Greenfield?

B

Size (Ha)

0.23

Current Land Use

None

Wholly within development boundary

☒

Partially within development boundary

☐

Abut development boundary

☐

Outside development boundary

☐

Policy Context and Identified Needs

Broad Oak recommended for 10-50 dwellings in Core Strategy, plus a need for employment uses. Parish Action Plan seeks recycling, improved public transport, tree planting, sowing of wildflowers and the creation of local nature reserves. PPG17 study identified shortage of amenity open space and need for new allotment as a high priority.

Planning History

●Planning applications relating to original construction of the existing dwelling, Cowslip Cottage, and garage addition (RR/85/1065 and RR/90/2127/P).
●Extensive planning history for re-development of land to west of site BO7 for which access was proposed between Cowslip Cottage and Roundwood (see Planning History for site BO3 for further details).

Environmental Factors

AONB, nearby ancient woodland and SNCI. BAP habitats (Ghyll woodland and wet woodland at eastern boundary across road).

ESCC Landscape Assessment Capacity to Accept Change - Housing:

Moderate

On-Site Appraisal

Summary of Constraints identified from On-Site Appraisals

Access, Trees, Views.

Layout/design parameters

Heavily dependent on access point, and on whether adjacent and nearby sites (BO3, BO8 and BO5) are included in a more comprehensive development.

Potential Mitigation Measures:

Sandwiched between two large areas of ancient woodland, the site offers opportunity to link network of connected habitats.

Highways and Accessibility Issues

Access to nearest

Distance from

Convenience Food Shop

est. 450m

Primary School

est. 620m (Brede Primary School)

Bus Route:

on road frontage

Railway Station

est. 11.4km (Robertsbridge)

Main Doctors Surgery

est. 770m (Broad Oak Surgery)

On-Site Access Issues

ESCC Highways comment in Jan 2010 "40 mph - 120m of visibility required. The only location where adequate visibility can be achieved is from BO8, though there wold be a need to remove trees/vegetation overhanging highway to ensure the visibility to the south. Mitigation measures should include improved footways along Northiam Road."
Submitter states "Under plans B and C but not A"

Utilities and Infrastructure

Gas Cables:

No high pressure gas mains impacting on site

SFRA Issues (+ Southern Water Advice where sought):

Flood Surface Water Less 2009 (east).
Southern Water site specific advice (11/02/10) "No capacity in local sewer. However redevelopment may offer scope for reduction in flows - developer should investigate" SW general advice "Where existing capacity is not currently available, development will need to be phased with the provision of the necessary infrastructure"

Contamination Issues:

Environmental Health (March 2010)
Confirmed "No issues"

Other Factors / Constraints

Availability / Ownership Constraints:

No

Awaiting Relocation of Current Use:

No - in residential use

Level of Developer Interest:

Submitter "High, subject to housing policy"

Recommendations for How Constraints Could Be Overcome:

PHOTO TO BE ADDED

Viability Assessment

e.g; cost factors, market factors based on HMP site archetypes

Archetype 7 - Redevelopment of Existing Properties in Large Grounds
Discussion at Housing Market Partnership (22/02/2010) suggests this type of site is likely to be viable.

Development Opportunities

Total Residential Units

Submitter '5'
Planning officer: Higher number could be developed alongside

Affordable Units

TBC

Indicative Density (units per ha)

30ph

Availability/Timescale

Available Now?

Maybe - access is an issue to be resolved.

How long to fully develop the site?

Submitter "2 depending on planning restrictions"

Available within 5 Years?

Yes, reasonable prospect of coming forward although access is a possible issue.

Timescale: Before 2011

Submitter "Yes"

Timescale: 2012-2016:

Timescale: 2017-2021:

Timescale: 2022-2026:

Timescale: After 2026:

Conclusions

May have potential for residential, possibly alongside other uses (open space, employment). Possible as part of wider scheme across neighbouring sites. Access is a constraint requiring further confirmation. No capacity in local sewer, although redevelopment may offer scope for reduction in water/sewerage flows and developer would be required to investigate. As existing sewerage capacity is not currently available, development will need to be phased with the provision of the necessary infrastructure.

BU2

Land South West of Strand Meadow, Burwash

Site Details

Location

Settlement:

Rural: Burwash

Address:

Land South West of Strand Meadow, Burwash

Parish:

Burwash

Ward:

Darwell

South Coast Sub Region:

No

Brownfield or Greenfield?

G

Size (Ha)

0.62

Current Land Use

Grassland

Wholly within development boundary

☒

Partially within development boundary

☐

Abut development boundary

☐

Outside development boundary

☐

Policy Context and Identified Needs

Core Strategy recommends 17-30 houses. RSS and PPG17 Study indicates high need for allotments. LAP identified desire for improved foot/cycle paths.

Planning History

●Local Plan Allocation - Policy VL1.

Environmental Factors

Whole site in AONB. Various trees subject to TPO. Adjacent to public path to North.

ESCC Landscape Assessment Capacity to Accept Change - Housing:

Moderate

On-Site Appraisal

Summary of Constraints identified from On-Site Appraisals

Steeply sloping with preserved trees and restricted access. Watercourse along length of western boundary.

Layout/design parameters

Need to protect watercourse.

Potential Mitigation Measures:

Additional/replacement boundary planting.

Highways and Accessibility Issues

Access to nearest

Distance from

Convenience Food Shop

est. 1.1km

Primary School

est. 990m (Burwash CE Primary School)

Bus Route:

est. 680m

Railway Station

est. 4.6km (Etchingham)

Main Doctors Surgery

est. 1.2km (Fairfield Surgery, Burwash)

On-Site Access Issues

Only available from Strand Meadow but does not abut it.

Utilities and Infrastructure

Gas Cables:

No high pressure gas mains impacting on site

SFRA Issues (+ Southern Water Advice where sought):

Flood Surface Water Less 2009 (north-west boundary). Southern Water site specific advice (11/02/10) "No capacity in local sewer. Downstream improvements required " SW general advice "Where existing capacity is not currently available, development will need to be phased with the provision of the necessary infrastructure "

Contamination Issues:

TBC

Other Factors / Constraints

Availability / Ownership Constraints:

None known. (source: LAA NI154 Report).

Awaiting Relocation of Current Use:

No

Level of Developer Interest:

Medium - allocation, but no recent planning interest - no applications and not submitted in LDF.

Recommendations for How Constraints Could Be Overcome:

Contact owners.

PHOTO TO BE ADDED

Viability Assessment

e.g; cost factors, market factors based on HMP site archetypes

Archetype 1 - Small, Edge of Settlement Greenfield Site Discussion at Housing Market Partnership (22/02/2010) suggests this type of site is likely to be viable.

Development Opportunities

Total Residential Units

17 (source: LAA N1154 Report)

Affordable Units

40%

Indicative Density (units per ha)

30

Availability/Timescale

Available Now?

No. Most recent information suggested developer not reached agreement to acquire.

How long to fully develop the site?

Available within 5 Years?

Yes. 17 (source: LAA NI154 Report).

Timescale: Before 2011

Timescale: 2012-2016:

1st likely completion from 2012/13 rather than 2009/10 as developer reached agreement to acquire.

Timescale: 2017-2021:

Timescale: 2022-2026:

Timescale: After 2026:

Conclusions

Yes, suitable option in line with allocation. No capacity in local sewer, so development will need to be phased with the provision of the necessary infrastructure.

BX16Galley Hill Depot

Site Details

Location

Settlement:

Bexhill

Address:

Ashdown Road

Parish:

N/a

Ward:

Sackville

South Coast Sub Region:

Yes

Brownfield or Greenfield?

Brownfield

Size (Ha)

1.3

Current Land Use

Derelict former railway land - redundant oil storage depot

Wholly within development boundary

☒

Partially within development boundary

☐

Abut development boundary

☐

Outside development boundary

☐

Policy Context and Identified Needs

Local Plan Housing allocation.
Core Strategy Preferred Strategy for Bexhill: Further 3100-3300 houses, 60,000 sq.m employment and 6,500 sq.m retail. Improve key community infrastructure, especially schools, further education, leisure and health facilities, housing for younger people, and support for older people.
Open Space, Sport and Recreation Study: indoor tennis facilities in the long term, replacement lane swimming facility in the long term, new play areas in northeast Bexhil, in the east of Bexhill in Little Common and in or near Collington wood and Gilham Wood. Additional pitches, allotments and qualitaive improvements.

Planning History

●Local Plan Allocation for 48 dwellings - Policy BX8.

Environmental Factors

None

ESCC Landscape Assessment Capacity to Accept Change - Housing:

Not assessed

On-Site Appraisal

Summary of Constraints identified from On-Site Appraisals

See Local Plan allocation.

Layout/design parameters

See Local Plan allocation.

Potential Mitigation Measures:

See Local Plan allocation.

Highways and Accessibility Issues

Access to nearest	Distance from
Convenience Food Shop	est. 960m (Bexhill Town Centre Shopping Area)
Primary School	est. 1.5km (St Peter & St Paul CE Primary)
Bus Route:	est. 170m
Railway Station	est. 930m (Bexhill)
Main Doctors Surgery	est. 1.4km (Old Town Surgery, Bexhill)

On-Site Access Issues

Planning Officer: None. Direct access from Ashdown Road.

Utilities and Infrastructure

Gas Cables:

High pressure gas mains close to north-west corner of site that may impact upon any development of site. British Gas Transco consulted on 07/01/10.

Feb 2010 Southern Gas Networks (Scotia) comment that

SFRA Issues (+ Southern Water Advice where sought):

Flood Surface Water Less 2009. Southern Water advice (11/02/10) "Capacity in local sewer. Deep 300 dia combined sewer crossing site."

Contamination Issues:

Environmental Health (March 2010)
Historic - Goods yard; railway land to south; tanks; oil depot; sidings; electricity sub-station.

Former oil storage depot - ground survey undertaken to identify issues/

Other Factors / Constraints

Availability / Ownership Constraints:

Potential ransom strip, although not an objection in principle. Site owners awaiting market conditions to improve before marketing.

Awaiting Relocation of Current Use:

TBC

Level of Developer Interest:

High

Recommendations for How Constraints Could Be Overcome:

Consider alternative access arrangements.

PHOTO TO BE ADDED

Viability Assessmente.g; cost factors, market factors based on HMP site archetypes

Archetype 6) Development on unused or underused land with legacy of industrial activity. Discussion at Housing Market Partnership (22/02/2010) suggests the viability of this type of site may depend to a large extent of Section 106 contribution levels and that the local authority may need to be flexible in this regard. The type of site could be viable but there are likely to be complex issues that may act as a disincentive for developers. Probably not viable in the short-term, but possibly in the longer term.

Development Opportunities

Total Residential Units	55 (source: LAA N1154 Report) Planning Officer: In line with Local Plan allocation
Affordable Units	40% Planning Officer: In line with Local Plan allocation
Indicative Density (units per ha)	42 Planning Officer: In line with Local Plan allocation

Availability/Timescale

Available Now?	No. (not got planning permission)
How long to fully develop the site?	1 - 2 years
Available within 5 Years?	Yes
Timescale: Before 2011	
Timescale: 2012-2016:	Yes
Timescale: 2017-2021:	
Timescale: 2022-2026:	
Timescale: After 2026:	

Conclusions

Yes, in line with allocation for housing in the Local Plan.

BX18 Land North of Pebsham Bexhill (Link Road East)

Site Details

Location

Settlement:

Bexhill

Address:

Land north of Pebsham

Parish:

N/a

Ward:

Old Town

South Coast Sub Region:

Yes

Brownfield or Greenfield?

Greenfield

Size (Ha)

30.336

Current Land Use

Grassland and Farming

Wholly within development boundary

☐

Partially within development boundary

☒

Abut development boundary

☐

Outside development boundary

☐

Policy Context and Identified Needs

The site is covered by the North East Bexhill SPD 2009 in which it is allocated for medium and high density housing. It is also covered by Local Plan Policy BX2. Core Strategy Preferred Strategy for Bexhill: Further 3100-3300 houses, 60,000 sq.m employment and 6,500 sq.m retail. Improve key community infrastructure, especially schools, further education, leisure and health facilities, housing for younger people, and support for older people. Open Space, Sport and Recreation Study: indoor tennis facilities in the long term, replacement lane swimming facility in the long term, new play areas in northeast Bexhil, in the east of Bexhill in Little Common and in or near Collington wood and Gilham Wood. Additional pitches, allotments and qualitaive improvements.

Planning History

- Local Plan Allocation - Policy BX2 .
- North East Bexhill 'Masterplan" SPD (adopted June 2009)

Environmental Factors

Two areas of Ancient & Semi-Natural Woodland in close proximity to the site, listed building is in close proximity to the site, Public Rights of Way on/adjoining the site and two areas of wet woodland in close proximity to the site.

ESCC Landscape Assessment

Capacity to Accept Change - Housing:

not assessed

On-Site Appraisal

Summary of Constraints identified from On-Site Appraisals

See North East Bexhill SPD

Layout/design parameters

See North East Bexhill SPD. Electricity - Needs reinforcement of existing supply, possibly additional sub-station to meet total demand from NE Bexhill development. Sewerage - Needs off-site connections to WTW to

Potential Mitigation Measures:

See North East Bexhill SPD

Highways and Accessibility Issues

Access to nearest	Distance from
Convenience Food Shop	est. 850m (from south via Wrestwood Road)
Primary School	est. 300m (St Mary Magdalenes Catholic Primary School)
Bus Route:	on road frontage (Wrestwood Road)
Railway Station	est. 1.8 km (Bexhill)
Main Doctors Surgery	est. 1.3km (Pebsham Surgery)

On-Site Access Issues

Planning Officer "Largely dependent upon Link Road. 100 dwellings may be built off exisitng infrastructure."

Utilities and Infrastructure

Gas Cables:

No high pressure gas mains impacting on site

SFRA Issues (+ Southern Water Advice where sought):

Flood Surface Water Less & Intermediate 2009 affects small area

Contamination Issues:

Officer "See North East Bexhill SPD"

Environmental Health (March 2010)

Historic - Upper worsham Farm in centre of sites

Other Factors / Constraints

Availability / Ownership Constraints:

None

Awaiting Relocation of Current Use:

No

Level of Developer Interest:

High

Recommendations for How Constraints Could Be Overcome:

Link Road contract let.

PHOTO TO BE ADDED

Viability Assessment e.g; cost factors, market factors based on HMP site archetypes

Archetype 2 - Large, Edge of settlement Greenfield Site Discussion at Housing Market Partnership (22/02/2010) suggests this type of site is likely to be viable.

Development Opportunities

Total Residential Units

1,175 (source: NE Bexhill SPD)

Affordable Units

See North East Bexhill SPD

Indicative Density (units per ha)

See North East Bexhill SPD

Availability/Timescale

Available Now?

No

How long to fully develop the site?

8 - 10 years

Available within 5 Years?

Yes

Timescale: Before 2011

No

Timescale: 2012-2016:

350

Timescale: 2017-2021:

825

Timescale: 2022-2026:

Timescale: After 2026:

Conclusions

Yes. In line with North East Bexhill SPD

BX19

Land North of Sidley Bexhill (Link Road West)

Site Details

Location

Settlement:

Bexhill

Address:

Land at Preston Hall Farm, Bexhill

Parish:

N/a

Ward:

Sidley

South Coast Sub Region:

Yes

Brownfield or Greenfield?

Greenfield

Size (Ha)

3.85

Current Land Use

Grassland and Farming

Wholly within development boundary

☒

Partially within development boundary

☐

Abut development boundary

☐

Outside development boundary

☐

Policy Context and Identified Needs

The site is covered by the North East Bexhill SPD 2009 where it is allocated for low density housing. Also covered by Local Plan Policy BX3. Core Strategy Preferred Strategy for Bexhill: Further 3100-3300 houses, 60,000 sq.m employment and 6,500 sq.m retail. Improve key community infrastructure, especially schools, further education, leisure and health facilities, housing for younger people, and support for older people. Open Space, Sport and Recreation Study: indoor tennis facilities in the long term, replacement lane swimming facility in the long term, new play areas in northeast Bexhil, in the east of Bexhill in Little Common and in or near Collington wood and Gilham Wood. Additional pitches, allotments and qualitaive improvements.

Planning History

- Local Plan Allocation - Policy BX3 .

●North East Bexhill 'Masterplan' SPD (adopted June 2009)

Environmental Factors

A TPO on the south west boundary, Public Rights of Way adjoin the site and listed buildings adjacent to north east of the site.

ESCC Landscape Assessment Capacity to Accept Change - Housing:

Not assessed

On-Site Appraisal

Summary of Constraints identified from On-Site Appraisals

See North East Bexhill SPD

Layout/design parameters

See North East Bexhill SPD. Electricity - Needs reinforcement of existing supply, possibly additional sub-station to meet total demand from NE Bexhill development. Sewerage - Needs off-site connections to WTW to

Potential Mitigation Measures:

See North East Bexhill SPD

Highways and Accessibility Issues

Access to nearest	Distance from
Convenience Food Shop	est. 640m (Sidley Shopping Area)
Primary School	est. 690m (All Saints CE Primary School)
Bus Route:	est. 200m
Railway Station	est. 2.7km (Bexhill)
Main Doctors Surgery	est. 700m (Sidley Surgery)

On-Site Access Issues

Planning officer "Dependent upon construction of Link Road"

Utilities and Infrastructure

Gas Cables:

No high pressure gas mains impacting on site

SFRA Issues (+ Southern Water Advice where sought):

Flood Surface Water Less & Intermediate 2009 affects land between the two areas of this site.

Contamination Issues:

Officer "See North East Bexhill SPD"

Environmental Health (March 2010)

Historic - Preston Farm to North East

Pumping Station North East (South section)

Other Factors / Constraints

Availability / Ownership Constraints:

None

Awaiting Relocation of Current Use:

N/A

Level of Developer Interest:

High

Recommendations for How Constraints Could Be Overcome:

Link Road built

PHOTO TO BE ADDED

Viability Assessment

e.g; cost factors, market factors based on HMP site archetypes

Archetype 2 - Large, Edge of settlement Greenfield Site Discussion at Housing Market Partnership (22/02/2010) suggests this type of site is likely to be viable.

Development Opportunities

Total Residential Units

see above 1210 (source: LAA N1154 Report)

Affordable Units

40%+

Indicative Density (units per ha)

30

Planning Officer: See North East Bexhill SPD

Availability/Timescale

Available Now?

No

How long to fully develop the site?

2 years

Available within 5 Years?

Yes

Timescale: Before 2011

Timescale: 2012-2016:

50 - 2012/13

Timescale: 2017-2021:

135

Timescale: 2022-2026:

Timescale: After 2026:

Conclusions

See North East Bexhill SPD - Housing allocation

BX4

High School Site and Drills Hall, Down Road

Site Details

Location

Settlement:

Bexhill

Address:

Bexhill High School Site, Down Road, Bexhill

Parish:

N/a

Ward:

St Stephens

South Coast Sub Region:

Yes

Brownfield or Greenfield?

B

Size (Ha)

3.12

Current Land Use

High School and Drills Hall

Wholly within development boundary

☒

Partially within development boundary

☐

Abut development boundary

☐

Outside development boundary

☐

Policy Context and Identified Needs

ESCC Notified Site - Highway Scheme to the east of site. Core Strategy Preferred Strategy for Bexhill: Further 3100-3300 houses, 60,000 sq.m employment and 6,500 sq.m retail. Improve key community infrastructure, especially schools, further education, leisure and health facilities, housing for younger people, and support for older people.

Open Space, Sport and Recreation Study: indoor tennis facilities in the long term, replacement lane swimming facility in the long term, new play areas in northeast Bexhil, in the east of Bexhill in Little Common and in or near Collington wood and Gilham Wood. Additional pitches, allotments and qualitaive improvements.

Planning History

- Local Plan Allocation - Policy BX9 and partial overlap on eastern edge with Link Road - Area of Search.
- County Council application RR/2770/CC (RDC ref. RR/2009/667/C) approved Aug 2009 for demolition of Technology building and Roselea building and erection of a 2-storey "Skill Centre".

Environmental Factors

Rights of Way

ESCC Landscape Assessment

Capacity to Accept Change - Housing:

Not assessed

On-Site Appraisal

Summary of Constraints identified from On-Site Appraisals

some trees, limited access point. Residential to N.

Layout/design parameters

"Gateway" location in central location respect relationships to neighbouring residential properties, remaining education and park activities.

Potential Mitigation Measures:

landscaping to W and improve to S.

Highways and Accessibility Issues

Access to nearest

Distance from

Convenience Food Shop

est. 280m

Primary School

adj to King Offa Primary School

Bus Route:

est. 55m

Railway Station

est. 1.5km (Bexhill)

Main Doctors Surgery

est. 1.2km (Collington Surgery)

On-Site Access Issues

As existing to Down Road.

Utilities and Infrastructure

Gas Cables:

No high pressure gas mains impacting on site

SFRA Issues (+ Southern Water Advice where sought):

Flood Surface Water More, Less & Intermediate 2009. Southern Water site specific advice (11/02/10) "Potential for removal of surface water from combined system."

Contamination Issues:

Environmental Health (March 2010)
Historic - garage

Other Factors / Constraints

Availability / Ownership Constraints:

None known. (source: LAA NI154 Report).

Awaiting Relocation of Current Use:

Following relocation of High School Autumn 2010

Level of Developer Interest:

High. Main landowner is assessing disposal options. Expected to retain part of site for adjacent Primary School.

Recommendations for How Constraints Could Be Overcome:

Involve respective landowners

PHOTO TO BE ADDED

Viability Assessment

e.g; cost factors, market factors based on HMP site archetypes

Archetype 8 - Development on School site
Discussion at Housing Market Partnership (22/02/2010) suggests this type of site is likely to be viable.

Development Opportunities

Total Residential Units

46 (source: LAA N1154 Report)

Affordable Units

40%

Indicative Density (units per ha)

30

Availability/Timescale

Available Now?

Yes.

How long to fully develop the site?

46 within 5 years (source LAA NI154 Report).

Available within 5 Years?

46 (source: LAA NI154 Report).

Timescale: Before 2011

Timescale: 2012-2016:

23 expected 2011/12
23 expected 2013/13

Timescale: 2017-2021:

Timescale: 2022-2026:

Timescale: After 2026:

Conclusions

Yes, in line with Local Plan allocation.

BX64 Land at Moleynes, Fryatts Way, Bexhill

Site Details

Location

Settlement:

Bexhill

Address:

Land at Moleynes, Fryatts Way, Bexhill

Parish:

N/a

Ward:

St Stephens

South Coast Sub Region:

Yes

Brownfield or Greenfield?

B

Size (Ha)

1.59

Current Land Use

Appears residential - large house, stables, swimming pool building & paddocks

Wholly within development boundary

☐

Partially within development boundary

☒

Abut development boundary

☐

Outside development boundary

☐

Policy Context and Identified Needs

Core Strategy Preferred Strategy for Bexhill: Further 3100-3300 houses, 60,000 sq.m employment and 6,500 sq.m retail. Improve key community infrastructure, especially schools, further education, leisure and health facilities, housing for younger people, and support for older people. Open Space, Sport and Recreation Study: indoor tennis facilities in the long term, replacement lane swimming facility in the long term, new play areas in northeast Bexhil, in the east of Bexhill in Little Common and in or near Collington wood and Gilham Wood. Additional pitches, allotments and qualitative improvements.

Core Strateav Preferred Strateav for Bexhill: Provide for additional business and emolvment

Planning History

Relevant history:

●RR/85/1283 approved in 1985 for covered swimming pool.

●Lapsed outline RR/80/1515 approved in 1980 for erection of 10 dwelling houses.

●Lapsed outline B/53/210 approved in 1953 for erection of a service cottage in connection with Moleynes Mead - to north of site.

Environmental Factors

Nearby TPO.

ESCC Landscape Assessment Capacity to Accept Change - Housing:

Not assessed

On-Site Appraisal

Summary of Constraints identified from On-Site Appraisals

Character of area. Trees. Neighbouring amenities. Access.

Layout/design parameters

Comprehensive scheme dependent on access point.

Potential Mitigation Measures:

Dependent on layout of scheme.

Highways and Accessibility Issues

Access to nearest

Distance from

Convenience Food Shop

est. 1.3km (One Stop, Turkey Road)

Primary School

est. 1.6km (King Offa Primary School)

Bus Route:

est. 550m (via west - Fryatts Way)

Railway Station

est. 2.3km (Collington)

Main Doctors Surgery

est. 1.9km (Sidley Surgery)

On-Site Access Issues

Existing access is on Ellerslie Lane (eastern boundary) - limited visibility to south. Potential access point on western boundary (Fryatts Way) or relocated to northern part of Ellerslie Lane boundary. ESCC Highways advise "possible to use existing point of access (with improvements) as well as one from Fryatts Way. Consider 50 units is optimistic for this site."

Utilities and Infrastructure

Gas Cables:

No high pressure gas mains impacting on site

SFRA Issues (+ Southern Water Advice where sought):

None

Contamination Issues:

Environmental Health (March 2010)
Historic - EA East Sussex, Fryatts Way) 50m SW
EA Landfill Sussex Fryatts Way)

Other Factors / Constraints

Availability / Ownership Constraints:

No. Owner confirms willingness to develop.

Awaiting Relocation of Current Use:

Currently low density residential use

Level of Developer Interest:

Low

Recommendations for How Constraints Could Be Overcome:

Owners need to be in agreement.

PHOTO TO BE ADDED

Viability Assessment

e.g; cost factors, market factors based on HMP site archetypes

Archetype 7 - Redevelopment of Existing Properties in Large Grounds
Discussion at Housing Market Partnership (22/02/2010) suggests this type of site is likely to be viable.

Development Opportunities

Total Residential Units

approx 40 (ESCC Highways concern at 50)

Affordable Units

in line with standard

Indicative Density (units per ha)

Approx 24ph (TBC)

Availability/Timescale

Available Now?

Yes

How long to fully develop the site?

Available within 5 Years?

Yes

Timescale: Before 2011

Timescale: 2012-2016:

Timescale: 2017-2021:

Timescale: 2022-2026:

Timescale: After 2026:

Conclusions

Yes, although highways concerns appear to suggest at this stage that 30 ph may not be achievable.

CM2

Old Lydd Road, Camber

Site Details

Location

Settlement:

Rural: Camber

Address:

Old Lydd Road, Camber

Parish:

Camber

Ward:

Eastern Rother

South Coast Sub Region:

Yes

Brownfield or Greenfield?

Brownfield

Size (Ha)

0.19

Current Land Use

Vacant former putting green.

Wholly within development boundary

☒

Partially within development boundary

☐

Abut development boundary

☐

Outside development boundary

☐

Policy Context and Identified Needs

The Rural Settlement Strategy suggests that Cambers main need is more local employment opportunities through the provision of tourist facilities and/or amenity facilities. The Rural Settlement Strategy does not suggest a particularly strong housing need in the area. This is reflected in the Core Strategy, which suggests that Camber, as a whole, may be allocated up to 20 new dwellings up to 2026.

Planning History

Relevant history:
●RR/2009/1948/P - temporary permission (until Sept 2010) for change of use from putting course to car park.
●Refused outline RR/2005/2415/P in 2005 for 10 commercial units with managers office and 11 apartments over and managers accommodation (reason: over-development of site).
●RR/2003/42/P approved in 2003 for new café/restaurant and retail centre.
●RR/89/2425/P allowed on appeal in 1990 for 9 dwellings.

Environmental Factors

The north east corner of the site abuts Flood Zone 2.

ESCC Landscape Assessment Capacity to Accept Change - Housing:

Not assessed

On-Site Appraisal

Summary of Constraints identified from On-Site Appraisals

Neighbouring amenities.

Layout/design parameters

TBC

Potential Mitigation Measures:

TBC

Highways and Accessibility Issues

Access to nearest	Distance from
Convenience Food Shop	est. 270m - access Old Lydd Rd
Primary School	est. 7.2km (Rye Community Primary School)
Bus Route:	est. 245m - access Old Lydd Rd
Railway Station	est. 7.7km (Rye) - access Old Lydd Rd
Main Doctors Surgery	est. 220m (Camber Surgery)

On-Site Access Issues

None. Straightforward access to and from the site.

Utilities and Infrastructure

Gas Cables:

Appears to be no gas at all in vicinity - source UtilityMaps

SFRA Issues (+ Southern Water Advice where sought):

Flood Surface Water Less 2009 (NW)

Contamination Issues:

No apparent issues.

Other Factors / Constraints

Availability / Ownership Constraints:

No

Awaiting Relocation of Current Use:

No

Level of Developer Interest:

Medium-High - proposals being invited from developers

Recommendations for How Constraints Could Be Overcome:

PHOTO TO BE ADDED

Viability Assessment

e.g; cost factors, market factors based on HMP site archetypes

Archetype 6) Development on unused or underused land with legacy of industrial activity. Discussion at Housing Market Partnership (22/02/2010) suggests the viability of this type of site may depend to a large extent of Section 106 contribution levels and that the local authority may need to be flexible in this regard. The type of site could be viable but there are likely to be complex issues that may act as a disincentive for developers. Probably not viable in the short-term, but possibly in the longer term.

Development Opportunities

Total Residential Units

Estimate up to 9

Affordable Units

In line with standards.

Indicative Density (units per ha)

TBC

Availability/Timescale

Available Now?

No - Council tendering process needs to be gone through.

How long to fully develop the site?

Available within 5 Years?

Yes

Timescale: Before 2011

Timescale: 2012-2016:

Timescale: 2017-2021:

Timescale: 2022-2026:

Timescale: After 2026:

Conclusions

Yes. Subject of 07/12/09 Cabinet Report (along with Camber central car park) in the context of the Camber Visitor Management Initiative (VMI) which was approved by Cabinet in Feb 2005. It is considered that this site could be an integral part of an scheme on the Central Car Park. The Council will invite proposals for either a leasehold disposal or joint venture arrangement for the development of th two sites (CM2 and CM6). Proposals should include an outline scheme setting out the type of development anticipated. Suggested facilities do not include residential, although it may be necessary as an enabler.

CR2

Land East of Station Road, Crowhurst

Site Details

Location

Settlement:

Rural: Crowhurst

Address:

Land east of Station Road, Crowhurst

Parish:

Crowhurst

Ward:

Crowhurst

South Coast Sub Region:

Yes

Brownfield or Greenfield?

G

Size (Ha)

61.58

Current Land Use

Agriculture. Grazing Lane.

Wholly within development boundary

☐

Partially within development boundary

☐

Abut development boundary

☒

Outside development boundary

☐

Policy Context and Identified Needs

Core Strategy recommends allocations for 0-15 dwellings (Parish Council has preference for affordable housing).
Rother District Council's 'Open Space, Sport and Recreation Audit and Assessment 2007' recommended a new facility for older children/teenagers, albeit as a low priority.
Crowhurst Village Action Plan identifies need for accommodation for play group, youth club, a new village hall (adjacent to current building), pathway round rec from car park to pavilion.

Planning History

Relevant history:
●A number of historic refused outlines for residential development on different parts of Site CR2, namely A/57/55, A/64/594, A/71/146, A/72/1857, RR/74/0123 & RR/74/0131 (reasons: outside development area, highway objections, precedent, harmful to visual amenities of rural locality).

Environmental Factors

AONB, Flood zones, Ancient Woodland, SNCI, ASA, Footpaths. BAP habitats (Ghyll woodland, wet woodland and sandstone outcrops)

ESCC Landscape Assessment

Capacity to Accept Change - Housing:

Low

On-Site Appraisal

Summary of Constraints identified from On-Site Appraisals

Access, landscape, possible drainage issue.

Layout/design parameters

Site heavily constrained by landscape and environmantal factors. Development would have to be small scale in pockets adjacent to boundary.

Potential Mitigation Measures:

Possible planting at boundaries, possible S106 to improve habitat connectivity in area. EA comment "There is wetland habitat on site and a

Highways and Accessibility Issues

Access to nearest

Distance from

Convenience Food Shop

est. 5km (Catsfield)

Primary School

est. 90m (Crowhurst CE Primary School)

Bus Route:

est. 3.4km (A2100 Telham, Battle)

Railway Station

est. 650m (Crowhurst)

Main Doctors Surgery

est. 6.9km (Battle Health Centre)

On-Site Access Issues

(Section a to north west) Can be accessed via 30 mph road to west
(Section b to south east) Major access difficulties down narrow, poorly maintained track is only option.
ESCC Highways initial advice "Visibility splays of 2.4m x 45m would need to be provided as part of any development which is achievable. Access is preferred from the western site boundary and should be located just south of the existing access into St Georges Church. Footway needs to be provided to connect with existing footway. Existing vegetation may need to be removed as part of the development."
ESCC further advise SE corner not feasible. West side - "Station Road is unadopted highway so if accessed from here then site could not be adopted"

Utilities and Infrastructure

Gas Cables:

Appears to be no gas at all in vicinity - source UtilityMaps. British Gas Transco consulted on 07/01/10.

Feb 2010 Southern Gas Networks (Scotia) comment that

SFRA Issues (+ Southern Water Advice where sought):

Flood Surface Water Less, Intermediate & More 2009. Southern Water site specific advice (11/02/10) "No capacity in local sewer. Sewers crossing site "
SW general advice "Where existing capacity is not currently available, development will need to be phased with the provision of the necessary infrastructure. Where infrastructure crosses the site, development design should avoid building over existing infrastructure."

Contamination Issues:

Environmental Health (March 2010)
Historic - Sampsons/Solomons Farm, Railway east edge. Quarrying of sand/clay, operation of sand and gravel pits. Weapons and ammunition manufacture and storage, south west boundary.

Other Factors / Constraints

Availability / Ownership Constraints:

No

Awaiting Relocation of Current Use:

Farm and agricultural uses. Some farm buildings on NW side may need to be re-located.

Level of Developer Interest:

High - Identified via external consultation

Recommendations for How Constraints Could Be Overcome:

ESCC Highways, Utilities (flood water and Gas) will all need to be confirmed.

PHOTO TO BE ADDED

Viability Assessment

e.g; cost factors, market factors based on HMP site archetypes

Archetype 1 - Small Edge of Settlement Greenfield Site
Discussion at Housing Market Partnership (22/02/2010) suggests this type of site is likely to be viable

Development Opportunities

Total Residential Units

<15 at either one of two points specified

Affordable Units

In line with standard

Indicative Density (units per ha)

30ph

Availability/Timescale

Available Now?

No - policy will need amending. Site is policy constrained as outside development boundary.

How long to fully develop the site?

Available within 5 Years?

Yes for a small section on the west side only. Majority of site is is unsuitable.

Timescale: Before 2011

Timescale: 2012-2016:

Timescale: 2017-2021:

Timescale: 2022-2026:

Timescale: After 2026:

Conclusions

Yes - at small western section only, although Environment Agency comments require further investigation. EA state "As well as fluvial flooding, the site may be at risk of flooding from a variety of other sources including surface runoff, groundwater and poor drainage."
Residential development should ideally incorporate a village shop. At western section there may also be potential to create a public space for the village alongside development.
Unacceptable impact upon AONB across majority of site. Gas will all need to be confirmed. No capacity in local sewer, development will need to be phased with the provision of the necessary infrastructure.

Sites Appendix i: Suitable and Developable Sites (Green)

ET4

Land West of Etchingham

Site Details

Location

Settlement:

Rural: Etchingham

Address:

Land West of Etchingham

Parish:

Etchingham

Ward:

Ticehurst and Etchingham

South Coast Sub Region:

No

Brownfield or Greenfield?

G

Size (Ha)

0.5

Current Land Use

Grassland

Wholly within development boundary

☒

Partially within development boundary

☐

Abut development boundary

☐

Outside development boundary

☐

Policy Context and Identified Needs

Core Strategy Consultation on Strategy Directions recommends 15-40 dwellings, including the outstanding allocation of 17 units. The Rural Settlement Study suggests need for new employment uses alongside any new housing. The ‘Open Space, Sport and Recreation Study’ recommends that a new allotment is needed (medium priority).

Planning History

●Local Plan Allocation - Policy VL2.

Environmental Factors

AONB.

ESCC Landscape Assessment Capacity to Accept Change - Housing:

Moderate

On-Site Appraisal

Summary of Constraints identified from On-Site Appraisals

None.

Layout/design parameters

In line with Local Plan policy.

Potential Mitigation Measures:

In line with Local Plan policy.

Highways and Accessibility Issues

Access to nearest

Distance from

Convenience Food Shop

est. 540m

Primary School

est. 1.6km (Etchingham CE Primary School)

Bus Route:

on road frontage (A265)

Railway Station

est. 1.3km (Etchingham)

Main Doctors Surgery

est. 3.2km (Fairfield Surgery, Burwash)

On-Site Access Issues

Straightforward access to A265.

Utilities and Infrastructure

Gas Cables:

Appears to be no gas at all in vicinity - source UtilityMaps. British Gas Transco consulted on 07/01/10.

Feb 2010 Southern Gas Networks (Scotia) comment that

SFRA Issues (+ Southern Water Advice where sought):

None

Contamination Issues:

No apparent issues

Other Factors / Constraints

Availability / Ownership Constraints:

None known. (source: LAA NI154 Report).

Awaiting Relocation of Current Use:

No

Level of Developer Interest:

High ongoing discussions with landowner.

Recommendations for How Constraints Could Be Overcome:

N/a

PHOTO TO BE ADDED

Viability Assessment

e.g; cost factors, market factors based on HMP site archetypes

Archetype 1 - Small Edge of Settlement Greenfield Site
Discussion at Housing Market Partnership (22/02/2010) suggests this type of site is likely to be viable

Development Opportunities

Total Residential Units

17 (source: LAA N1154 Report)

Affordable Units

40%

Indicative Density (units per ha)

In line with allocation.

Availability/Timescale

Available Now?

Pre application discussions with landowners/ agent/ESCC and Etchingham Parish Council. Delay in securing a

How long to fully develop the site?

17 within 5 years (source LAA NI154 Report).

Available within 5 Years?

17 (source: LAA NI154 Report).

Timescale: Before 2011

Timescale: 2012-2016:

17 expected - 2012/13 (source 2009 AMR)

Timescale: 2017-2021:

Timescale: 2022-2026:

Timescale: After 2026:

Conclusions

Yes, in line with current allocation.

FC1

Fairlight Gardens, Fairlight

Site Details

Location

Settlement:

Rural: Fairlight Cove

Address:

Fairlight Gardens, Fairlight

Parish:

Fairlight

Ward:

Marsham

South Coast Sub Region:

Yes

Brownfield or Greenfield?

G

Size (Ha)

0.51

Current Land Use

Garage compound, previously a garden nursery.

Wholly within development boundary

☒

Partially within development boundary

☐

Abut development boundary

☐

Outside development boundary

☐

Policy Context and Identified Needs

Core Strategy proposes allocating 15-35 dwellings in Fairlight Cove. RDC's 'Open Space, Sport & Recreation Study' identifies the need for a new play area as a medium priority and new allotment as high priority. Logically play area should be on east side of village to complement existing play area on west side. Parish Council identify need for cycleway provision.

Planning History

●Local Plan Allocation - Policy VL3.

Environmental Factors

TPO

ESCC Landscape Assessment Capacity to Accept Change - Housing: Not assessed

On-Site Appraisal

Summary of Constraints identified from On-Site Appraisals

Addressed at Local Plan stage.

Layout/design parameters

Relates more to residential development at Lower Waites Lane in the built form of Fairlight Gardens.

Potential Mitigation Measures:

Refer to Local Plan Policy VL3

Highways and Accessibility Issues

Access to nearest	Distance from
Convenience Food Shop	est. 660m
Primary School	est. 4.4km (Guestling-Bradshaw CE Primary School)
Bus Route:	est. 95m
Railway Station	est. 7.2km (Three Oaks)
Main Doctors Surgery	est. 3.9km (Guestling Surgery)

On-Site Access Issues

Local Plan 'Access should be taken from Lower Waites Lane with the approach along Smuggler's Way, subject to widening the junction with Lower Waites Lane, as well as upgrading the approach to an adoptable standard. A strip at Limehurst needed to improve the width and alignment of the existing highway has already been dedicated for this purpose.

Utilities and Infrastructure

Gas Cables:

No high pressure gas mains impacting on site

SFRA Issues (+ Southern Water Advice where sought):

Flood Surface Water Less & Intermediate 2009. Southern Water site specific advice (11/02/10) "No capacity in local sewer" SW general advice "Where existing capacity is not currently available, development will need to be phased with the provision of the necessary infrastructure "

Contamination Issues:

Environmental Health (March 2010)
Historic - Waits Farm to West

Other Factors / Constraints

Availability / Ownership Constraints:

None known. (source: LAA NI154 Report).

Awaiting Relocation of Current Use:

No

Level of Developer Interest:

High

Recommendations for How Constraints Could Be Overcome:

Contact Southern Water

PHOTO TO BE ADDED

Viability Assessment

e.g; cost factors, market factors based on HMP site archetypes

Archetype 4) Development on unused or underused areas for car parking or otherwise unused. Discussion at Housing Market Partnership (22/02/2010) suggests this type of site will probably be viable in most circumstances, subject to land contamination costs.

Development Opportunities

Total Residential Units	17 in line with allocation
Affordable Units	40% in line with allocation
Indicative Density (units per ha)	34 in line with allocation

Availability/Timescale

Available Now?	Yes
How long to fully develop the site?	17 within 5 years (source LAA NI154 Report).
Available within 5 Years?	17 (source: LAA NI154 Report).
Timescale: Before 2011	
Timescale: 2012-2016:	17 expected - 2012/13 (source: 2009 AMR)
Timescale: 2017-2021:	
Timescale: 2022-2026:	
Timescale: After 2026:	

Conclusions

Yes. Allocation. Developers confirm likely delivery in 2012/12. No capacity in local sewer so development will need to be phased with the provision of the necessary infrastructure.

FC2

Land East of Waites Lane

Site Details

Location

Settlement:

Rural: Fairlight Cove

Address:

Wakehams Farm, Pett Level Road, Fairlight Cove, Hastings

Parish:

Fairlight

Ward:

Marsham

South Coast Sub Region:

Yes

Brownfield or Greenfield?

G

Size (Ha)

3.14

Current Land Use

Agriculture

Wholly within development boundary

☐

Partially within development boundary

☐

Abut development boundary

☒

Outside development boundary

☐

Policy Context and Identified Needs

Core Strategy proposes allocating 15-35 dwellings in Fairlight Cove. RDC's 'Open Space, Sport & Recreation Study' identifies the need for a new play area as a medium priority and new allotment as high priority. Logically play area should be on east side of village to complement existing play area on west side. Parish Council identify need for cycleway provision.

Planning History

- Dismissed appeal A/71/1053 in 1974 for residential development (issue: adequacy of existing public sewers).
- Refused outline A/54/115 in 1954 for bungalow (reasons: undesirable extension of ribbon development, unacceptable loss of good agricultural land).

Environmental Factors

AONB

ESCC Landscape Assessment Capacity to Accept Change - Housing:

Low

On-Site Appraisal

Summary of Constraints identified from On-Site Appraisals

Drainage. Visual landscape.

Layout/design parameters

TBC - dependent to a large degree on access.

Potential Mitigation Measures:

New landscape works are proposed to screen new access and reinforce existing boundary planting.

Highways and Accessibility Issues

Access to nearest	Distance from
Convenience Food Shop	est. 290m
Primary School	est. 3.9km (Guestling-Bradshaw CE Primary School)
Bus Route:	on road frontages (Battery Hill & Waites Lane)
Railway Station	est. 6.6km (Three Oaks)
Main Doctors Surgery	est. 3.4km (Guestling Surgery)

On-Site Access Issues

ESCC Highways advise (19/02/2010) "Access of Battery Hill / Fairlight Road would require change to the speed limit that could not be controlled through the Planning Process. Prefereed access is off of Waites Lane to open up site. Adequate visibility and width could be accommodated at this position." Further comments on speed limit on Battery Hill / Fairlight Road: "Traffic Regulation Order's would not be conditioned through the planning process. The Road and Traffic Safety Team undertake their annual speed limit review to determine appropriate speed limits. I do not imagine that they would reduce the speed limit unless there is an existing safety problem with this stretch of road. Visibility could be achieved at Battery Hill but speed limit would need to be reduced and vegetation would need to be trimmed back."

Utilities and Infrastructure

Gas Cables:

No high pressure gas mains impacting on site

SFRA Issues (+ Southern Water Advice where sought):

Sewerage Flooding Incident (Waites Lane); Flood Surface Water Less, Intermediate & More 2009 (to south). Southern Water site specific advice (11/02/10) "No capacity in local sewer. Sewers crossing site " SW general advice "Where existing capacity is not currently available, development will need to be phased with the provision of the necessary infrastructure. Where infrastructure crosses the site, development design should avoid building over existing infrastructure."

Contamination Issues:

Possible as a result of agricultural uses. Environmental Health (March 2010)
Historic - Telephone exchange to North West

Other Factors / Constraints

Availability / Ownership Constraints:

No

Awaiting Relocation of Current Use:

No

Level of Developer Interest:

High - Identified via external consultation

Recommendations for How Constraints Could Be Overcome:

Access is main obstacle. ESCC Highways would prefer an access via Waites Lane.

PHOTO TO BE ADDED

Viability Assessment

e.g; cost factors, market factors based on HMP site archetypes

Archetype 1/2 - Edge of settlement greenfield site
Discussion at Housing Market Partnership (22/02/2010) suggests this type of site is likely to be viable.

Development Opportunities

Total Residential Units

Submitter "30"

Affordable Units

Submitter "12"

Indicative Density (units per ha)

Submitter "20dph"

Availability/Timescale

Available Now?

No - policy constrained at present as outside development boundary.

How long to fully develop the site?

Each stage would be completed within 18 months, once planning permission had been obtained

Available within 5 Years?

Yes, reasonable prospect of development.

Timescale: Before 2011

Timescale: 2012-2016:

10 dwellings

Timescale: 2017-2021:

10 dwellings

Timescale: 2022-2026:

10 dwellings

Timescale: After 2026:

Conclusions

Yes, suitable although proposed access to Battery Hill Fairlight Road is problematic (see ESCC highways comments for more details). However, given the likely scale of development and the number of options avaialble to west, there is a reasonable prospect of access being achieved from that direction. No capacity in local sewer so development will need to be phased with the provision of the necessary infrastructure.

FL1

Land at Corner Farm, Flimwell

Site Details

Location

Settlement:

Rural: Flimwell

Address:

Land at Corner Farm, Flimwell

Parish:

Ticehurst

Ward:

Ticehurst and Etchingham

South Coast Sub Region:

No

Brownfield or Greenfield?

G

Size (Ha)

0.68

Current Land Use

Former farm buildings and office, plus open land levelled for use as a nursery.

Wholly within development boundary

☒

Partially within development boundary

☐

Abut development boundary

☐

Outside development boundary

☐

Policy Context and Identified Needs

Local Plan allocation site (at least 12 dwellings). Core Strategy Consultation on Strategy Directions 35-50 dwellings including at least 25 from unimplemented planning applications). Rural Settlements Study suggests the Ticehurst / Flimwell area does need some employment. High need for affordable housing identified and Housing needs Survey produced by Ticehurst Parish Council. RDC 'Open Space, Sport & Recreation Study': new allotment medium priority.

Planning History

●Local Plan Allocation - Policy VL4.

Environmental Factors

AONB

ESCC Landscape Assessment Capacity to Accept Change - Housing:

Moderate

On-Site Appraisal

Summary of Constraints identified from On-Site Appraisals

Addressed at local plan allocation stage

Layout/design parameters

In line with Local Plan allocation.

Potential Mitigation Measures:

In line with Local Plan allocation.

Highways and Accessibility Issues

Access to nearest

Distance from

Convenience Food Shop

est. 3.2km (Ticehurst)

Primary School

est. 2.5km (Ticehurst & Flimwell CE Primary School)

Bus Route:

on road frontage (A21)

Railway Station

est. 7.5km (Etchingham)

Main Doctors Surgery

est. 3.2km (Ticehurst)

On-Site Access Issues

From High street to North

Utilities and Infrastructure

Gas Cables:

No high pressure gas mains impacting on site

SFRA Issues (+ Southern Water Advice where sought):

None

Contamination Issues:

TBC

Other Factors / Constraints

Availability / Ownership Constraints:

None known. (source: LAA NI154 Report).

Awaiting Relocation of Current Use:

No

Level of Developer Interest:

High

Recommendations for How Constraints Could Be Overcome:

N/a

PHOTO TO BE ADDED

Viability Assessment

e.g; cost factors, market factors based on HMP site archetypes

Archetype 1 - Small Edge of settlement greenfield site Discussion at Housing Market Partnership (22/02/2010) suggests this type of site is likely to be viable.

Development Opportunities

Total Residential Units

14 (source: LAA N1154 Report)

Affordable Units

40%

Indicative Density (units per ha)

30

Availability/Timescale

Available Now?

Yes

How long to fully develop the site?

14 within 5 years (source LAA NI154 Report).

Available within 5 Years?

14 (source: LAA NI154 Report).

Timescale: Before 2011

Timescale: 2012-2016:

14 expected - 2011/12 (source 2009 AMR)

Timescale: 2017-2021:

Timescale: 2022-2026:

Timescale: After 2026:

Conclusions

Yes, in line with existing allocation

FL2

Land at Old Wardsdown, Flimwell

Site Details

Location

Settlement:

Rural: Flimwell

Address:

Land at Old Wardsdown, Flimwell

Parish:

Ticehurst

Ward:

Ticehurst and Etchingham

South Coast Sub Region:

No

Brownfield or Greenfield?

G

Size (Ha)

0.33

Current Land Use

Grassland and Parking

Wholly within development boundary

☒

Partially within development boundary

☐

Abut development boundary

☐

Outside development boundary

☐

Policy Context and Identified Needs

Local Plan allocation site (at least 12 dwellings).
Core Strategy Consultation on Strategy Directions 35-50 dwellings including at least 25 from unimplemented planning applications). Rural Settlements Study suggests the Ticehurst / Flimwell area does need some employment. High need for affordable housing identified and Housing needs Survey produced by Ticehurst Parish Council. RDC 'Open Space, Sport & Recreation Study': new allotment medium priority.

Planning History

- Local Plan Allocation - Policy VL5.
- Dismissed appeal on outline RR/2007/1092/P - 11 dwellings with new vehicular access (issues - boundaries of application site & density of development). ●Note: The application plans proposed the 11 dwellings on Site FL2 with Amenity Land on Site FL11 to the North.

Environmental Factors

AONB

ESCC Landscape Assessment Capacity to Accept Change - Housing:

Moderate

On-Site Appraisal

Summary of Constraints identified from On-Site Appraisals

Addressed at Local Plan allocation stage.

Layout/design parameters

in line with allocation

Potential Mitigation Measures:

In line with allocation

Highways and Accessibility Issues

Access to nearest	Distance from
Convenience Food Shop	est. 2.3km (Ticehurst)
Primary School	est 1.5km (Ticehurst & Flimwell CE Primary School)
Bus Route:	est. 80m
Railway Station	est 8.1km (Etchingham)
Main Doctors Surgery	est 2.3 km (Ticehurst)

On-Site Access Issues

No, straightforward access from Old Wardsdown

Utilities and Infrastructure

Gas Cables:

No high pressure gas mains impacting on site

SFRA Issues (+ Southern Water Advice where sought):

None

Contamination Issues:

Environmental Health (March 2010) - Sub-station to south

Other Factors / Constraints

Availability / Ownership Constraints:

No

Awaiting Relocation of Current Use:

No

Level of Developer Interest:

High - recent planning history

Recommendations for How Constraints Could Be Overcome:

N/a

PHOTO TO BE ADDED

Viability Assessment

e.g; cost factors, market factors based on HMP site archetypes

Archetype 1 - Small Edge of settlement greenfield site
Discussion at Housing Market Partnership (22/02/2010) suggests this type of site is likely to be viable.

Development Opportunities

Total Residential Units

10 (source: LAA N1154 Report)

Affordable Units

40%

Indicative Density (units per ha)

33

Availability/Timescale

Available Now?

Maybe - Not controlled by developer.

How long to fully develop the site?

10 within 5 years (source 2009 AMR)

Available within 5 Years?

Yes

Timescale: Before 2011

Timescale: 2012-2016:

10 expected 2011/12 (source 2009 AMR)

Timescale: 2017-2021:

Timescale: 2022-2026:

Timescale: After 2026:

Conclusions

Yes, in line with existing allocation

HG10

Land r/o Meadow View Cottages, Foundry Close, Hurst Green

Site Details

Location

Settlement:

Rural: Hurst Green

Address:

Land r/o Meadow View Cottages, Foundry Close, Hurst Green

Parish:

Hurst Green

Ward:

Salehurst & Robertsbridge

South Coast Sub Region:

No

Brownfield or Greenfield?

G

Size (Ha)

0.45

Current Land Use

Semi rural fringe

Wholly within development boundary

☐

Partially within development boundary

☐

Abut development boundary

☒

Outside development boundary

☐

Policy Context and Identified Needs

Local Plan: No allocations.
Core Strategy Consultation on Strategy Directions:0-40 dwellings in village by 2026
RSS: Village has high levels of housing need, average demand from housing register. Some need for local employment uses; new facility for older children and teenagers as a medium priority; new allotment - high priority.

Planning History

Inspector's Conclusion - Omission Site no.1573 (2006 Local Plan Inquiry):
"The site is not needed for general housing. Its location outside the development boundary but close to the centre of the village could make it suitable to address the local need for affordable housing as an exception site under Policy HG2 subject to an assessment of landscape interest."

Environmental Factors

AONB

ESCC Landscape Assessment Capacity to Accept Change - Housing:

Moderate

On-Site Appraisal

Summary of Constraints identified from On-Site Appraisals

Need to be mindful of potential A21 improvements. Strengthen and consolidate north east and southern boundary

Layout/design parameters

Site would start indepth development on east side of settlement. Access point for development of HG7

Potential Mitigation Measures:

Strengthen tree screen to east of site. Exception site only would remove implications for sites to south

Highways and Accessibility Issues

Access to nearest

Distance from

Convenience Food Shop

est. 2.8km (Etchingham)

Primary School

est. 700m (Hurst Green)

Bus Route:

on road frontage (A21)

Railway Station

est. 2.7km (Etchingham)

Main Doctors Surgery

est. 4.3km (Oldwood Surgery, Robertsbridge)

On-Site Access Issues

Potential access from Foundry Close. ESCC Highways advise (jan 2010) "Access via Foundry Lane considered to be acceptable in terms of visibility and width and radii. Noted that on street parking is prevalent which effectively reduces width and restrict two way flow of traffic. Any proposal should include measures to restrict parking on Foundry Close in order to prevent waiting on the London Road and allow the free flow of traffic to and from the site."
Highways Agency advise verbally (26/02/10) HG10 access is preferable to southern access to HG7 and HG9. HG10 access probably suitable to accommodate 50 new dwellings. PICARDY analysis may be required for right hand turning issue.

Utilities and Infrastructure

Gas Cables:

No high pressure gas mains impacting on site

SFRA Issues (+ Southern Water Advice where sought):

None

Contamination Issues:

Environmental Health (March 2010)
Historic - Ex gas works to the south (what exactly is this?)

Current - Gas valve compound

Other Factors / Constraints

Availability / Ownership Constraints:

No

Awaiting Relocation of Current Use:

No

Level of Developer Interest:

High

Recommendations for How Constraints Could Be Overcome:

PHOTO TO BE ADDED

Viability Assessment

e.g; cost factors, market factors based on HMP site archetypes

Archetype 1 - Small Edge of settlement greenfield site
Discussion at Housing Market Partnership (22/02/2010) suggests this type of site is likely to be viable.

Development Opportunities

Total Residential Units

13.5 at 30ph. Realistically up to 40 dwellings at sites HG7 and HG10 would represent a sustainable level of growth for Hurst Green.

Affordable Units

40%

Indicative Density (units per ha)

30

Availability/Timescale

Available Now?

No - Constrained by policy as outside the development boundary

How long to fully develop the site?

Submitter "1 year"

Available within 5 Years?

Yes

Timescale: Before 2011

Timescale: 2012-2016:

Submitter "Yes"

Timescale: 2017-2021:

Timescale: 2022-2026:

Timescale: After 2026:

Conclusions

Yes. Potential for residential and/or employment.

Sites Appendix i: Suitable and Developable Sites (Green)

HG7

Land East of the Old Bakery

Site Details

Location

Settlement:

Rural: Hurst Green

Address:

Foundry Close

Parish:

Hurst Green

Ward:

Salehurst & Robertsbridge

South Coast Sub Region:

No

Brownfield or Greenfield?

G

Size (Ha)

1.98

Current Land Use

Green field scrub

Wholly within development boundary

☐

Partially within development boundary

☐

Abut development boundary

☒

Outside development boundary

☐

Policy Context and Identified Needs

Local Plan: No allocations.
Core Strategy Consultation on Strategy Directions:0-40 dwellings in village by 2026
RSS: Village has high levels of housing need, average demand from housing register. Some need for local employment uses; new facility for older children and teenagers as a medium priority; new allotment - high priority.

Planning History

●Considered during Local Plan process but withdrawn July 2004 (omission site no. 3654).

Environmental Factors

AONB

ESCC Landscape Assessment Capacity to Accept Change - Housing:

Moderate

On-Site Appraisal

Summary of Constraints identified from On-Site Appraisals

Landscape impact is reduced due to line of trees protecting views from east. Highways Agency scheme for proposed by-pass is further to east.□The desirability of village development straddling the current A21 is a consideration. Southern part of site as later phasing, dependant on bypass.

Layout/design parameters

Mindful of proposed A21 Hurst Green bypass. Will be difficult to let part of site within development boundary. Land reads as one area.

Potential Mitigation Measures:

Strengthen landscape buffer on eastern boundary, build in informal space to southern edge to compliment cricket field.

Highways and Accessibility Issues

Access to nearest

Distance from

Convenience Food Shop

est. 2.6km (Etchingham)

Primary School

est. 730m (Hurst Green CE Primary School)

Bus Route:

est. 45m (access via Foundry Close)

Railway Station

est. 2.5km (Etchingham)

Main Doctors Surgery

est. 4km (Oldwood Surgery, Robertsbridge)

On-Site Access Issues

Possible access from Foundry Close which feeds into HG10. Narrow track between 2 listed buidlings but would not meet highway requirements. Possible 3rd party access. ESCC advise "Access between 48 and 50 London Road is considered to be too close to the T-junc with Station Road and traffic signals. Option available to join site with HG10 and access from Foundry Close."
Highways Agency advise verbally (26/02/10) "The south access to HG7 is of concern as it is adjacent to a busy junction. North access via HG10 preferred"

Utilities and Infrastructure

Gas Cables:

No high pressure gas mains impacting on site

SFRA Issues (+ Southern Water Advice where sought):

None

Contamination Issues:

Pasture, so unlikely

Other Factors / Constraints

Availability / Ownership Constraints:

Owners written to (15.2.10) to ascertain interest in development.

Awaiting Relocation of Current Use:

Level of Developer Interest:

Medium - Local plan omission site

Recommendations for How Constraints Could Be Overcome:

Achieve safe and viable access. Planting at boundaries to mitigate landscape impact.

PHOTO TO BE ADDED

Viability Assessment

e.g; cost factors, market factors based on HMP site archetypes

Archetype 1/2 - Edge of settlement greenfield site
Discussion at Housing Market Partnership (22/02/2010) suggests this type of site is likely to be viable.

Development Opportunities

Total Residential Units

Would be 59 at 30ph.Realistically up to 40 dwellings at sites HG7 and HG10 would represent a sustainable level of growth for Hurst Green.

Affordable Units

40%

Indicative Density (units per ha)

30

Availability/Timescale

Available Now?

No - Policy constraints, outside current development boundary.

How long to fully develop the site?

Available within 5 Years?

Yes - provided HG10 developed in order to secure access.

Timescale: Before 2011

Timescale: 2012-2016:

Timescale: 2017-2021:

Timescale: 2022-2026:

Timescale: After 2026:

Conclusions

Yes - previously considered at Local Plan stage but ruled out due to uncertainty of A21 improvements. Location at junction of A21/A265 and proximity to Etchingham Station supports case for further investigation for residential, possibly with employment and/or associated openspace. Following ESCC and Highways Agency comments can only be developed alongside HG10.

NE1

Land at Darvel Down, Netherfield

Site Details

Location

Settlement:

Rural: Netherfield

Address:

Land at Darvel Down, Netherfield

Parish:

Battle

Ward:

Darwell

South Coast Sub Region:

No

Brownfield or Greenfield?

G

Size (Ha)

1.03

Current Land Use

None - This is an un-used area of land surrounded by residential development on three sides

Wholly within development boundary

☐

Partially within development boundary

☐

Abut development boundary

☒

Outside development boundary

☐

Policy Context and Identified Needs

RSS coments that Netherfield has reasonable range of services for its population. Core Strategy proposes housing allocation of up to 15 dwellings to 2026. Darvel Down Residents Association and Battle Town Council have both suggested a higher figure would be appropriate during consultation. ESCC Notified mineral site to west.

Planning History

●Inspector's Conclusion - Omission Site no.1281 (2006 Local Plan Inquiry):
".... The site is not prominent in itself and is reasonably contained by defensible landscaped boundaries. Nevertheless, if developed at a density in accordance with PPG3 guidance, it would lead to a major expansion of development in a remote rural settlement which provides a very limited range of facilities and has little in the way of public transport provision. This would run counter to the principles of sustainable development."

Environmental Factors

AONB

ESCC Landscape Assessment

Capacity to Accept Change - Housing:

Low

On-Site Appraisal

Summary of Constraints identified from On-Site Appraisals

Visual impact of developing western half of site. Drainage, Loss of Trees, shrubs.

Layout/design parameters

Some of trees at boundary may be worthy of further investigation for protection. Design needs to consider impact on properties to south.

Potential Mitigation Measures:

Planting belt at northern boundary (west side) could be thickened by taller trees to limit landscape impact.

Highways and Accessibility Issues

Access to nearest

Distance from

Convenience Food Shop

est. 315m

Primary School

est. 240m (Netherfield CE Primary School)

Bus Route:

est. 350m

Railway Station

est. 6.2km (Battle)

Main Doctors Surgery

est. 5km (Martins Oak Surgery, Battle)

On-Site Access Issues

Relatively straightforward access options from Darvel Down, although submitter states site would require third party access across land owned by Rother Homes. 3rd party access would also be required to access site from B2096 to south.
ESCC Highways advise "Access could be sought from Darvel Down or the B2096 although visibility splays of 2.4m x 120m would need to be provided from B2096 compared with 2.4m x 45m off Darvel Down. Access location should be along the NE1 / NE5 boundary to the south or west of the water tower to the north. Site should be linked in with NE5 if possible so that potential of land can be realised and densities can be maximised."

Utilities and Infrastructure

Gas Cables:

No high pressure gas mains impacting on site. Submitter states "the existing estate is connected to all mains services and we are not aware of any capacity issues"

SFRA Issues (+ Southern Water Advice where sought):

None

Contamination Issues:

Environmental Health (March 2010)
"Garage to south of site"

Other Factors / Constraints

Availability / Ownership Constraints:

No

Awaiting Relocation of Current Use:

No

Level of Developer Interest:

High - Identified via external consultation

Recommendations for How Constraints Could Be Overcome:

Access needs to be confirmed.

PHOTO TO BE ADDED

Viability Assessment

e.g; cost factors, market factors based on HMP site archetypes

Archetype 1 - Small Edge of settlement greenfield site
Discussion at Housing Market Partnership (22/02/2010) suggests this type of site is likely to be viable.

Development Opportunities

Total Residential Units

Submitter (no 462): "20"
Planning Officer: If whole site were to be developed, could potentially

Affordable Units

Submitter (No 462): "8"
Planning Officer: If whole site were to be developed, could potentially

Indicative Density (units per ha)

30 per hectare seems reasonable at this location.

Availability/Timescale

Available Now?

No - Policy constrained as outside development boundary

How long to fully develop the site?

1 year

Available within 5 Years?

Yes

Timescale: Before 2011

Yes

Timescale: 2012-2016:

Yes - It would become available for development as soon a
the site was included within the development boundaries

Timescale: 2017-2021:

Timescale: 2022-2026:

Timescale: After 2026:

Conclusions

Yes - Advantageous site in several respects, although landscape impacts need careful consideration and development should not be out of scale with size of existing village.

Sites Appendix i: Suitable and Developable Sites (Green)

NE5

Swallow Barn, Darwell Hill, Netherfield

Site Details

Location

Settlement:

Rural: Netherfield

Address:

Swallow Barn, Netherfield, Battle, TN33 9QH

Parish:

Battle

Ward:

Darwell

South Coast Sub Region:

No

Brownfield or Greenfield?

B

Size (Ha)

0.518

Current Land Use

Residential

Wholly within development boundary

☐

Partially within development boundary

☒

Abut development boundary

☐

Outside development boundary

☐

Policy Context and Identified Needs

RSS coments that Netherfield has reasonable range of services for its population. Core Strategy proposes housing allocation of up to 15 dwellings to 2026. Darvel Down Residents Association and Battle Town Council have both suggested a higher figure would be appropriate during consultation.

Planning History

Inspector's Conclusion - Omission Site no.1281 (2006 Local Plan Inquiry):
".... The site is not prominent in itself and is reasonably contained by defensible landscaped boundaries. Nevertheless, if developed at a density in accordance with PPG3 guidance, it would lead to a major expansion of development in a remote rural settlement which provides a very limited range of facilities and has little in the way of public transport provision. This would run counter to the principles of sustainable development."

Environmental Factors

AONB.

ESCC Landscape Assessment

Capacity to Accept Change - Housing:

Low

On-Site Appraisal

Summary of Constraints identified from On-Site Appraisals

Neighbouring amenities. Landscape impact from south.

Layout/design parameters

Dependent on whether neighbouring, adjacent sites included in comprehensive development and on access point.

Potential Mitigation Measures:

Planting at boundaries.

Highways and Accessibility Issues

Access to nearest

Distance from

Convenience Food Shop

est. 130m

Primary School

est. 220m (Netherfield CE Primary School)

Bus Route:

on road frontage

Railway Station

est. 6.1km (Battle)

Main Doctors Surgery

est. 5km (Martins Oak Surgery, Battle)

On-Site Access Issues

Site abuts B2096 - 40mph road. Access from north maybe problematic and require access across 3rd party land.
ESCC Highways advise "Access should be sought from Darvel Down due to the close proximity of the B2096 / Netherfield Rd junction . Access location could be eithereast of the playground or through the existing water tower site. Site should be linked in with NE1 if possible so that potential of land can be realised and densities canbe maximised."

Utilities and Infrastructure

Gas Cables:

No high pressure gas mains impacting on site

SFRA Issues (+ Southern Water Advice where sought):

None

Contamination Issues:

No apparent issues.

Other Factors / Constraints

Availability / Ownership Constraints:
British Gypsum covenant requiring consent to develop

Awaiting Relocation of Current Use:
No.

Level of Developer Interest:
High - Identified via external consultation

Recommendations for How Constraints Could Be Overcome:

PHOTO TO BE ADDED

Viability Assessment

e.g; cost factors, market factors based on HMP site archetypes

Archetype 7 - Redevelopment of Existing Properties in Large Grounds
Discussion at Housing Market Partnership (22/02/2010) suggests this type of site is likely to be viable

Development Opportunities

Total Residential Units

Depends whether existing dweling remains. Probably less then 10 given trees worthy of retention. Realistically up to 40 dwellings at sites NE1

Affordable Units

In line with standard

Indicative Density (units per ha)

At least 30dph seems reasonable at this locality

Availability/Timescale

Available Now?

No - Policy constrained as outside development boundary.

How long to fully develop the site?

Available within 5 Years?

Yes - only if NE1 is also developed as access required through NE1.

Timescale: Before 2011

Timescale: 2012-2016:

Timescale: 2017-2021:

Timescale: 2022-2026:

Timescale: After 2026:

Conclusions

Yes, although constraints such as landscape and access exist.

Sites Appendix i: Suitable and Developable Sites (Green)

PS21 Land at Pippins, Main Street, Peasmarsh

Site Details

Location

Settlement:

Rural: Peasmarsh

Address:

Land at Pippins, Main Street, Peasmarsh

Parish:

Peasmarsh

Ward:

Rother Levels

South Coast Sub Region:

No

Brownfield or Greenfield?

G

Size (Ha)

1.16

Current Land Use

Paddock/equestrian

Wholly within development boundary

☐

Partially within development boundary

☒

Abut development boundary

☐

Outside development boundary

☐

Policy Context and Identified Needs

Strategy Directions - 10-40 additional dwellings
RSS - High housing need and high demand from Register (and existing high social housig stock).
Limited need for additonal local job oportunities.
New play area required and provision of cycleways
P.C. comment - Little choice for those who want to downsize.

Planning History

Relevant history:
●RR/2008/6/P approved in Feb 2008 for change of use of the land for keeping of horses and erection of stables.

Environmental Factors

AONB.

ESCC Landscape Assessment Capacity to Accept Change - Housing:

Moderate

On-Site Appraisal

Summary of Constraints identified from On-Site Appraisals

Departure from settlement pattern of this part of Peasmarsh. Its acceptance for development will open up large area south west of the village which has similar characteristics. Access issue.

Layout/design parameters

This site needs to be looked at in association with PS9, PS7 and PS10 as these sites have similar constraints and opportunities. Landlocked.

Potential Mitigation Measures:

Co-ordinated approach to these sites, rationalise any access to prevent proliferation of a number of points on A268. Strengthen field boundaries.

Highways and Accessibility Issues

Access to nearest

Distance from

Convenience Food Shop

est. 410m (Jempsons)

Primary School

est. 810m (Peasmarsh CE Primary School)

Bus Route:

on road frontage (assuming access via Pippins)

Railway Station

est. 7.1km (Rye)

Main Doctors Surgery

est. 4.9km (Rye Medical Centre, Rye Foreign)

On-Site Access Issues

Submitter states "The land has an access off Main Street via a right of way as shown on the submitted plan. It is an unmade road which is unlikely to be suitable to serve more development because of its restricted width particularly at the junction with Main Street. It is proposed that Pippins is demolished to allow access to the site to a design to accord with Manual for Streets. Additional third party land would be required to enlarge the narrow strip of land connecting Pippins to its land to the south to provide adequate width for an estate road. Alternatively, depending on other submissions, other properties fronting Main Street might be available for access to the land or access from adjoining land put forward for consideration in the Site Allocations DPD."
ESCC Highways advise (19/02/2010) "If suitable access can be gained through 'Pippins' then sites PS9 and PS21 can be realised. Access width of 5m would be required and visibility could be achieved."

Utilities and Infrastructure

Gas Cables:

No high pressure gas mains impacting on site

SFRA Issues (+ Southern Water Advice where sought):

No issues on site, but sewerage flooding incident to south-east. Therefore site sent to Southern Water for consultation. SW advise (03/10) "Analysis suggests foul water capacity for the site. No plant crossing the site."

Contamination Issues:

Environmental Health (March 2010)
Confirmed "No issues"

Other Factors / Constraints

Availability / Ownership Constraints:
No, although site is dependent on access point in neighbouring site PS21.

Awaiting Relocation of Current Use:

No

Level of Developer Interest:

High -

Recommendations for How Constraints Could Be Overcome:

Comprehensive development would need to include site PS21.

PHOTO TO BE ADDED

Viability Assessment e.g; cost factors, market factors based on HMP site archetypes

Archetype 1 - Small Edge of settlement greenfield site
Discussion at Housing Market Partnership (22/02/2010) suggests this type of site is likely to be viable

Development Opportunities

Total Residential Units

34

Affordable Units

13 (40%)

Indicative Density (units per ha)

30ph

Availability/Timescale

Available Now?

No. Policy constraints as beyond development boundary.

How long to fully develop the site?

Submitter "Difficult to estimate in the absence of a known developer"

Available within 5 Years?

Yes

Timescale: Before 2011

Submitter "the site is available for development now"

Timescale: 2012-2016:

Timescale: 2017-2021:

Timescale: 2022-2026:

Timescale: After 2026:

Conclusions

Yes, preferred site in Peasmarsh. Possible access issue to clarify with Highways.

RB13

Land west of Johns Cross Road

Site Details

Location

Settlement:

Rural: Robertsbridge

Address:

Johns Cross Road
r/o Heathfield Gardens

Parish:

Salehurst and Robertsbridge

Ward:

Salehurst

South Coast Sub Region:

No

Brownfield or Greenfield?

g

Size (Ha)

1.65

Current Land Use

Greenfield

Wholly within development boundary

☐

Partially within development boundary

☐

Abut development boundary

☒

Outside development boundary

☐

Policy Context and Identified Needs

Core Strategy recommends 55-100 houses and need for employment. RSS indicates relatively high need for affordable housing and AiRS study identified 36 households in need. The Parish Council would like to see the inclusion of a sheltered/assisted housing scheme. PPG 17 study identified needs for play areas and amenity open space in west Robertsbridge and a facility for older children/teenagers in Robertsbridge. LAP identified aspiration for all year round footpath/cyclepath/bridleway.

Planning History

●Historic refusals for residential development, the most recent being:
●Refused outline A/72/1060 (reasons - outside development area, unwarranted sprawl of development outside reasonable limits of Robertsbridge, land should remain as agricultural, other vacant land in Robertsbridge should be considered if residential development needed).

Environmental Factors

AONB

ESCC Landscape Assessment Capacity to Accept Change - Housing:

Moderate

On-Site Appraisal

Summary of Constraints identified from On-Site Appraisals

Minor landscape issues, loss of trees.

Layout/design parameters

TBC - dependent on scale, need for play area, etc. Site is effectively two plots divided east/west.

Potential Mitigation Measures:

Planting at boundaries. Site boundaries would require strengthening on all sides.

Highways and Accessibility Issues

Access to nearest

Distance from

Convenience Food Shop

est. 560m

Primary School

est. 435m (Salehurst CE Primary School)

Bus Route:

on road frontage (assuming access via John's Cross Road)

Railway Station

est. 940m (Robertsbridge)

Main Doctors Surgery

est. 740m (Oldwood Surgery)

On-Site Access Issues

Via Johns Cross Road would be most suitable where an existing curb has been lowered for the entrance however minor highway works may be required in order to accommodate a larger entrance.
ESCC Written advice (19/02/10) "Access to be sought from either Heathfield Gardens or Johns Cross Road. Visibility splays of 2.4m x 45m to be provided for the latter which would require access from north of the site frontage. Possible gateway feature / traffic calming into village to be provided as a part of any development."

Utilities and Infrastructure

Gas Cables:

No high pressure gas mains impacting on site

SFRA Issues (+ Southern Water Advice where sought):

None

Contamination Issues:

Environmental Health (March 2010)
Historic - Grove Farm Telephone Exchange

Other Factors / Constraints

Availability / Ownership Constraints:

Interests of owner TBC

Awaiting Relocation of Current Use:

No

Level of Developer Interest:

Low - No recent history of development proposals

Recommendations for How Constraints Could Be Overcome:

Access issues difficult to overcome.

PHOTO TO BE ADDED

Viability Assessment

e.g; cost factors, market factors based on HMP site archetypes

Archetype 1 - Small Edge of settlement greenfield site
Discussion at Housing Market Partnership (22/02/2010) suggests this type of site is likely to be viable

Development Opportunities

Total Residential Units

Planning officer -Perhaps 20 on dvelopable east side. West side not yet developable.

Affordable Units

In line with standards

Indicative Density (units per ha)

TBC

Availability/Timescale

Available Now?

No. Requires change in policy as site outside development boundary. Owners commitment TBC.

How long to fully develop the site?

Available within 5 Years?

East side: Yes, owners confirmed interest in developing.
West side: Maybe - (dependent on owners)

Timescale: Before 2011

Timescale: 2012-2016:

Planning officer "Likely if adopted as allocation"

Timescale: 2017-2021:

Timescale: 2022-2026:

Timescale: After 2026:

Conclusions

Yes, site with development potential. Some access issues may need to be resolved. East side owners wish to develop. Interests of owner on west side TBC.

RB2

Land adjacent to Grove Farm, Robertsbridge

Site Details

Location

Settlement:

Rural: Robertsbridge

Address:

Land adj. To Grove Farm, Robertsbridge

Parish:

Salehurst and Robertsbridge

Ward:

Salehurst

South Coast Sub Region:

No

Brownfield or Greenfield?

B

Size (Ha)

1.13

Current Land Use

Farm and grassland

Wholly within development boundary

☐

Partially within development boundary

☒

Abut development boundary

☐

Outside development boundary

☐

Policy Context and Identified Needs

Core Strategy recommends 55-100 houses and need for employment. RSS indicates relatively high need for affordable housing and AiRS study identified 36 households in need. The Parish Council would like to see the inclusion of a sheltered/assisted housing scheme. PPG 17 study identified needs for play areas and amenity open space in west Robertsbridge and a facility for older children/teenagers in Robertsbridge. LAP identified aspiration for all year round footpath/cyclepath/bridleway.

Planning History

●Local Plan Reserve Allocation - Policy VL7.

Environmental Factors

ASA is main constraint. AONB. Listed Building. Adjoins Conservation Area.

ESCC Landscape Assessment Capacity to Accept Change - Housing:

Moderate

On-Site Appraisal

Summary of Constraints identified from On-Site Appraisals

Physical presence of ASA. Cost of decontaminating and remediation.

Layout/design parameters

May need to build around the mound.

Potential Mitigation Measures:

Protection of ASA - landscaping

Highways and Accessibility Issues

Access to nearest

Distance from

Convenience Food Shop

est. 270m

Primary School

est. 160m (Salehurst CE Primary School)

Bus Route:

on road frontage

Railway Station

est. 650m (Robertsbridge)

Main Doctors Surgery

est. 450m (Oldwood Surgery)

On-Site Access Issues

ESCC Written advice (19/02/10) "Access width and appropriate visibility splays can be achieved at this site. Preferred access towards north of site frontage and staggered from Blenheim Ct. Could provide access into other potential sites such as RB5 or RB7."

Utilities and Infrastructure

Gas Cables:

No high pressure gas mains impacting on site

SFRA Issues (+ Southern Water Advice where sought):

None

Contamination Issues:

Environmental Health (March 2010)
Historic - Auction Mart

Current - May have report on this site

Other Factors / Constraints

Availability / Ownership Constraints:

No

Awaiting Relocation of Current Use:

No

Level of Developer Interest:

High

Recommendations for How Constraints Could Be Overcome:

PHOTO TO BE ADDED

Viability Assessment

e.g; cost factors, market factors based on HMP site archetypes

Archetype 1 - Small Edge of settlement greenfield site
Discussion at Housing Market Partnership (22/02/2010) suggests this type of site is likely to be viable

Development Opportunities

Total Residential Units

35 (likely to be less because of ASA). Submitter proposes 70 dwellings across sites RB2, 3, 4, 5, 7 (phase 1= 30 and includes existing reserve

Affordable Units

40%

Indicative Density (units per ha)

30-35ha

Availability/Timescale

Available Now?

Policy constraint

How long to fully develop the site?

Submitter "1 year (depending on scale)"

Available within 5 Years?

Yes

Timescale: Before 2011

Submitter "Yes - phase 1 (at least 30 dwellings)"

Timescale: 2012-2016:

Submitter "Yes - phase 2 (around 40 dwellings)"

Timescale: 2017-2021:

Timescale: 2022-2026:

Timescale: After 2026:

Conclusions

Yes, although ASA survey required.

RB4

Land South East of Salehurst C E Primary School, Robertsbridge

Site Details

Location

Settlement:

Rural: Robertsbridge

Address:

A21

Parish:

Salehurst and Robertsbridge

Ward:

Salehurst

South Coast Sub Region:

No

Brownfield or Greenfield?

G

Size (Ha)

0.62

Current Land Use

private greenfield

Wholly within development boundary

☐

Partially within development boundary

☐

Abut development boundary

☐

Outside development boundary

☒

Policy Context and Identified Needs

Core Strategy recommends 55-100 houses and need for employment. RSS indicates relatively high need for affordable housing and AiRS study identified 36 households in need. The Parish Council would like to see the inclusion of a sheltered/assisted housing scheme. PPG 17 study identified needs for play areas and amenity open space in west Robertsbridge and a facility for older children/teenagers in Robertsbridge. LAP identified aspiration for all year round footpath/cyclepath/bridleway.

Planning History

Inspector's Conclusion - Omission Site no. 1003 (2006 Local Plan Inquiry):

"I recommend that the substantive Policy VL6 allocation be retained in the Local Plan but as a reserve site to ensure that local housing needs are met should sufficient development not come forward on previously-developed land such as the Northbridge Mill site. Robertsbridge has advantages over many other settlements in terms of the availability of services and public transport facilities. However it has experienced considerable development in recent years and THERE IS NO IDENTIFIED NEED FOR THE ENLARGEMENT OF THIS ALLOCATION"

Environmental Factors

AONB. Public Footpath.

ESCC Landscape Assessment

Capacity to Accept Change - Housing:

Moderate

On-Site Appraisal

Summary of Constraints identified from On-Site Appraisals

Access constraints may mean the site is only accessible via George Hill through site RB2, which would mean all sites between A21 and Robertsbridge would be better developed as part of single masterplan. Would require tree belt on A21 frontage.

Layout/design parameters

Respect character of area and enhance adjacent conservation area.

Potential Mitigation Measures:

Retain/enhance boundary planting.

Highways and Accessibility Issues

Access to nearest

Distance from

Convenience Food Shop

est. 395m (via site RB2)

Primary School

adjacent to west (Salehurst CE Primary School)

Bus Route:

est. 150m (via site RB2)

Railway Station

est. 760m (via site RB2) (Robertsbridge)

Main Doctors Surgery

est. 560m (via site RB2) (Oldwood Surgery)

On-Site Access Issues

Would require access via other sites RB5 and RB2. ESCC Highways confirm access from Fair Lane is not possible.

Utilities and Infrastructure

Gas Cables:

No high pressure gas mains impacting on site

SFRA Issues (+ Southern Water Advice where sought):

None

Contamination Issues:

Environmental Health (March 2010)
Historic - Grove Farm Telephone Exchange

Other Factors / Constraints

Availability / Ownership Constraints:

No

Awaiting Relocation of Current Use:

No

Level of Developer Interest:

High

Recommendations for How Constraints Could Be Overcome:

Access issue need to be addressed

PHOTO TO BE ADDED

Viability Assessment

e.g; cost factors, market factors based on HMP site archetypes

Archetype 1 - Small Edge of settlement greenfield site

Discussion at Housing Market Partnership (22/02/2010) suggests this type of site is likely to be viable.

Development Opportunities

Total Residential Units

estimate 18 (officer). Submitter proposes 70 dwellings across sites RB2, 3, 4, 5, 7 (phase 1= 30 and includes existing reserve site, phase 2 =40)

Affordable Units

40% (officer)

Indicative Density (units per ha)

30-50 (officer)

Availability/Timescale

Available Now?

No, unlikley to be deliverable in short term given access constraints.

How long to fully develop the site?

Available within 5 Years?

No, unlikley to be deliverable in short term given access constraints.

Timescale: Before 2011

Timescale: 2012-2016:

Timescale: 2017-2021:

Timescale: 2022-2026:

Timescale: After 2026:

Conclusions

Yes - as part of larger comprehensive development with RB2 & RB5

Sites Appendix i: Suitable and Developable Sites (Green)

RB5

Land South of Salehurst C E Primary School, Robertsbridge

Site Details

Location

Settlement:

Rural: Robertsbridge

Address:

A21

Parish:

Salehurst and Robertsbridge

Ward:

Salehurst

South Coast Sub Region:

No

Brownfield or Greenfield?

G

Size (Ha)

1.04

Current Land Use

private greenfield

Wholly within development boundary

☐

Partially within development boundary

☐

Abut development boundary

☒

Outside development boundary

☐

Policy Context and Identified Needs

Core Strategy recommends 55-100 houses and need for employment. RSS indicates relatively high need for affordable housing and AiRS study identified 36 households in need. The Parish Council would like to see the inclusion of a sheltered/assisted housing scheme. PPG 17 study identified needs for play areas and amenity open space in west Robertsbridge and a facility for older children/teenagers in Robertsbridge. LAP identified aspiration for all year round footpath/cyclepath/bridleway.

Planning History

●Local Plan Allocation - Policy VL7 (Proposed Tree Belt and Proposed Children's Play Area within this site).
●Inspector's Conclusion - Omission Site no. 1003 (2006 Local Plan Inquiry):
"I recommend that the substantive Policy VL6 allocation be retained in the Local Plan but as a reserve site to ensure that local housing needs are met should sufficient development not come forward on previously-developed land such as the Northbridge Mill site. Robertsbridge has advantages over many other settlements in terms of the availability of services and public transport facilities. However it has experienced considerable development in recent years and THERE IS NO IDENTIFIED NEED FOR THE ENLARGEMENT OF THIS ALLOCATION"

Environmental Factors

AONB. Abuts ASA.

ESCC Landscape Assessment Capacity to Accept Change - Housing:

Moderate

On-Site Appraisal

Summary of Constraints identified from On-Site Appraisals

Access constraints may mean the site is only accessible via George Hill through site RB2, which would mean all sites between A21 and Robertsbridge would be better developed as part of single masterplan. Would require tree belt on A21 frontage.

Layout/design parameters

Respect character of area and enhance setting of adjacent listed building and nearby conservation area.

Potential Mitigation Measures:

Retain/enhance boundary planting.

Highways and Accessibility Issues

Access to nearest

Distance from

Convenience Food Shop

est. 320m (assuming via RB2)

Primary School

est. 215m (via RB2)

Bus Route:

est. 70m (via RB2)

Railway Station

est. 710m (Robertsbridge) (via RB2)

Main Doctors Surgery

est. 510m (via RB2) (Oldwood Surgery, Robertsbridge)

On-Site Access Issues

ESCC advise (19/02/10) "Would require to be linked in with RB2 to be deliverable. If access is sought directly off A21 then Highways Agency would need to be consulted."

Utilities and Infrastructure

Gas Cables:

No high pressure gas mains impacting on site

SFRA Issues (+ Southern Water Advice where sought):

None

Contamination Issues:

Environmental Health (March 2010)
Historic - Grove Farm Telephone Exchange

Other Factors / Constraints

Availability / Ownership Constraints:

No

Awaiting Relocation of Current Use:

No

Level of Developer Interest:

High

Recommendations for How Constraints Could Be Overcome:

N/a

PHOTO TO BE ADDED

Viability Assessment

e.g; cost factors, market factors based on HMP site archetypes

Archetype 1 - Small Edge of settlement greenfield site
Discussion at Housing Market Partnership (22/02/2010) suggests this type of site is likely to be viable.

Development Opportunities

Total Residential Units

Estimate maximum of 15 to allow for incorporation of children's play area nd tree buffer. Submitter proposes 70 dwellings across sites RB2,

Affordable Units

40% (officer)

Indicative Density (units per ha)

TBC

Availability/Timescale

Available Now?

No

How long to fully develop the site?

Available within 5 Years?

Yes

Timescale: Before 2011

Timescale: 2012-2016:

Timescale: 2017-2021:

Timescale: 2022-2026:

Timescale: After 2026:

Conclusions

Yes as part of larger comprehensive development with surrounding sites. Local Plan Allocation for Children's Play Area and Tree Belt covers west part of site). Allocating any part of this site for housing in the LDF may require a new layout that retains the play area.

RB7

Land East of John's Cross Road, Robertsbridge

Site Details

Location

Settlement:

Rural: Robertsbridge

Address:

George Hill
Adjacent Telephone Exchange

Parish:

Salehurst and Robertsbridge

Ward:

Salehurst

South Coast Sub Region:

No

Brownfield or Greenfield?

G

Size (Ha)

1.8

Current Land Use

private greenfield

Wholly within development boundary

☐

Partially within development boundary

☐

Abut development boundary

☒

Outside development boundary

☐

Policy Context and Identified Needs

Core Strategy recommends 55-100 houses and need for employment. RSS indicates relatively high need for affordable housing and AiRS study identified 36 households in need. The Parish Council would like to see the inclusion of a sheltered/assisted housing scheme. PPG 17 study identified needs for play areas and amenity open space in west Robertsbridge and a facility for older children/teenagers in Robertsbridge. LAP identified aspiration for all year round footpath/cyclepath/bridleway.

Planning History

●Local Plan Allocation - Policy VL7 (Proposed Tree Belt within this site).

●Inspector's Conclusion - Omission Site no. 1003 (2006 Local Plan Inquiry):

"I recommend that the substantive Policy VL6 allocation be retained in the Local Plan but as a reserve site to ensure that local housing needs are met should sufficient development not come forward on previously-developed land such as the Northbridge Mill site. Robertsbridge has advantages over many other settlements in terms of the availability of services and public transport facilities. However it has experienced considerable development in recent years and THERE IS NO IDENTIFIED NEED FOR THE ENLARGEMENT OF THIS ALLOCATION"

Environmental Factors

AONB

ESCC Landscape Assessment

Capacity to Accept Change - Housing:

Moderate

On-Site Appraisal

Summary of Constraints identified from On-Site Appraisals

Access constraints may mean the site is only accessible via George Hill through site RB2, which would mean all sites between A21 and Robertsbridge would be better developed as part of single masterplan. Would require tree belt on A21 frontage.

Layout/design parameters

May need to relocate pylons. Respect privacy of existing adjacent dwellings.

Potential Mitigation Measures:

Retain and enhance boundary planting.

Highways and Accessibility Issues

Access to nearest

Distance from

Convenience Food Shop

est. 500m

Primary School

est. 365m

Bus Route:

on road frontage

Railway Station

est. 845m (Robertsbridge)

Main Doctors Surgery

est. 675m (Oldwood Surgery)

On-Site Access Issues

Direct access on to George Hill. ESCC Highways verbal comment (11/09) that this should be possible to achieve safe access from the west side, as long as it is not directly opposite Heathfield Gardens. ESCC Highways written comment (19/02/10) "Would require a linkage with RB2 to be considered deliverable. If access is sought off A21 then Highways Agency would need to be consulted."

Utilities and Infrastructure

Gas Cables:

No high pressure gas mains impacting on site

SFRA Issues (+ Southern Water Advice where sought):

None

Contamination Issues:

Environmental Health (March 2010)
Historic - Grove Farm - Telephone Exchange

Other Factors / Constraints

Availability / Ownership Constraints:

No

Awaiting Relocation of Current Use:

No

Level of Developer Interest:

High

Recommendations for How Constraints Could Be Overcome:

Planning policy may need revision, depending on access.

PHOTO TO BE ADDED

Viability Assessment

e.g; cost factors, market factors based on HMP site archetypes

Archetype 1 - Small Edge of settlement greenfield site
Discussion at Housing Market Partnership (22/02/2010) suggests this type of site is likely to be viable.

Development Opportunities

Total Residential Units

estimate 24 (officer) on north part. Submitter proposes 70 dwellings across sites RB2, 3, 4, 5, 7 (phase 1= 30 and includes existing reserve

Affordable Units

40% (officer)

Indicative Density (units per ha)

30-35 (submitter)

Availability/Timescale

Available Now?

No

How long to fully develop the site?

Available within 5 Years?

Yes - northern section only.

Timescale: Before 2011

Timescale: 2012-2016:

Timescale: 2017-2021:

Timescale: 2022-2026:

Timescale: After 2026:

Conclusions

Northern sections of the site have potential as part of wider development with RB2 and RB5. Sensitive landscape so development will need to be carefully planned. May be necessary to leave higher and more visually exposed sections of site to the south free of development.

RB8

Land to the rear of Culverwells, Station Road

Site Details

Location

Settlement:

Rural: Robertsbridge

Address:

Land to the rear of Culverwells, Station Road

Parish:

Salehurst and Robertsbridge

Ward:

Salehurst

South Coast Sub Region:

No

Brownfield or Greenfield?

G

Size (Ha)

1.52

Current Land Use

Factory, allotments to south and flood plains to north and east.

Wholly within development boundary

☐

Partially within development boundary

☒

Abut development boundary

☐

Outside development boundary

☐

Policy Context and Identified Needs

Core Strategy recommends 55-100 houses and need for employment. RSS indicates relatively high need for affordable housing and AiRS study identified 36 households in need. The Parish Council would like to see the inclusion of a sheltered/assisted housing scheme. PPG 17 study identified needs for play areas and amenity open space in west Robertsbridge and a facility for older children/teenagers in Robertsbridge. LAP identified aspiration for all year round footpath/cyclepath/bridleway.

Planning History

Local Plan Allocation - Policy VL8 for Housing and Business Use.

Environmental Factors

AONB. Eastern side in Flood Zones 2 & 3

ESCC Landscape Assessment

Capacity to Accept Change - Housing:

Low

On-Site Appraisal

Summary of Constraints identified from On-Site Appraisals

Access to Station Road only.

Layout/design parameters

Need to avoid the flood protection works. Access through the existing business site could be problematic.

Potential Mitigation Measures:

Enhancement of wildlife and planting on and adjacent the site.

Highways and Accessibility Issues

Access to nearest

Distance from

Convenience Food Shop

est. 290m

Primary School

est. 575m (Salehurst CE Primary School)

Bus Route:

est. 400m

Railway Station

est. 250m (Robertsbridge)

Main Doctors Surgery

est. 200m (Oldwood Surgery)

On-Site Access Issues

Via Culverwells access to Station Road.

Utilities and Infrastructure

Gas Cables:

No high pressure gas mains impacting on site

SFRA Issues (+ Southern Water Advice where sought):

Flood Surface Water Less & Intermediate 2009 (south-east).Southern Water site specific advice (11/02/10) "No capacity in local sewer. Sewers crossing site. " SW general advice "Where existing capacity is not currently available, development will need to be phased with the provision of the necessary infrastructure" and "Where infrastructure crosses the site, development design should avoid building over existing infrastructure".

Contamination Issues:

Environmental Health (March 2010)
Historic -Brickworks, gas works and allotments to the south, sewage filters to east

Current - Recent notification of vegetation die back - EA involved but no

Other Factors / Constraints

Availability / Ownership Constraints:

None known. (source: LAA NI154 Report).

Awaiting Relocation of Current Use:

No

Level of Developer Interest:

High, an application is expected to be submitted within the next 6 months.

Recommendations for How Constraints Could Be Overcome:

N/a

PHOTO TO BE ADDED

Viability Assessment

e.g; cost factors, market factors based on HMP site archetypes

Archetype 1 - Small Edge of settlement greenfield site
Discussion at Housing Market Partnership (22/02/2010) suggests this type of site is likely to be viable

Development Opportunities

Total Residential Units

16 (submitter) 14 minimum (allocation) 16 (source: LAA N1154 Report)

Affordable Units

40% (allocation)

Indicative Density (units per ha)

TBC

Availability/Timescale

Available Now?

Yes

How long to fully develop the site?

3 years. 16 within 5 years (source LAA NI154 Report).

Available within 5 Years?

16 (source: LAA NI154 Report).

Timescale: Before 2011

Timescale: 2012-2016:

16 expected 2012/13 (source 2009 AMR)

Timescale: 2017-2021:

Timescale: 2022-2026:

Timescale: After 2026:

Conclusions

The site is recognised in the Adopted Local Plan as being suitable for mixed use development which includes employment and some residential uses. There are constraints as parts of the site lie within the EA defined flood zone and it will be necessary to secure a safe access. No capacity in local sewer and sewers crossing site. Southern Water advise "Where existing capacity is not currently available, development will need to be phased with the provision of the necessary infrastructure" and "Where infrastructure crosses the site, development design should avoid building over existing infrastructure".

Sites Appendix i: Suitable and Developable Sites (Green)

RB9

Robertsbridge Mill, SCATS, Northbridge Street

Site Details

Location

Settlement:

Rural: Robertsbridge

Address:

Robertsbridge Mil Site, Northbridge Street, Robertsbridge

Parish:

Salehurst and Robertsbridge

Ward:

Salehurst

South Coast Sub Region:

No

Brownfield or Greenfield?

B

Size (Ha)

3.1

Current Land Use

Vacant business uses and woodland to North-West corner/side. Business premises formerly occupied by SCATS and more recently by Grampian Country Food Group Ltd.

Wholly within development boundary

☐

Partially within development boundary

☒

Abut development boundary

☐

Outside development boundary

☐

Policy Context and Identified Needs

Most in development boundary and identified for employment or a mixed employment/housing site. Core Strategy recommends 55-100 houses and need for employment. RSS indicates relatively high need for affordable housing and AiRS study identified 36 households in need. The Parish Council would like to see the inclusion of a sheltered/assisted housing scheme. PPG 17 study identified needs for play areas and amenity open space in west Robertsbridge and a facility for older children/teenagers in Robertsbridge. LAP identified aspiration for all year round footpath/cyclepath/bridleway.

Planning History

●Inspector's Conclusion - Omission Site no. 1924 (2006 Local Plan Inquiry): "This a suitable site for development but there has been inadequate investigation of its suitability for continued employment use or of the form which redevelopment might take. If continued employment use of the whole site shown not to be feasible, there should be a preference for mixed use including employment...."

●Outline RR/2007/2576/P - Dismissed Appeal in Aug 2008 for Class B1 business use buildings, up to 66 residential units, surgergy and café. ●RR/2007/2696/P - Dismissed Appeal in Aug 2008 for change of use & conversion of redundant buildings to form 13 residential units. (Appeal issues - loss of employment land, no overriding need for housing land, harmful to character/appearance of area).

Environmental Factors

AONB. Flood Zones 2 & 3 to S. Listed building.

ESCC Landscape Assessment Capacity to Accept Change - Housing:

Moderate

On-Site Appraisal

Summary of Constraints identified from On-Site Appraisals

Somewhat detached from rest of Robertsbridge village. Portion of site within flood zone.

Layout/design parameters

Access is an issue.

Potential Mitigation Measures:

Landscaping to boundaries.

Highways and Accessibility Issues

Access to nearest

Distance from

Convenience Food Shop

est. 440m

Primary School

est. 680m (Salehurst CE Primary School)

Bus Route:

on road frontage

Railway Station

est. 930m (Robertsbridge)

Main Doctors Surgery

est. 740m (Oldwood Surgery)

On-Site Access Issues

As existing but in flood zone adj protection walls/gates.

Utilities and Infrastructure

Gas Cables:

No high pressure gas mains impacting on site

SFRA Issues (+ Southern Water Advice where sought):

Highway Flooding Hotspot; Flood Surface Water More, Less & Intermediate 2009.

Contamination Issues:

Environmental Health (March 2010)
Historic - Corn Mill, Tank and Saw Pit + Electricity Sub-station

Current - Mill Report exists

Other Factors / Constraints

Availability / Ownership Constraints:

No - recent history of applications and appeals.

Awaiting Relocation of Current Use:

Yes, site within employment use.

Level of Developer Interest:

High

Recommendations for How Constraints Could Be Overcome:

Viable scheme containing sufficient employment floorspace so as to meet the satisfaction of the local planning authority.

PHOTO TO BE ADDED

Viability Assessment

e.g; cost factors, market factors based on HMP site archetypes

Archetype 6) Development on unused or underused land with legacy of industrial activity Discussion at Housing Market Partnership (22/02/2010) suggests the viability of this type of site may depend to a large extent of Section 106 contribution levels and that the local authority may need to be flexible in this regard. The type of site could be viable but there are likely to be complex issues that may act as a disincentive for developers. Probably not viable in the short-term, but possibly in the longer term.

Development Opportunities

Total Residential Units

estimate 13 within Hodsons Mill (based on RDC position at appeal)

Affordable Units

In line with standard

Indicative Density (units per ha)

N/a - mixed use site so difficult to ascertain.

Availability/Timescale

Available Now?

Yes, primarily for employment. Possibly a small number of dwellings (estimate 13) required as an enabler. Constraints

How long to fully develop the site?

Available within 5 Years?

Yes, primarily for employment. Possibly a small number of dwellings (estimate 13) required as an enabler.

Timescale: Before 2011

Timescale: 2012-2016:

Timescale: 2017-2021:

Timescale: 2022-2026:

Timescale: After 2026:

Conclusions

Yes suitable for employment led mixed use site. Extent of residential debated at appeal and most recent RDC position accepted principle of 13 units within Hodsons Mill and was not against a mixed development in principle. The site was also subject of RDC previous commissioned Donaldsons feasibility study together with subsequent sensitivity analysis. SFRA identified constraints may require further investigation.

RH1

Harbour Road, Land adjacent to Stonework Cottages

Site Details

Location

Settlement:

Rye Harbour

Address:

Harbour Road, Rye Harbour

Parish:

Icklesham

Ward:

Easter Rother

South Coast Sub Region:

Yes

Brownfield or Greenfield?

B

Size (Ha)

0.52

Current Land Use

Derelict Car Dump

Wholly within development boundary

☒

Partially within development boundary

☐

Abut development boundary

☐

Outside development boundary

☐

Policy Context and Identified Needs

Site is Policy RY8 of Local Plan2006 allocated for 16 dwellings 40% affordable. Policy Context for Rye and Rye Harbour: at least 22 new dwellings to be allocated, opportunities for cycle and footpaths 1650sqm retail floorspace, new library and cultural facility. urban potential for housing to be maximised and explored prior to any new greenfield allocation. Employment development within existing employment area or appropriate opportunities to enlarge employment area.

Planning History

●Local Plan Allocation - Policy RY8.

Environmental Factors

Flood Zones 2 & 3. ESCC Notified Mineral Site to south

ESCC Landscape Assessment Capacity to Accept Change - Housing:

Moderate

On-Site Appraisal

Summary of Constraints identified from On-Site Appraisals

Possible access issues. Food risk.

Layout/design parameters

must be built flood resilient and ensure safe access in event of flood

Potential Mitigation Measures:

Highways and Accessibility Issues

Access to nearest	Distance from
Convenience Food Shop	est. 280m
Primary School	est. 3.5km (Rye Community Primary School)
Bus Route:	on road frontage (assuming access to Gordon Place)
Railway Station	est. 3.2km (Rye)
Main Doctors Surgery	est. 3.2km (Ferry Road Health Centre, Rye)

On-Site Access Issues

not for employment use but maybe access issues for residential concerning flood risk and safe access along Rye Harbour Rd

Utilities and Infrastructure

Gas Cables:

Appears to be no gas in vicinity - source UtilityMaps. British Gas Transco consulted on 07/01/10.

Feb. 2010 Southern Gas Networks (Scotia) comment that :

SFRA Issues (+ Southern Water Advice where sought):

None

Contamination Issues:

Possible asbestos cement roofing, and oils from abandoned/dumped vehicles and neighbouring industry. EA advise "Historic waste disposal has occurred on this land. We are uncertain about the nature and extent of waste disposal in the area. Groundwater levels are shallow and particularly vulnerable from surface contamination. If this site is considered appropriate

Other Factors / Constraints

Availability / Ownership Constraints:

None known. (source: LAA NI154 Report).

Awaiting Relocation of Current Use:

Level of Developer Interest:

Recommendations for How Constraints Could Be Overcome:

PHOTO TO BE ADDED

Viability Assessment e.g; cost factors, market factors based on HMP site archetypes

Archetype 6) Development on unused or underused land with legacy of industrial activity Discussion at Housing Market Partnership (22/02/2010) suggests the viability of this type of site may depend to a large extent of Section 106 contribution levels and that the local authority may need to be flexible in this regard. The type of site could be viable but there are likely to be complex issues that may act as a disincentive for developers. Probably not viable in the short-term, but possibly in the longer term.

Development Opportunities

Total Residential Units	18 (source: LAA N1154 Report)
Affordable Units	40%
Indicative Density (units per ha)	36

Availability/Timescale

Available Now?	Yes.
How long to fully develop the site?	18 within 5 years (source LAA NI154 Report).
Available within 5 Years?	18 (source: LAA NI154 Report).
Timescale: Before 2011	
Timescale: 2012-2016:	18 expected 2012/13 (source 2009 AMR)
Timescale: 2017-2021:	
Timescale: 2022-2026:	
Timescale: After 2026:	

Conclusions

Yes. Developable subject to sequential and exception test. EA advise need to contact Natural England due to proximity to SPA

RY19

Land at Freda Gardham School

Site Details

Location

Settlement:

Rye

Address:

Land at Freda Gardham School,

Parish:

Rye

Ward:

Rye

South Coast Sub Region:

Yes

Brownfield or Greenfield?

B

Size (Ha)

3.26

Current Land Use

School

Wholly within development boundary

☐

Partially within development boundary

☒

Abut development boundary

☐

Outside development boundary

☐

Policy Context and Identified Needs

LDF Core Strategy Consultation on Strategy Directions indicates 22 new dwellings to be allocated, opportunities for cycle and footpaths 1650sqm retail floorspace, new library & cultural facility. Sites within development boundary prioritised.

site potential diminished for early phased development as site is not defended from flooding to the appropriate standard. Consider water compatible uses or phasing for later in the Plan period.

Planning History

●No relevant planning history.

Environmental Factors

Flood zone

ESCC Landscape Assessment Capacity to Accept Change - Housing:

Low - Moderate

On-Site Appraisal

Summary of Constraints identified from On-Site Appraisals

Serious flood risk issues at present until flood defences are in place

Layout/design parameters

flood risk issues to be resolved prior to any development - residential development will need to be flood resilient

Potential Mitigation Measures:

retain plenty of open space, leisure faciities and playing fields

Highways and Accessibility Issues

Access to nearest

Distance from

Convenience Food Shop

est. 400m (Rye Shopping Area)

Primary School

est. 1.1km (Rye Community Primary School)

Bus Route:

on road frontage

Railway Station

est. 1.7km (Rye)

Main Doctors Surgery

est. 1.5km (Rye Medical Centre)

On-Site Access Issues

ESCC Highways advise "Site has advantage of having former traffic movements associated with it, good quality vehicular access point is available. Close to bus stops, good quality footways. 15 units here is likely to be a reduction in traffic compared with a school."

Utilities and Infrastructure

Gas Cables:

No high pressure gas mains impacting on site

SFRA Issues (+ Southern Water Advice where sought):

SFRA indicates Flood Surface Water Less & Intermediate 2009. Southern Water advice on site (12/02/2010) "Plant crossing site. This is a redevelopment, so potentially there may be opportunities to remove surface water from the combined system" SW General advice "Where infrastructure crosses the site, development design should avoid building over existing infrastructure."

Contamination Issues:

Environmental Health (March 2010) Historic - Swimming Pool to South Pool unfilled with water 1997

Current - Swimming Pool to South

Other Factors / Constraints

Availability / Ownership Constraints:

No

Awaiting Relocation of Current Use:

New school being constructed and due to open September 2008

Level of Developer Interest:

High

Recommendations for How Constraints Could Be Overcome:

submitter states "Romney Marsh 10B have advised that opportunities exist to improve on site drainage.

PHOTO TO BE ADDED

Viability Assessment

e.g; cost factors, market factors based on HMP site archetypes

Archetype 8 - Development on School site Discussion at Housing Market Partnership (22/02/2010) suggests this type of site is likely to be viable.

Development Opportunities

Total Residential Units

22+

Affordable Units

40%

Indicative Density (units per ha)

30

Availability/Timescale

Available Now?

No

How long to fully develop the site?

1 year

Available within 5 Years?

Yes - top brownfield section has potential for development, possibly as part of a mixed use scheme.

Timescale: Before 2011

Yes

Timescale: 2012-2016:

Timescale: 2017-2021:

Timescale: 2022-2026:

Timescale: After 2026:

Conclusions

Yes, although only possible for later phasing. Northern brownfield section more suitable for development, possibly as part of a mixed use scheme. Community uses and residential would both be suiatble. Southern sections may have potential for other uses such as open space. Constraints include: Serious flood risk issues at present until flood defences are in place. Good quality agricultral land. Any development scheme will need to be mindful of the Southern Water advice received. Developable subject to sequential and exception test.

Sites Appendix i: Suitable and Developable Sites (Green)

RY3

Land at Rock Channel

Site Details

Location

Settlement:

Rye

Address:

Rock Channel, Rye

Parish:

Rye

Ward:

Rye

South Coast Sub Region:

Yes

Brownfield or Greenfield?

B

Size (Ha)

7.53

Current Land Use

Industrial and residential

Wholly within development boundary

☐

Partially within development boundary

☒

Abut development boundary

☐

Outside development boundary

☐

Policy Context and Identified Needs

Local Plan allocation for housing, open space and appropriate commercial uses. Potential for community facility. High density housing including 40% affordable. LDF Core Strategy Consultation on Strategy Directions indicates 22 new dwellings to be allocated, opportunities for cycle and footpaths 1650sqm retail floorspace, new library & cultural facility. Sites within development boundary prioritised.

Planning History

- Local Plan Allocation - Policy RY3. Draft Development Brief SPD (July 2007).
- Refused outline RR/2005/3318/P (Feb 2006) for residential development of land at River Café, Strand Coachworks - (reasons - tidal flood risk area, does not form part of a comprehensive scheme for development of land between South Undercliff & Rock Channel & South of Rock Channel as defined in Policy RY3 of Revised Deposit RDLP).

Environmental Factors

Flood Zone. Right of Way.

ESCC Landscape Assessment Capacity to Accept Change - Housing:

Low - Moderate

On-Site Appraisal

Summary of Constraints identified from On-Site Appraisals

Flooding. Landscape. Access.

Layout/design parameters

river frontage walkway, consideration to roofscape as prominent views from citadel vantage points - see draft SPD

Potential Mitigation Measures:

flood resilience, see draft SPD

Highways and Accessibility Issues

Access to nearest	Distance from
Convenience Food Shop	est. 600m (Rye Shopping Area)
Primary School	est. 1.4km (Rye Community Primary School)
Bus Route:	on road frontage (A259)
Railway Station	est. 800m (Rye) (assuming access via Shipyard Lane to A259)
Main Doctors Surgery	est. 900m (Ferry Road Health Centre)

On-Site Access Issues

yes - studies available as part of work on draft SPD

Utilities and Infrastructure

Gas Cables:

No high pressure gas mains impacting on site

SFRA Issues (+ Southern Water Advice where sought):

Flood Surface Water Less & Intermediate 2009. Southern Water site specific advice (11/02/10) "No capacity in local sewer. Sewers crossing site. " SW general advice "Where existing capacity is not currently available, development will need to be phased with the provision of the necessary infrastructure. Where infrastructure crosses the site, development design should avoid building over existing infrastructure"

Contamination Issues:

Likely to be asbestos and contamination from oils Environmental Health (March 2010) Historic - 2 x works. Rother Iron works. Coal and timber yard. Shipbuilding. Transport manufacturing and repair (opp. Bide Cottage) Coal storage. 2 x

Other Factors / Constraints

Availability / Ownership Constraints:

Awaiting Relocation of Current Use:

Level of Developer Interest:

Recommendations for How Constraints Could Be Overcome:

PHOTO TO BE ADDED

Viability Assessment

e.g: cost factors, market factors based on HMP site archetypes

Archetype 6) Development on unused or underused land with legacy of industrial activity Discussion at Housing Market Partnership (22/02/2010) suggests the viability of this type of site may depend to a large extent of Section 106 contribution levels and that the local authority may need to be flexible in this regard. The type of site could be viable but there are likely to be complex issues that may act as a disincentive for developers. Probably not viable in the short-term, but possibly in the longer term.

Development Opportunities

Total Residential Units	115 (source: LAA N1154 Report)
Affordable Units	50%
Indicative Density (units per ha)	40%

Availability/Timescale

Available Now?	yes. Draft SPD prepared in 2007 with revised housing numbers. Landowner involvement/ interest. Housing
How long to fully develop the site?	115 within 6 - 10 years (source LAA NI154 Report).
Available within 5 Years?	115 (source: LAA NI154 Report).
Timescale: Before 2011	
Timescale: 2012-2016:	
Timescale: 2017-2021:	
Timescale: 2022-2026:	
Timescale: After 2026:	

Conclusions

yes. Developable subject to sequential and exception test. No capacity in local sewer and sewers crossing site. Southern Water general advice on these matters as follows "Where existing capacity is not currently available, development will need to be phased with the provision of the necessary infrastructure. Where infrastructure crosses the site, development design should avoid building over existing infrastructure"

RY4

Former Thomas Peacocke School and adjacent land

Site Details

Location

Settlement:

Rye

Address:

Former Thomas Peacocke School and adjacent land

Parish:

Rye

Ward:

Rye

South Coast Sub Region:

Yes

Brownfield or Greenfield?

B

Size (Ha)

0.8

Current Land Use

Vacant school

Wholly within development boundary

☐

Partially within development boundary

☒

Abut development boundary

☐

Outside development boundary

☐

Policy Context and Identified Needs

Local Plan allocation for housing development of 32 dwellings with 40% affordable also requires new vehicle, pedestrian and cycle link and junction improvements

Planning History

Local Plan Allocation - Policy RY4.

Environmental Factors

Flood Zone.

ESCC Landscape Assessment Capacity to Accept Change - Housing:

Low - Moderate

On-Site Appraisal

Summary of Constraints identified from On-Site Appraisals

Traffic. Flooding.

Layout/design parameters

retain screening along boundaries

Potential Mitigation Measures:

Highways and Accessibility Issues

Access to nearest

Distance from

Convenience Food Shop

est. 80m (Rye Shopping Area)

Primary School

est. 1km (Rye Community Primary School)

Bus Route:

on road frontage (Ferry Road)

Railway Station

est. 210m (Rye)

Main Doctors Surgery

est. 140m (Ferry Rd. Health Centre)

On-Site Access Issues

would appear to be directly off the main road just before the level crossing - possible implications

Utilities and Infrastructure

Gas Cables:

No high pressure gas mains impacting on site

SFRA Issues (+ Southern Water Advice where sought):

Highway Flood Alleviation Scheme; Flood Surface Water Less & Intermediate 2009. Southern Water site specific advice (11/02/10) "May be scope to remove surface water from combined system - developer should investigate. Sewers crossing site" SW general advice "Where infrastructure crosses the site, development design should avoid building over existing infrastructure."

Contamination Issues:

Environmental Health (March 2010)
Historic - Timber yard to West
Allotment Gardens, Tanks to South East
Swimming Pool

Other Factors / Constraints

Availability / Ownership Constraints:

None known. (source: LAA NI154 Report).

Awaiting Relocation of Current Use:

Level of Developer Interest:

High - allocation but no history of applications since Local plan adoption. Understood that site sold to developer. 1st likely completion from 2011/12.

Recommendations for How Constraints Could Be Overcome:

PHOTO TO BE ADDED

Viability Assessment

e.g; cost factors, market factors based on HMP site archetypes

Archetype 8 - Development on School site
Discussion at Housing Market Partnership (22/02/2010) suggests this type of site is likely to be viable.

Development Opportunities

Total Residential Units

37 (source: LAA N1154 Report)

Affordable Units

40%

Indicative Density (units per ha)

46

Availability/Timescale

Available Now?

Yes. 1st likely completion from 2011/12.
Understood that site sold to developer. Considering

How long to fully develop the site?

37 within 5 years
(source LAA NI154 Report).

Available within 5 Years?

Yes, 37 (source: LAA NI154 Report).

Timescale: Before 2011

Timescale: 2012-2016:

18 expected 2011/12. 19 expected 2012/13
(source: 2009 AMP)

Timescale: 2017-2021:

Timescale: 2022-2026:

Timescale: After 2026:

Conclusions

Yes, although development will need to be food resilient and further liaison with Environment Agency necessary. Developable subject to sequential and exception test. Southern Water site specific advice (11/02/10) "May be scope to remove surface water from combined system - developer should investigate. Sewers crossing site" SW general advice "Where infrastructure crosses the site, development design should avoid building over existing infrastructure."

Sites Appendix i: Suitable and Developable Sites (Green)

SE5

Land adj to Street Farm, Brede Lane, Sedlescombe

Site Details

Location

Settlement:

Rural: Sedlescombe

Address:

Land adj to Street Farm, Brede Lane, Sedlescombe

Parish:

Sedlescombe

Ward:

Ewhurst and sedlescombe

South Coast Sub Region:

No

Brownfield or Greenfield?

Greenfield

Size (Ha)

4.55

Current Land Use

grass field/meadow

Wholly within development boundary

☐

Partially within development boundary

☐

Abut development boundary

☒

Outside development boundary

☐

Policy Context and Identified Needs

Core Strategy recommends 0-10 dwellings.
RSS - identifies possible need to relocate surgery and to improve business/employment opportunites if increase housing.

Planning History

●Refused RR/98/1509/P in 1999 for replacement of 14 metre timber pole with 20 metre tower, add vodafone antennae & ground level cabin (reasons: adverse effect on AONB).
●RR/83/1814 aproved in 1983 for erection of television relay station - 14 metre pole with aerial & equipment cubicle.
● Refused outline A/57/64 in 1957 for residential development (reasons: undesirable ribbon development, loss of agricultural land).

Environmental Factors

AONB. Adjacent right of Way. Nearby Ancient Woodland. Protected species.

ESCC Landscape Assessment Capacity to Accept Change - Housing:

Moderate - (section within development boundary only)

On-Site Appraisal

Summary of Constraints identified from On-Site Appraisals

AONB. Landscape - Located on a prominent ridge, although development extends higher up the slope to the north.

Layout/design parameters

Layout of any scheme must address the social issue of severance by tenure in Sedlescombe. Layout and siting of tenures must work so as to improve rather then exacerbate the situation at present. It is important to

Potential Mitigation Measures:

Good landscaping and tree planting, with retention of existing boundary hedges and trees. May need licence if are protected species. Care ref.

Highways and Accessibility Issues

Access to nearest

Distance from

Convenience Food Shop

est. 410m

Primary School

est. 310m (Sedlescombe CE Primary School)

Bus Route:

on road frontage

Railway Station

est. 6.1km (Battle)

Main Doctors Surgery

est. 270m (Sedlescombe Surgery)

On-Site Access Issues

Only from Brede Lane. Access at SE corner to East View Terrace blocked by Multi-use gaming area.
ESCC Highways comment (19/02/2010) "Access width of 5m x 10m would be required. Access point needs to be staggered with that of 'Gorselands' opposite. The alignment of Brede Lane should dictate where the access is positioned. Would consider 20 dwellings appropriate."

Utilities and Infrastructure

Gas Cables:

No high pressure gas mains impacting on site

SFRA Issues (+ Southern Water Advice where sought):

None

Contamination Issues:

Environmental Health (March 2010)
Confirmed "No issues"

Other Factors / Constraints

Availability / Ownership Constraints:
TBC

Awaiting Relocation of Current Use:
No

Level of Developer Interest:
Low

Recommendations for How Constraints Could Be Overcome:

PHOTO TO BE ADDED

Viability Assessment

e.g; cost factors, market factors based on HMP site archetypes

Archetype 2 - Large, Edge of settlement Greenfield Site
Discussion at Housing Market Partnership (22/02/2010) suggests this type of site is likely to be viable.

Development Opportunities

Total Residential Units

Planning Officer "Small section of site maximum of 20".

Affordable Units

40%+

Indicative Density (units per ha)

30

Availability/Timescale

Available Now?

No. Site is currently policy constrained as outside development boundary.

How long to fully develop the site?

Available within 5 Years?

Yes

Timescale: Before 2011

Timescale: 2012-2016:

Timescale: 2017-2021:

Timescale: 2022-2026:

Timescale: After 2026:

Conclusions

Landscape constraints, but discrete sections of site may be suitable, either at north or west. Developed in its entirety the site would be of too large a scale considering the current size of the village. Development of north area may have the advantage of bridging the divide between East View Terrace and the main core of Sedlescombe village. Areas to the south (S1 in Landscape Assessment) may have potential for associated green infrastructure.

SP3

Land at Staplecross, Ewhurst

Site Details

Location

Settlement:

Rural: Staplecross

Address:

Land adj to Bowling Green, Staplecross

Parish:

Ewhurst

Ward:

Ewhurst and Sedlescombe

South Coast Sub Region:

No

Brownfield or Greenfield?

Greenfield

Size (Ha)

0.97

Current Land Use

Pasture

Wholly within development boundary

☐

Partially within development boundary

☐

Abut development boundary

☒

Outside development boundary

☐

Policy Context and Identified Needs

Rural Settlements Study states 'Given the locally expressed need it may be appropriate to investigate a small scale allocation of 0-10 dwellings that is predominantly for affordable housing with an emphasis on the needs of local residents'. It further suggests a possible need for local employment uses if an opportunity presents itself. In local plan as village with dev boundary and in Strategy Directions as village with potential for exception site.

Planning History

- Omission Site no.1071 - Rejected by RDC during Local Plan process and did not go to Inquiry as not pursued further by Submitter.
- A number of refused historic planning applications (A/59/239, A/60/264, A/61/136, A/62/777, A/64/277, A/64/278, A/64/279 relating to residential development of land including this site. (reasons: outside development area, adversely affect character of area, land should remain agricultural, precedent, highway issues).

Environmental Factors

AONB Hedgeline must provide important wildlife corridor

ESCC Landscape Assessment Capacity to Accept Change - Housing:

Low

On-Site Appraisal

Summary of Constraints identified from On-Site Appraisals

No overt site constraints. Mitigation opportunities to reduce impact on wider landscape, bowling facility and adjacent properties.

Layout/design parameters

Western side of the site, south of the bowling green has potential without significantly impacting on the rural setting of the village or the surrounding wider landscape.

Potential Mitigation Measures:

provide tree screen to eastern and southern boundary of site (reduced part) to consolodate and strengthen village edge

Highways and Accessibility Issues

Access to nearest

Distance from

Convenience Food Shop

est. 260m

Primary School

est. 430m (Staplecross Methodist Primary School)

Bus Route:

est. 230m

Railway Station

est. 7.8km (Robertsbridge)

Main Doctors Surgery

est. 5.2km (Sedlescombe Surgery)

On-Site Access Issues

ESCC advise "It would make sense to spur off the existing network in Cricketers Field. Footway provision at the site frontage would be required for access to public transport provision"

Utilities and Infrastructure

Gas Cables:

No high pressure gas mains impacting on site

SFRA Issues (+ Southern Water Advice where sought):

None

Contamination Issues:

Environmental Health (March 2010)
Electricity sub-station to west

Other Factors / Constraints

Availability / Ownership Constraints:

No

Awaiting Relocation of Current Use:

No

Level of Developer Interest:

Medium

Recommendations for How Constraints Could Be Overcome:

PHOTO TO BE ADDED

Viability Assessment

e.g; cost factors, market factors based on HMP site archetypes

Archetype 1 - Small Edge of settlement greenfield site
Discussion at Housing Market Partnership (22/02/2010) suggests this type of site is likely to be viable.

Development Opportunities

Total Residential Units

Given 0.44 hectares (reduced site) 13 dwellings minimum (approx)

Affordable Units

approx 5/6

Indicative Density (units per ha)

30

Availability/Timescale

Available Now?

No - Policy constraints

How long to fully develop the site?

Available within 5 Years?

Yes

Timescale: Before 2011

Timescale: 2012-2016:

Timescale: 2017-2021:

Timescale: 2022-2026:

Timescale: After 2026:

Conclusions

Yes.
Western section preferred for residential, utilising Crickerter's Field access. May be suitable for a mix of uses, possibly incorporating some employment.

TC11 Land off Steellands Rise, Ticehurst

Site Details

Location

Settlement:

Rural: Ticehurst

Address:

Banky Field, Land off Steellands Rise, Ticehurst

Parish:

Ticehurst

Ward:

Ticehurst and Etchingham

South Coast Sub Region:

No

Brownfield or Greenfield?

G

Size (Ha)

3.26

Current Land Use

Agriculture

Wholly within development boundary

☐

Partially within development boundary

☐

Abut development boundary

☒

Outside development boundary

☐

Policy Context and Identified Needs

Core Strategy and Rural Settlements Study say 15 - 60 houses would be appropriate in Ticehurst which is identified as "Rural Service Centre". Accompanying employment also appropriate. Parish Council said there is demand for more outdoor sport facilities in their responses to the 'Open Space, Sport and Recreation Study'.

Planning History

●Refused outline A/58/597 for residential development on this site and adjoining land in 1959 (reasons: unsuitable access, strong objection on agricultural land use grounds).

Environmental Factors

AONB. TPO.

ESCC Landscape Assessment Capacity to Accept Change - Housing:

Moderate

On-Site Appraisal

Summary of Constraints identified from On-Site Appraisals

Gradient Issue.

Layout/design parameters

Southern area suitable for development. North too exposed.

Potential Mitigation Measures:

Opportunity to provide a more direct footpath linking the school to the town centre.

Highways and Accessibility Issues

Access to nearest	Distance from
Convenience Food Shop	est. 1.1km
Primary School	adj to Ticehurst & Flimwell CE Primary School)
Bus Route:	est. 100m
Railway Station	est. 6km (Stonegate)
Main Doctors Surgery	est. 1.1km (Ticehurst Surgery)

On-Site Access Issues

Possible access from E, W or South. ESCC advise "There is a preference for access via Steellands Rise as Acres Rise and The Warren have prevalent on street parking. It would also keep a proportion of traffic out of the High Street. For this reason, it is essential that good pedestrian links are provided between site and High Street"

Utilities and Infrastructure

Gas Cables:

No high pressure gas mains impacting on site

SFRA Issues (+ Southern Water Advice where sought):

SFRA Issues: Sewerage Flooding Incident (Springfields) to south; Flood Surface Water Less & Intermediate 2009 (west). Southern Water site advice (12/02/2010) "No Capacity in local sewer. Pumping main crossing site. Sewer flooding adjacent, potential inundation/infiltration issues." SW general advice "Where existing capacity is not currently available, development will need to be phased with the provision of the necessary infrastructure. Where infrastructure crosses the site, development design should avoid building over existing

Contamination Issues:

Environmental Health (March 2010)
Confirmed "No issues"

Other Factors / Constraints

Availability / Ownership Constraints:

None

Awaiting Relocation of Current Use:

No, currently in agricultural use.

Level of Developer Interest:

High - Identified via external consultation

Recommendations for How Constraints Could Be Overcome:

PHOTO TO BE ADDED

Viability Assessment e.g; cost factors, market factors based on HMP site archetypes

Archetype 1/2 - Edge of settlement greenfield site
Discussion at Housing Market Partnership (22/02/2010) suggests this type of site is likely to be viable.

Development Opportunities

Total Residential Units

Submitter '60'
Officer - TBC

Affordable Units

Submitter '24'
Officer - in line with standard 40/50%

Indicative Density (units per ha)

Submitter '35-40-ha'

Availability/Timescale

Available Now?

No - policy constraints

How long to fully develop the site?

Available within 5 Years?

Yes.

Timescale: Before 2011

Timescale: 2012-2016:

Site can be delivered at any time within Plan period

Timescale: 2017-2021:

Some potential for phasing of site if considered necessary

Timescale: 2022-2026:

Timescale: After 2026:

Conclusions

Yes. Preference for access from Steellands Rise. Opportunity to provide good pedestrian links are provided between site and High Street. Development would need to be mindful of the Southern water advice received.

WF5

Land at Westfield Down

Site Details

Location

Settlement:

Rural: Westfield

Address:

Land at Westfield Down

Parish:

Westfield

Ward:

Brede Valley

South Coast Sub Region:

No

Brownfield or Greenfield?

G

Size (Ha)

0.95

Current Land Use

Open greenfield land

Wholly within development boundary

☒

Partially within development boundary

☐

Abut development boundary

☐

Outside development boundary

☐

Policy Context and Identified Needs

This site is Local Plan allocation.
Core Strategy Consultation on Strategy Directions recommends between 55 and 70 new dwellings (including at least 40 from existing allocations). Other needs highlighted in evidence work include employment, an allotment and a new facility for older children/teenagers. The Westfield Parish Survey & Action Plan 2006 identified a number of local needs, including affordable housing for Westfield families, parking, more pedestrian pathways, Cycle routes, a youth club.

Planning History

- Local Plan Allocation - Policy VL11.
- Outline application submitted (RR/2009/322/P) for residential development incorporating up to 39 dwellings and formation of new vehicular access - no decision to date (as at 13/5/09).

Environmental Factors

AONB, Public Rights of Way.

ESCC Landscape Assessment Capacity to Accept Change - Housing:

Moderate

On-Site Appraisal

Summary of Constraints identified from On-Site Appraisals

no major issues for proposed use.

Layout/design parameters

In line with allocation

Potential Mitigation Measures:

In line with allocation

Highways and Accessibility Issues

Access to nearest	Distance from
Convenience Food Shop	est. 360m
Primary School	est. 270m (Westfield School)
Bus Route:	on road frontage (A28)
Railway Station	est. 2.7km (Doleham)
Main Doctors Surgery	adj to Westfield Surgery

On-Site Access Issues

No

Utilities and Infrastructure

Gas Cables:

No high pressure gas mains impacting on site

SFRA Issues (+ Southern Water Advice where sought):

None

Contamination Issues:

Environmental Health (March 2010)
Confirmed "No issues"

Other Factors / Constraints

Availability / Ownership Constraints:

None known. (source: LAA NI154 Report).

Awaiting Relocation of Current Use:

No

Level of Developer Interest:

High

Recommendations for How Constraints Could Be Overcome:

PHOTO TO BE ADDED

Viability Assessment

e.g; cost factors, market factors based on HMP site archetypes

Archetype 1 - Small Edge of settlement greenfield site
Discussion at Housing Market Partnership (22/02/2010) suggests this type of site is likely to be viable.

Development Opportunities

Total Residential Units

25 (source: LAA N1154 Report)

Affordable Units

40%

Indicative Density (units per ha)

36

Availability/Timescale

Available Now?

Yes .1st likely completion from 2010/11 rather than 2009/10.

How long to fully develop the site?

25 within 5 years (source LAA NI154 Report).

Available within 5 Years?

Yes - 25 (source: LAA NI154 Report).

Timescale: Before 2011

Timescale: 2012-2016:

39 expected 2011/12 (source: 2009 AMR)

Timescale: 2017-2021:

Timescale: 2022-2026:

Timescale: After 2026:

Conclusions

Yes, in line with Local plan allocation.

WF6e Land off Moor Lane, north of Moor Farm

Site Details

Location

Settlement:

Rural: Westfield

Address:

Land north of Moor Farm

Parish:

Westfield

Ward:

Brede Valley

South Coast Sub Region:

No

Brownfield or Greenfield?

B

Size (Ha)

0.19

Current Land Use

Open greenfield land

Wholly within development boundary

☒

Partially within development boundary

☐

Abut development boundary

☐

Outside development boundary

☐

Policy Context and Identified Needs

This site is Local Plan allocation.
Core Strategy Consultation on Strategy Directions recommends between 55 and 70 new dwellings (including at least 40 from existing allocations). Other needs highlighted in evidence work include employment, an allotment and a new facility for older children/teenagers. The Westfield Parish Survey & Action Plan 2006 identified a number of local needs, including affordable housing for Westfield families, parking, more pedestrian pathways, Cycle routes, a youth club.

Planning History

Local Plan Allocation - Policy VL9.

Outline RR/2004/155/P - Dismissed on Appeal in 2005 for erection of 9 2/3 bed houses

Environmental Factors

AONB. Public Right of Way

ESCC Landscape Assessment

Capacity to Accept Change - Housing:

Low

On-Site Appraisal

Summary of Constraints identified from On-Site Appraisals

None, other than need to ensure layout integrates with village form and facilitates direct access to village centre.

Layout/design parameters

Need to ensure layout integrates with village form and facilitates direct access to village centre.

Potential Mitigation Measures:

Footpath & cycleway.

Highways and Accessibility Issues

Access to nearest

Distance from

Convenience Food Shop

est. 520m

Primary School

est. 550m (Westfield School)

Bus Route:

est. 390m

Railway Station

est. 3.3km (Doleham)

Main Doctors Surgery

est. 780m (Westfield Surgery)

On-Site Access Issues

Need to ensure access by most direct route to village centre. Cycle way and footpath on NW edge to be provided as part of development.

Utilities and Infrastructure

Gas Cables:

No high pressure gas mains impacting on site

SFRA Issues (+ Southern Water Advice where sought):

None

Contamination Issues:

Environmental Health (March 2010)
Current/recent applications. Reports?

Other Factors / Constraints

Availability / Ownership Constraints:

None known. (source: LAA NI154 Report).

Awaiting Relocation of Current Use:

Level of Developer Interest:

Recommendations for How Constraints Could Be Overcome:

PHOTO TO BE ADDED

Viability Assessment

e.g; cost factors, market factors based on HMP site archetypes

Archetype 1 - Small Edge of settlement greenfield site
Discussion at Housing Market Partnership (22/02/2010) suggests this type of site is likely to be viable

Development Opportunities

Total Residential Units

estimate 6
* 17 for wf6 as a whole (source: LAA N1154 Report)

Affordable Units

40%

Indicative Density (units per ha)

30

Availability/Timescale

Available Now?

Yes in line with allocation

How long to fully develop the site?

Available within 5 Years?

Yes in line with allocation

Timescale: Before 2011

Timescale: 2012-2016:

Timescale: 2017-2021:

Timescale: 2022-2026:

Timescale: After 2026:

Conclusions

Yes in line with allocation

Sites Appendix ii: Suitable but not Currently Developable Sites (Amber)

BA23

Land r/o 26 Hastings Road

Site Details

Location

Settlement:	Battle		
Address:	Land r/o 26 Hastings Road		
Parish:	Battle	Ward:	Battle Town
South Coast Sub Region:	No		
Brownfield or Greenfield?	G	Size (Ha)	0.78
Current Land Use	Vacant Field		
Wholly within development boundary☐Partially within development boundary☐ Abut development boundary☒Outside development boundary☐			

Policy Context and Identified Need

Housing: Some 140 dwellings to be built up to 2026.
Housing Needs Survey: Signfiicant local need.
Employment Strategy & Land Review: 3,000 sq.m required. Retail Study: additional 1,000 sq.m needed.
Education:Early years facilities needed.
PPG17 Audit: New swimming facility, new allotment site in south Battle. Qualitative improvements to existing natural/semi natural sites + green spaces.
Battle LATS: Improve accessibility by alternatives to car, car parking improvements needed.

Planning History

●A/72/1787 outline for bungalow refused in Oct 1972 on part of this site - to rear of The Wood, 30 Hastings Road - (reasons -unsatisfactory form of backland development without adequate road frontage, adversely affect local amenities).

Environmental Factors

AONB. Strategic Gap. Nearby TPOs.

ESCC Landscape Assessment Capacity to Accept Change - Housing:	Low - Moderate
--	----------------

On-Site Appraisal

Summary of Constraints identified from On-Site Appraisals

Land locked site.

Layout/design parameters	Awkward shape of site to make best use of site
Potential Mitigation Measures:	Develop in association with adjacent site BA28 or BA31

Highways and Accessibility Issues

Access to nearest	Distance from
Convenience Food Shop	est. 650m (Tesco Express)
Primary School	est. 2.2km (Battle & Langton CE Primary School)
Bus Route:	est. 70m (assuming access NE to A2100)
Railway Station	est. 1km (Battle)
Main Doctors Surgery	est. 1km (Battle Health Centre)
On-Site Access Issues	(as further advised by ESCC Highways)

Land locked so 3rd party access required. ESCC Highways commented in Jan 2010 "Poor visibility to the east due to vegetative growth and alignment of Hastings Road. Access is within a 40mph and visibility splays of 2.4m x 120m need to be provided which is likely to prove difficult. Unsure as whether a speed limit reduction could be implemented here."

Utilities and Infrastructure

Gas Cables:	No high pressure gas mains impacting on site.
SFRA Issues (+ Southern Water Advice where sought):	None
Contamination Issues:	Environmental Health (March 2010) Confirmed "No issues"

Other Factors / Constraints

Availability / Ownership Constraints:	TBC
Awaiting Relocation of Current Use:	No
Level of Developer Interest:	Low - No recent history of applications.

Recommendations for How Constraints Could Be Overcome:	Access needs to be secured.
--	-----------------------------

Viability Assessment

e.g: cost factors, market factors based on HMP site archetypes

Archetype 1 - Small Edge of Settlement Greenfield Site
Discussion at Housing Market Partnership (22/02/2010) suggests this type of site is likely to be viable.

Archetype 5 - Development on access constrained land
Discussion at Housing Market Partnership (22/02/2010) suggests this type of site is likely to be

Development Opportunities

Total Residential Units	23 at 30ph
Affordable Units	9
Indicative Density (units per ha)	30ph

Availability/Timescale

Available Now?	No. Policy constrained as outside development boundary.
How long to fully develop the site?	
Available within 5 Years?	Maybe

Conclusions

Yes. This parcel of land is in favoured sector for development at Battle. Close to station and A2100. Would need to be developed in association with adjacent land to make best us of land

BA28

Land North of Loose Farm

Site Details

Location

Settlement:

Battle

Address:

Land North of Loose Farm

Parish:

Battle

Ward:

Crowhurst

South Coast Sub Region:

Yes

Brownfield or Greenfield?

G

Size (Ha)

10.46

Current Land Use

Grassland

Wholly within development boundary

☐

Partially within development boundary

☐

Abut development boundary

☒

Outside development boundary

☐

Policy Context and Identified Need

Housing: Some 140 dwellings to be built up to 2026.
Housing Needs Survey: Signfiicant local need.
Employment Strategy & Land Review: 3,000 sq.m required. Retail Study: additional 1,000 sq.m needed.
Education:Early years facilities needed.
PPG17 Audit: New swimming facility, new allotment site in south Battle. Qualitative improvements to existing natural/semi natural sites + green spaces.
Battle LATs: Improve accessibility by alternatives to car, car parking improvements needed.

Planning History

Relevant history:
●Poultry unit allowed on appeal in 2008 (RR/2007/3395/P) on land at Greenacres Holding.
●Refusals for single dwellings on land at Greenacres RR/2002/1579/P, RR/2002/1581/P, RR/2002/1582/P (appeal dismissed) & RR/2008/2265/P. (Reasons - outside development boundary & no justification, harmful to AONB).
●Refusal in 1960 (A/60/646) for dwelling rear of 58 Hastings Road.

Environmental Factors

AONB. Strategic Gap.

ESCC Landscape Assessment Capacity to Accept Change - Housing:

Low - Moderate

On-Site Appraisal

Summary of Constraints identified from On-Site Appraisals

West has more potential than east. Amber 2 (west) Amber 3 (east)

Layout/design parameters

The south east part of the site is rural and forms context for listed building and rural context for Battle

Potential Mitigation Measures:

Any development be confined to the more western part of the site.
Potential access via Glengorse

Highways and Accessibility Issues

Access to nearest

Distance from

Convenience Food Shop

est. 1.1km (Tesco Express)

Primary School

est. 2.5km (Battle & Langton CE Primary School)

Bus Route:

on road frontage

Railway Station

est. 1.4km (Battle)

Main Doctors Surgery

est. 1.4km (Battle Health Centre)

On-Site Access Issues

(as further advised by ESCC Highways)

Existing access serves farm complex and buildings. Otherwise 3rd party access required which would need the removal of dwelling(s) fronting the A2100. ESCC Highways commented in Jan 2010 on existing site access as follows"Substandard visibility in both directions due to vegetation and alignment of Hastings Road, particularly to the west. Access is within a 40mph and visibility splays of 2.4m x 120m need to be provided which is likley to prove difficult. Unsure as whether a speed limit reduction could be implemented here. Access is proposed via a Non County Road (NCR) which would present further difficulties" Regarding potential access from BA31 and Glengorse "Glengorse can be utilised for a number of dwellings. It is impossible to accurately estimate how many as a model would be required to ascertain the impact on Hastings Road which may lead to junction modifications. I agree that Glengorse itself could be widened to accommodate significant increased traffic. I would suggest that detailed investigations are undertaken to work out how many units could feasibly be provided without having an adverse effect on the existing highway network. No issues from a highway safety perspective."

Utilities and Infrastructure

Gas Cables:

No high pressure gas mains impacting on site.

SFRA Issues (+ Southern Water Advice where sought):

SFRA issues: Flood Surface Water Less 2009. Southern Water site specific advice (11/02/2010) "No capacity in local sewer. Sewers crossing site." SW general advice "Where existing capacity is not currently available, development will need to be phased with the provision of the necessary infrastructure"

Contamination Issues:

Environmental Health (March 2010)
Historic - Loose Farm to south

Current - Loose Farm to south

Other Factors / Constraints

Availability / Ownership Constraints:

TBC

Awaiting Relocation of Current Use:

no

Level of Developer Interest:

Low - recent history of aplications for residential, but of a very small scale relative to the site size.

Recommendations for How Constraints Could Be Overcome:

Viability Assessment e.g: cost factors, market factors based on HMP site archetypes

Archetype 2 - Large Edge of Settlement Greenfield Site
Discussion at Housing Market Partnership (22/02/2010) suggests this type of site is likely to be viable.

Development Opportunities

Total Residential Units

Wholly dependentt on access question via Glengorse at BA31. If 1.5 hectares developed could achieve 45

Affordable Units

18

Indicative Density (units per ha)

30ph

Availability/Timescale

Available Now?

TBC - depends on access

How long to fully develop the site?

Available within 5 Years?

Conclusions

Yes. Fair distance from services. Surface water flooding only affects a small part of site. Western part of the site has access potential off Glengorse and more hidden from wider landscape. Development would need to be phased with the provision of the necessary water& sewerage infrastructure.

BA54

Land r/o Tesco Express, Battle hill

Site Details

Location

Settlement:

Battle

Address:

Land r/o Tesco Express, Battle Hill, Battle

Parish:

Battle

Ward:

Battle Town

South Coast Sub Region:

No

Brownfield or Greenfield?

mostly greenfield

Size (Ha)

2.3

Current Land Use

some parking and a paddock

Wholly within development boundary

☐

Partially within development boundary

☐

Abut development boundary

☐

Outside development boundary

☒

Policy Context and Identified Need

Housing: Some 140 dwellings to be built up to 2026.
Housing Needs Survey: Signiificant local need.
Employment Strategy & Land Review: 3,000 sq.m required. Retail Study: additional 1,000 sq.m needed.
Education:Early years facilities needed.
PPG17 Audit: New swimming facility, new allotment site in south Battle. Qualitative improvements to existing natural/semi natural sites + green spaces.
Battle LATs: Improve accessibility by alternatives to car, car parking improvements needed.

Planning History

- RR/2005/2909/P dismissed on appeal in 2006 for erection of detached bungalow (issues - harmful to character & appearance of area, use of access endanger highway safety).
- RR/86/0278 approved in 1986 and RR/92/2242/P approved in 1993 for use of land as enclosed car parking area.
- Refused outline RR/85/2421 in 1985 for 2 dwellings (reasons: outside development area, undesirable backland development, inadequate access, highway objections, good agricultural land, precedent).
- A/67/278 approved in 1967 for petrol storage tanks.
- Refused outline A/62/75 in 1962 for 47 dwellings.

Environmental Factors

AONB & trees may harbour protected bird species

ESCC Landscape Assessment

Capacity to Accept Change - Housing:

Low - Moderate

On-Site Appraisal

Summary of Constraints identified from On-Site Appraisals

Access via petrol station may be an issue as well as increase in numbers of vehicles to/from the site. Need to retain boundary trees and take account of changing ground levels to SW corner.

Layout/design parameters

Need to retain boundary screening to soften impact upon surrounding countryside and for ecological putposes. Also likely to need to retain petrol station as only one in the area.

Potential Mitigation Measures:

Retain boundary trees.

Highways and Accessibility Issues

Access to nearest

Distance from

Convenience Food Shop

adj to Tesco Express

Primary School

est. 1.5km (Battle & Langton CE Primary School)

Bus Route:

on road frontage (A2100, Battle Hill)

Railway Station

est. 420m (Battle)

Main Doctors Surgery

est. 400m (Battle Health Centre)

On-Site Access Issues

(as further advised by ESCC Highways)

Only possible access is via the Tesco express site or via site BA31. ESCC advise "Accepted that access via BA 31 is only feasible solution given that the access via Tesco is potentially locked and is likely to result in a development with a road that remains unadopted as the access wou,ld have to cross over private land. This authority is likely to support this site if linked to Glen Gorse."

Utilities and Infrastructure

Gas Cables:

No high pressure gas mains impacting on site

SFRA Issues (+ Southern Water Advice where sought):

None

Contamination Issues:

tbc

Other Factors / Constraints

Availability / Ownership Constraints:

Awaiting Relocation of Current Use:

Level of Developer Interest:

Recommendations for How Constraints Could Be Overcome:

Viability Assessment

e.g: cost factors, market factors based on HMP site archetypes

Archetype 5 - Development on access constrained land. Discussion at Housing Market Partnership (22/02/2010) suggests this type of site is likely to be viable, although access issues are a constraint.

Development Opportunities

Total Residential Units

TBC - perhaps 50

Affordable Units

40% or more

Indicative Density (units per ha)

30

Availability/Timescale

Available Now?

Not currently. Site is policy constrained as outside development boundary. Plus access constraints.

How long to fully develop the site?

Available within 5 Years?

Maybe.

Conclusions

Has potential for various developments subject to highways/access issues being acceptable. Planning history suggests this may be difficult to achieve (dismissed on appeal in 2006 for erection of detached bungalow (issues - harmful to character & appearance of area, use of access endanger highway safety). An alternative access option may be via Glengorse and site BA31.

BO5

Land r/o Round Wood, Broad Oak

Site Details

Location

Settlement:

Rural: Broad Oak

Address:

Land r/o Round Wood, Broad Oak

Parish:

Brede

Ward:

Brede Valley

South Coast Sub Region:

No

Brownfield or Greenfield?

G

Size (Ha)

3.44

Current Land Use

Grazing pasture.

Wholly within development boundary

☐

Partially within development boundary

☒

Abut development boundary

☐

Outside development boundary

☐

Policy Context and Identified Need

Broad Oak recommended for 10-50 dwellings in Core Strategy, plus a need for employment uses. Parish Action Plan seeks recycling, improved public transport, tree planting, sowing of wildflowers and the creation of local nature reserves. PPG17 study identified shortage of amenity open space and need for new allotment as a high priority.

Planning History

●Planning permisssion RR/2007/611/P (approved August 2007) for demolition of Archalvic and erection of 3 chalet bungalows - (partly within Site BO5 - north side) - "blue" land covers all of site BO5.

Environmental Factors

AONB, footpath and proximity of ancient woodland. BAP habitats (Ghyll woodland and wet woodland adjacent to west).

ESCC Landscape Assessment Capacity to Accept Change - Housing:

Moderate

On-Site Appraisal

Summary of Constraints identified from On-Site Appraisals

Access is a potential constraint to be overcome.

Layout/design parameters

No obvious limitations other than need to retain public footpath and provide a buffer strip to ancient woodland.

Potential Mitigation Measures:

Native species planting at boundaries can increase screenage and help create wildlife corridors.

Highways and Accessibility Issues

Access to nearest

Distance from

Convenience Food Shop

est. 670m (if access to north)

Primary School

est. 840m (Brede Primary School)

Bus Route:

est. 42m

Railway Station

est. 11.8km (Robertsbridge)

Main Doctors Surgery

est. 990m (Broad Oak Surgery)

On-Site Access Issues (as further advised by ESCC Highways)

ESCC Highways comment in Jan 2010 "40 mph - 120m of visibility required. The only location where adequate visibility can be achieved is from BO8, though there wold be a need to remove trees/vegetation overhanging highway to ensure the visibility to the south. Mitigation measures should include improved footways along Northiam Road."

Utilities and Infrastructure

Gas Cables:

No high pressure gas mains impacting on site

SFRA Issues (+ Southern Water Advice where sought):

Sewerage Flooding Incident (Northiam Road) to north of site. Southern Water site specific advice (11/02/10) "No capacity in local sewer. Sewers crossing site." SW general advice "Where existing capacity is not currently available, development will need to be phased with the provision of the necessary infrastructure"

Contamination Issues:

Environmental Health (March 2010) Confirmed "No issues"

Other Factors / Constraints

Availability / Ownership Constraints:

TBC

Awaiting Relocation of Current Use:

No

Level of Developer Interest:

Medium - Some recent planning history of development applicatioesn on part of the site

Recommendations for How Constraints Could Be Overcome:

Secure access. Confirm with utilities bodies regarding sewerage flooding.

Viability Assessment e.g: cost factors, market factors based on HMP site archetypes

Archetype 1 - Small Edge of Settlement Greenfield Site
Discussion at Housing Market Partnership (22/02/2010) suggests this type of site is likely to be viable. Archetype 5 - Development on access constrained land. Discussion at Housing Market Partnership (22/02/2010) suggests this type of site is likely to be viable, although access issues are a constraint.

Development Opportunities

Total Residential Units

Approx 25 at 30ha using 50% of site, leaving remainder for community uses and mitigation measure.

Affordable Units

At standard 40/50%

Indicative Density (units per ha)

30ph

Availability/Timescale

Available Now?

No. Policy constrained as outside development boundary.

How long to fully develop the site?

Available within 5 Years?

Maybe - access is an issue to be resolved.

Conclusions

May have potential for residential, possibly alongside other uses (open space, employment). ESCC cite access from the north as a constraint requiring although there is an extant permission fo 3 dwellings (RR/2007/611/P). No capacity in local sewer, although redevelopment may offer scope for reduction in water/sewerage flows and developer would be required to investigate. As existing sewerage capacity is not currently available, development will need to be phased with the provision of the necessary infrastructure.

BU3

Land at 101 Shrub Lane, Burwash

Site Details

Location

Settlement:

Rural: Burwash

Address:

Land at 101 Shrub Lane, Burwash

Parish:

Burwash

Ward:

Darwell

South Coast Sub Region:

No

Brownfield or Greenfield?

B

Size (Ha)

0.18

Current Land Use

Bungalow and garden

Wholly within development boundary

☐

Partially within development boundary

☒

Abut development boundary

☐

Outside development boundary

☐

Policy Context and Identified Need

Core Strategy recommends 17-30 houses. RSS and PPG17 study indicates high need for allotments. LAP identified desire for improved foot/cycle paths.

Planning History

●RR/84/0647 approved in 1984 for formation of new vehicular access.

Environmental Factors

Whole site in AONB. Listed building opposite.

ESCC Landscape Assessment

Capacity to Accept Change - Housing:

Low - Moderate

On-Site Appraisal

Summary of Constraints identified from On-Site Appraisals

Corner plot set above road level.

Layout/design parameters

Corner plot so care with relationships to rear.

Potential Mitigation Measures:

Boundary planting to soften appearance.

Highways and Accessibility Issues

Access to nearest

Distance from

Convenience Food Shop

est. 1.2km

Primary School

est. 1.1km (Burwash CE Primary School)

Bus Route:

est. 800m

Railway Station

est. 4.7km (Etchingham)

Main Doctors Surgery

est. 1.3km (Fairfield Surgery, Burwash)

On-Site Access Issues

(as further advised by ESCC Highways)

ESCC advise "like BU10, however, these site give rise to an opportunity to improve Greenfield Road in terms of its width, even it if for the first 45m or so which can then be subsequently adopted. Again, a shared access is advised with option from either Greenfield Road or Shrub Lane." Planning officer "Greenfield Road is a private road which may limit the extent to which it can be used as an access point.

Utilities and Infrastructure

Gas Cables:

No high pressure gas mains impacting on site

SFRA Issues (+ Southern Water Advice where sought):

Sewerage Flooding Incident (Shrub Lane). Sothern Water advise (11/02/10) "Minor redevelopment, ensure no surface water to foul sewer."

Contamination Issues:

None aware.

Other Factors / Constraints

Availability / Ownership Constraints:

Yes - owner not known or contacted.

Awaiting Relocation of Current Use:

No - in residential use.

Level of Developer Interest:

Low

Recommendations for How Constraints Could Be Overcome:

Viability Assessment

e.g: cost factors, market factors based on HMP site archetypes

Archetype 7 - Redevelopment of Existing Properties in Large Grounds Discussion at Housing Market Partnership (22/02/2010) suggests this type of site is likely to be viable.

Development Opportunities

Total Residential Units

6 (officer)

Affordable Units

40% (officer)

Indicative Density (units per ha)

30 (officer)

Availability/Timescale

Available Now?

Maybe - ownes dependent

How long to fully develop the site?

Available within 5 Years?

Maybe - ownes dependent

Conclusions

Yes. Possible opportunity to make better use of plot for larger number of properties. Dependent on owners agreement.

Sites Appendix ii: Suitable but not Currently Developable Sites (Amber)

BX1

Sainsburys/Station Road/De La Warr Mews/Clifford Road/Buckhurst Road

Site Details

Location

Settlement:

Bexhill

Address:

De La Warr Mews/Station Road/Clifford Road/Buckhurst Road

Parish:

N/a

Ward:

Central

South Coast Sub Region:

Yes

Brownfield or Greenfield?

B

Size (Ha)

2.223

Current Land Use

Existing retail, mixed residential and business/light industrial use.

Wholly within development boundary

☒

Partially within development boundary

☐

Abut development boundary

☐

Outside development boundary

☐

Policy Context and Identified Need

Referred to in Local Plan Policy BX6.
Core Strategy Preferred Strategy for Bexhill: Provide for additional business and employment opportunities within the town, with early development of new space and as part of new mixed use developments. Improve key community infrastructure, especially schools, further education, leisure and health facilities, housing for younger people, and support for older people. Invest in improving the range and quality of existing open spaces and the wider public realm, with additional multi-functional green space within the urban fringe. Strengthen the commercial and "civic centre" role of the town centre, including through additional shopping floorspace. Accommodate most business and housing needs through a combination of urban sites and existing allocations for major mixed use developments to the north-east of the town, with further allocations that most

Planning History

●Extensive planning history relating to existing uses of the site.

Environmental Factors

Conservation Area to south.

ESCC Landscape Assessment Capacity to Accept Change - Housing:

Not assessed

On-Site Appraisal

Summary of Constraints identified from On-Site Appraisals

Existing uses and road layout.

Layout/design parameters

TBC

Potential Mitigation Measures:

TBC

Highways and Accessibility Issues

Access to nearest

Distance from

Convenience Food Shop

mostly within Bexhill Town Centre Shopping Area

Primary School

est. 270m (St Peter & St Paul CE Primary School)

Bus Route:

on road frontages

Railway Station

adj to Bexhill Station

Main Doctors Surgery

est. 550m (Albert Road Surgery)

On-Site Access Issues

(as further advised by ESCC Highways)

Site well connected to existing road network.
ESCC Highways advise (19/02/2010) "Western section of the site to be accessed from Station Rd with additional access to the north east of the site from Buckhurst Road. No objection in principle from highway authority taking into account existing use of the site."

Utilities and Infrastructure

Gas Cables:

High pressure gas mains in Buckhurst Place/Buckhurst Road outside site boundaries but may impact upon any development of site. British Gas Transco consulted on 07/01/10.

SFRA Issues (+ Southern Water Advice where sought):

Sewerage Flooding Incident (Sackville Road) to western corner; 'Flood Surface Water Less 2009' to north

Contamination Issues:

Environmental Health (March 2010)
Historic - Coal yard; cattle pen; railway land to south; sidings; station; goods yard; garages; electricity sub-station; telephone exchange; coal storage.
Current - Telephone exchange; garage; electricity sub-stations

Other Factors / Constraints

Availability / Ownership Constraints:

Multiple ownership

Awaiting Relocation of Current Use:

Yes

Level of Developer Interest:

Medium

Recommendations for How Constraints Could Be Overcome:

Viability Assessment

e.g: cost factors, market factors based on HMP site archetypes

Archetype 4) Development on unused or underused areas for car parking or otherwise unused. Discussion at Housing Market Partnership (22/02/2010) suggests this type of site will probably be viable in most circumstances, subject to land contamination costs.

Development Opportunities

Total Residential Units

Dependent on scheme. In 2005 Study, one scheme had 112, whilst the other had 36. Midpoint is 74 units

Affordable Units

In line with standard.

Indicative Density (units per ha)

Mixed use scheme. Dwellings would likely be comprised of mainly 2 bed apartments.

Availability/Timescale

Available Now?

No - leasehold interests may need to be acquired.

How long to fully develop the site?

Dependent on extent of scheme

Available within 5 Years?

Maybe as part of a mixed use scheme but multiple ownership means likely development in phases over a

Conclusions

Suitable as part of a mixed use scheme.
Recommended that policy continues to allow for possibility.
Broad location that requires further work on town centre master planning.

BX3

Cranston Avenue

Site Details

Location

Settlement:

Bexhill

Address:

Cranston Avenue

Parish:

N/a

Ward:

Collington

South Coast Sub Region:

Yes

Brownfield or Greenfield?

B

Size (Ha)

0.35

Current Land Use

Grassed area adj to staff car park

Wholly within development boundary

☒

Partially within development boundary

☐

Abut development boundary

☐

Outside development boundary

☐

Policy Context and Identified Need

Core Strategy Preferred Strategy for Bexhill: Provide for additional business and employment opportunities within the town, with early development of new space and as part of new mixed use developments. Improve key community infrastructure, especially schools, further education, leisure and health facilities, housing for younger people, and support for older people. Invest in improving the range and quality of existing open spaces and the wider public realm, with additional multi-functional green space within the urban fringe. Strengthen the commercial and "civic centre" role of the town centre, including through additional shopping floorspace. Accommodate most business and housing needs through a combination of urban sites and existing allocations for major mixed use developments to the north-east of the town, with further allocations that most effectively support the objectives and vision, and meet locational criteria.

Planning History

- Extensive planning history principally relating to use of office building to south.
- Undetermined planning permission RR/2009/2671/P (accepted Feb 2010) for extension to existing car park.
- Lapsed RR/2000/959/P approved in Dec 2000 for extension to existing car park (grass crete filled with pea-beach) to provide an additional 122 spaces and new external lighting.

Environmental Factors

None

ESCC Landscape Assessment Capacity to Accept Change - Housing:

Not assessed

On-Site Appraisal

Summary of Constraints identified from On-Site Appraisals

Access, neighbouring amenities, character of area

Layout/design parameters

Development of backland hosue to east sets precedent that could allow for more than frontage scheme. Plus west boundary is rear of properties from Close. If business use, car park preferred to allow development of

Potential Mitigation Measures:

Retention of established planting, possibly thickening at east and west

Highways and Accessibility Issues

Access to nearest	Distance from
Convenience Food Shop	est. 700m - access via north
Primary School	est 1.1km (King Offa Primary School) - access north
Bus Route:	est. 200m (assuming access from North)
Railway Station	est. 1.3km (Collington Railway Station) - access north
Main Doctors Surgery	est. 800m (Collington Surgery) - access north

On-Site Access Issues

(as further advised by ESCC Highways)

2 possibilities, from south via Conquest House or from north via Cranston Avenue. Steep slope down to Cranston Avenue limits option, although western end is more level and has potential. ESCC Highways advise (19/02/2010) "Good visibility across whole site frontage. If single point of access then needs to be staggered with estate road opposite. If individual access points to dwellings off Cranston Avenue then footway should be included along frontage"

Utilities and Infrastructure

Gas Cables:

No high pressure gas mains impacting on site

SFRA Issues (+ Southern Water Advice where sought):

None

Contamination Issues:

Environmental Health (March 2010) Confirmed "No issues"

Other Factors / Constraints

Availability / Ownership Constraints:

Awaiting Relocation of Current Use:

N/A

Level of Developer Interest:

Enquiry of landowner interest being made

Recommendations for How Constraints Could Be Overcome:

Viability Assessment

e.g: cost factors, market factors based on HMP site archetypes

Archetype 4 - Development on unused or underused areas
Discussion at Housing Market Partnership (22/02/2010) suggests this type of site will probably be viable in most circumstances, subject to land contamination costs.

Development Opportunities

Total Residential Units

Up to 10

Affordable Units

In line with standard

Indicative Density (units per ha)

30ph

Availability/Timescale

Available Now?

Maybe - owners advice dependent

How long to fully develop the site?

Available within 5 Years?

Maybe - owners advice dependent

Conclusions

Yes, subject to confirmation of landowner interest

BX37

Land adj to Midways, Ninfield Road

Site Details

Location

Settlement:	Bexhill		
Address:	Land adj to Midways, Ninfield Road		
Parish:	N/a	Ward:	Sidley
South Coast Sub Region:	Yes		
Brownfield or Greenfield?	G	Size (Ha)	2.39
Current Land Use	Vacant/grazing		
Wholly within development boundary ☐ Partially within development boundary ☐ Outside development boundary ☒			

Policy Context and Identified Need

Core Strategy Preferred Strategy for Bexhill:
Broad Location for Major Development

Bexhill Generally: Provide for additional business and employment opportunities within the town, with early development of new space and as part of new mixed use developments. Improve key community infrastructure, especially schools, further education, leisure and health facilities, housing for younger people, and support for older people. Invest in improving the range and quality of existing open spaces and the wider public realm, with additional multi-functional green space within the urban fringe. Strengthen the commercial and "civic centre" role of the town centre, including through additional shopping floorspace. Accommodate most business and

Planning History

- Refused outline B/66/612 in 1967 to erect a dwelling within north of site BX37 fronting Freezeland Lane (reasons: outside development area, precedent, highway objections - Freezeland Lane).
- Refused outline B/59/159 in 1959 for residential development (reasons: outside area zoned for residential development, layout would prejudice new road proposals, mains drainage not available, land should remain agricultural).

Environmental Factors

None

ESCC Landscape Assessment

Capacity to Accept Change - Housing:

High

On-Site Appraisal

Summary of Constraints identified from On-Site Appraisals

Character of area, landscape, access, trees and hedges.

Layout/design parameters

TBC

Potential Mitigation Measures:

TBC

Highways and Accessibility Issues

Access to nearest	Distance from
Convenience Food Shop	est. 1.2km (One-Stop, Turkey Road)
Primary School	est. 1.6km (All Saints CE Primary School)
Bus Route:	on road frontage (Ninfield Road)
Railway Station	est. 3.7km (Bexhill)
Main Doctors Surgery	est. 1.5km (Sidley Surgery)

On-Site Access Issues

(as further advised by ESCC Highways)

Access possibilities are either busy A269 (possible Highways concerns) or Freezeland Lane - a narrow country Lane to north. ESCC highways advise "Access via Freezeland Lane is not supported by the HA. Site access could be created from the A269 provded it is of sufficient distance from crossroads and can demonstate sufficient visibility sightlines (90m x 2.4m)"

Utilities and Infrastructure

Gas Cables:

No high pressure gas mains impacting on site

SFRA Issues (+ Southern Water Advice where sought):

Flood Surface Water Less 2009 (small area to south-west)

Contamination Issues:

Environmental Health (March 2010)
Historic - Freezeland Farm to North

Other Factors / Constraints

Availability / Ownership Constraints:

TBC

Awaiting Relocation of Current Use:

TBC

Level of Developer Interest:

High

Recommendations for How Constraints Could Be Overcome:

Viability Assessment

e.g: cost factors, market factors based on HMP site archetypes

Archetype 2 - Large, edge of settlement Greenfield Site
Discussion at Housing Market Partnership (22/02/2010) suggests this type of site is likely to be viable.

Development Opportunities

Total Residential Units	40-50
Affordable Units	in line with policy
Indicative Density (units per ha)	30 per ha

Availability/Timescale

Available Now?	No - policy constrained as outside development boundary.
How long to fully develop the site?	1 - 2 years
Available within 5 Years?	Maybe as part of broad location.

Conclusions

Yes in line with Core Strategy, although would be somewhat out-of-keeping with fringe character if developed in isolation. Part of broad location.

BX38Land adj to Sandhurst Lodge, Barnhorn Road

Site Details

Location

Settlement:

Bexhill

Address:

Land adj to Sandhurst Lodge, Barnhorn Road

Parish:

N/a

Ward:

St Marks

South Coast Sub Region:

Yes

Brownfield or Greenfield?

G

Size (Ha)

0.91

Current Land Use

Amenity

Wholly within development boundary

☐

Partially within development boundary

☐

Abut development boundary

☒

Outside development boundary

☐

Policy Context and Identified Need

Core Strategy Preferred Strategy for Bexhill: Provide for additional business and employment opportunities within the town, with early development of new space and as part of new mixed use developments. Improve key community infrastructure, especially schools, further education, leisure and health facilities, housing for younger people, and support for older people. Invest in improving the range and quality of existing open spaces and the wider public realm, with additional multi-functional green space within the urban fringe. Strengthen the commercial and "civic centre" role of the town centre, including through additional shopping floorspace. Accommodate most business and housing needs through a combination of urban sites and existing allocations for major mixed use developments to the north-east of the town, with further allocations that most effectively support the objectives and vision, and meet locational criteria.

Planning History

●Inspector's Conclusion - Omission Site no.3744 - 30 hectare site proposed for housing (2006 Local Plan Inquiry):
"Large greenfield site for which there is no identified need and where development would impact adversely on the landscape and traffic conditions".

Environmental Factors

Right of Way

ESCC Landscape Assessment Capacity to Accept Change - Housing:

Not assessed

On-Site Appraisal

Summary of Constraints identified from On-Site Appraisals

access.

Layout/design parameters

Relate to adjacent land

Potential Mitigation Measures:

Reinforce tree planting on elevated ground

Highways and Accessibility Issues

Access to nearest	Distance from
Convenience Food Shop	"Considered as part of broad location" - See BX43
Primary School	"Considered as part of broad location" - See BX43
Bus Route:	"Considered as part of broad location" - See BX43
Railway Station	"Considered as part of broad location" - See BX43
Main Doctors Surgery	"Considered as part of broad location" - See BX43

On-Site Access Issues

(as further advised by ESCC Highways)

Yes - no current access. Options would be via demolition of property on Barnhorn Road or new development on adjacent land. HA view that overall development proposals in locality should be subject to a Transport Assessment due to impact on A259, as well as on the local road network.

Utilities and Infrastructure

Gas Cables:

No high pressure gas mains impacting on site

SFRA Issues (+ Southern Water Advice where sought):

None

Contamination Issues:

Environmental Health (March 2010)
Confirmed "No issues"

Other Factors / Constraints

Availability / Ownership Constraints:

TBC

Awaiting Relocation of Current Use:

TBC

Level of Developer Interest:

Medium. Developer promoting adjacent land interested in serving area.

Recommendations for How Constraints Could Be Overcome:

Viability Assessment

e.g: cost factors, market factors based on HMP site archetypes

Archetype 2 - Large Edge of Settlement Greenfield Site (when considered alongside wider area of strategic site including sites BX38, 39, 43, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 52, 63)

Development Opportunities

Total Residential Units

26

Affordable Units

As per policy

Indicative Density (units per ha)

30 per hectare

Availability/Timescale

Available Now?

No

How long to fully develop the site?

Available within 5 Years?

Maybe as part of broader strategic area.

Conclusions

Consider further as part of wider area; otherwise it would represent an undue extension of development beyond existing logical boundaries (include in Broad Location)

BX39Land West of Willow Drive

Site Details

Location

Settlement:

Bexhill

Address:

Land west of Willow Drive, Little Common

Parish:

N/a

Ward:

St Marks

South Coast Sub Region:

Yes

Brownfield or Greenfield?

G

Size (Ha)

1.47

Current Land Use

Agricultural - Fallow/Vacant

Wholly within development boundary

☐

Partially within development boundary

☒

Abut development boundary

☐

Outside development boundary

☐

Policy Context and Identified Need

Core Strategy Preferred Strategy for Bexhill: Provide for additional business and employment opportunities within the town, with early development of new space and as part of new mixed use developments. Improve key community infrastructure, especially schools, further education, leisure and health facilities, housing for younger people, and support for older people. Invest in improving the range and quality of existing open spaces and the wider public realm, with additional multi-functional green space within the urban fringe. Strengthen the commercial and "civic centre" role of the town centre, including through additional shopping floorspace. Accommodate most business and housing needs through a combination of urban sites and existing allocations for major mixed use developments to the north-east of the town, with further allocations that most effectively support the objectives and vision, and meet locational criteria.

Planning History

●Inspector's Conclusion - Omission Site no. 1019, 1021 and 3744 (2006 Local Plan Inquiry): "... greenfield site for which there is no identified need and where development would impact adversely on the landscape and traffic conditions".

Environmental Factors

Flood Zones 2 & 3

ESCC Landscape Assessment Capacity to Accept Change - Housing:

High

On-Site Appraisal

Summary of Constraints identified from On-Site Appraisals

Access. Character of area. Impact on adj residential properties.

Layout/design parameters

Satisfactory access? Subject to HA. Retain trees

Potential Mitigation Measures:

Limit height/distance to s. bungalows. TPOs. Split traffic flows between accesses?

Highways and Accessibility Issues

Access to nearest	Distance from
Convenience Food Shop	"Considered as part of broad location" - See BX43
Primary School	"Considered as part of broad location" - See BX43
Bus Route:	"Considered as part of broad location" - See BX43
Railway Station	"Considered as part of broad location" - See BX43
Main Doctors Surgery	"Considered as part of broad location" - See BX43

On-Site Access Issues (as further advised by ESCC Highways)

No. Access to Spring Lane long and tortuous (see BX49). Query HA view re emergency vehicles? Access also off Willow Drive. Extra traffic at Chestnut Walk access? Need further assessment of access issues in association with other land put forward for development.

Utilities and Infrastructure

Gas Cables:

No high pressure gas mains impacting on site

SFRA Issues (+ Southern Water Advice where sought):

Flood Surface Water Less & Intermediate 2009 (NE)

Contamination Issues:

Environmental Health (March 2010) Confirmed "No issues"

Other Factors / Constraints

Availability / Ownership Constraints:

No - acquired by development company

Awaiting Relocation of Current Use:

No

Level of Developer Interest:

High

Recommendations for How Constraints Could Be Overcome:

Viability Assessment e.g: cost factors, market factors based on HMP site archetypes

Archetype 2 - Large Edge of Settlement Greenfield Site (when considered alongside wider area of strategic site including sites BX38, 39, 43, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 52, 63) Discussion at Housing Market Partnership (22/02/2010) suggests this type of site is likely to be viable.

Development Opportunities

Total Residential Units

Submitter '30 - 50' (likely reduce to keep distance from trees)

Affordable Units

As required by policy.

Indicative Density (units per ha)

20-30ha

Availability/Timescale

Available Now?

No

How long to fully develop the site?

2-3 years

Available within 5 Years?

Maybe as part of broader strategic area.

Conclusions

Could be developed incrementally or as part of wider area, if considered appropriate, subject to access being confirmed as satisfactory and site constraints addressed. Also, suitable for POS use if local need. (Include in Broad Location).

BX40

Land west of Hazelwood Close

Site Details

Location

Settlement:

Bexhill

Address:

Land west of Hazelwood Close

Parish:

N/a

Ward:

St Marks

South Coast Sub Region:

Yes

Brownfield or Greenfield?

G

Size (Ha)

1.38

Current Land Use

Fallow/Vacant

Wholly within development boundary

☐

Partially within development boundary

☒

Abut development boundary

☐

Outside development boundary

☐

Policy Context and Identified Need

Core Strategy Preferred Strategy for Bexhill: Provide for additional business and employment opportunities within the town, with early development of new space and as part of new mixed use developments. Improve key community infrastructure, especially schools, further education, leisure and health facilities, housing for younger people, and support for older people. Invest in improving the range and quality of existing open spaces and the wider public realm, with additional multi-functional green space within the urban fringe. Strengthen the commercial and "civic centre" role of the town centre, including through additional shopping floorspace. Accommodate most business and housing needs through a combination of urban sites and existing allocations for major mixed use developments to the north-east of the town, with further allocations that most effectively support the objectives and vision, and meet locational criteria.

Planning History

- Refused outline B/62/369 in 1962 for chalet bungalows.
- Refused outline B/60/167 in 1960 for residential development.

Environmental Factors

None

ESCC Landscape Assessment Capacity to Accept Change - Housing:

High

On-Site Appraisal

Summary of Constraints identified from On-Site Appraisals

Access, character of area

Layout/design parameters

N/A

Potential Mitigation Measures:

N/A

Highways and Accessibility Issues

Access to nearest	Distance from
Convenience Food Shop	est. 300m (Little Common Shopping Area)
Primary School	est. 550m (Little Common Primary School)
Bus Route:	est. 320m
Railway Station	est. 1.7km (Cooden Beach)
Main Doctors Surgery	est. 320m (Little Common Surgery)

On-Site Access Issues

(as further advised by ESCC Highways)

Yes, no obvious access points, other than via adjacent site

Utilities and Infrastructure

Gas Cables:

No high pressure gas mains impacting on site

SFRA Issues (+ Southern Water Advice where sought):

Flood Surface Water Less & Intermediate 2009 area to south.

Contamination Issues:

Environmental Health (March 2010)
Historic - Piggery adjacent/nearby

Other Factors / Constraints

Availability / Ownership Constraints:

TBC

Awaiting Relocation of Current Use:

TBC

Level of Developer Interest:

High

Recommendations for How Constraints Could Be Overcome:

Viability Assessment

e.g: cost factors, market factors based on HMP site archetypes

Archetype 2 - Large Edge of Settlement Greenfield Site (when considered alongside wider area of strategic site including sites BX40, 42, 44)
Discussion at Housing Market Partnership (22/02/2010) suggests this type of site is likely to be viable.

Development Opportunities

Total Residential Units

N/A

Affordable Units

N/A

Indicative Density (units per ha)

N/A

Availability/Timescale

Available Now?

No. Policy constrained as outside development boundary.

How long to fully develop the site?

2 years

Available within 5 Years?

No - No readily available form of access.

Conclusions

Reasonable site that may be suitable although an extension of development boundary in inaccessible location. However access is a serious constraint, particularly since permission for 5 dwellings granted on BX76 which effectively blocks potential access from south. Furthermore, ESCC Highways comments on site BX44 suggest access may cope with up to 175 dwellings from the east subject to traffic assessment. Whilst the outcome of the transport assessment may allow the development of BX42 and/or BX40 there is insufficient certainty to consider these neighbouring sites developable at present."

BX42Land south of 55a Barnhorn Road

Site Details

Location

Settlement:

Bexhill

Address:

Land south of 55a Barnhorn Road

Parish:

N/a

Ward:

St Marks

South Coast Sub Region:

Yes

Brownfield or Greenfield?

G

Size (Ha)

2.33

Current Land Use

Farmland

Wholly within development boundary

☐

Partially within development boundary

☐

Abut development boundary

☒

Outside development boundary

☐

Policy Context and Identified Need

Core Strategy Preferred Strategy for Bexhill: Provide for additional business and employment opportunities within the town, with early development of new space and as part of new mixed use developments. Improve key community infrastructure, especially schools, further education, leisure and health facilities, housing for younger people, and support for older people. Invest in improving the range and quality of existing open spaces and the wider public realm, with additional multi-functional green space within the urban fringe. Strengthen the commercial and "civic centre" role of the town centre, including through additional shopping floorspace. Accommodate most business and housing needs through a combination of urban sites and existing allocations for major mixed use developments to the north-east of the town, with further allocations that most effectively support the objectives and vision, and meet locational criteria.

Planning History

●No relevant planning history.

Environmental Factors

None

ESCC Landscape Assessment Capacity to Accept Change - Housing:

High

On-Site Appraisal

Summary of Constraints identified from On-Site Appraisals

Access, character of area, trees

Layout/design parameters

Dependent on access

Potential Mitigation Measures:

TBC

Highways and Accessibility Issues

Access to nearest

Distance from

Convenience Food Shop

est. 590m (Little Common Shopping Area)

Primary School

est. 1km (Little Common Primary School)

Bus Route:

est. 100m (if access north to Barnhorn Road)

Railway Station

est. 2.2km (Cooden Beach)

Main Doctors Surgery

est. 950m (Little Common Surgery)

On-Site Access Issues (as further advised by ESCC Highways)

Access to Barnhorn Road would need to be secured, which may be difficult given HA previous concerns. ESCC Highways advice on BX42 and BX44 "There is a potential point of access off Spindlewood Drive. HA would need to know numbers if sites are combined and consider impact on Meads Road/Cooden Sea Road junction. If BX44 in isolation is considered for service via Spindlewood Drive, then the proposed (up to) 175 units would need traffic assessment. Preference for BX42 to be isolated from BX44 just from looking at scale of land availability."

Utilities and Infrastructure

Gas Cables:

No high pressure gas mains impacting on site

SFRA Issues (+ Southern Water Advice where sought):

None

Contamination Issues:

Possible as a result of agricultural use
Environmental Health (March 2010)
Historic - Barnhorn Farm to west

Other Factors / Constraints

Availability / Ownership Constraints:

TBC

Awaiting Relocation of Current Use:

TBC

Level of Developer Interest:

Medium

Recommendations for How Constraints Could Be Overcome:

Viability Assessment e.g: cost factors, market factors based on HMP site archetypes

Archetype 2 - Large Edge of Settlement Greenfield Site (when considered alongside wider area of strategic site including sites BX40, 42, 44)
Discussion at Housing Market Partnership (22/02/2010) suggests this type of site is likely to be viable.

Development Opportunities

Total Residential Units

70

Affordable Units

In line with standard

Indicative Density (units per ha)

30 dw/ha

Availability/Timescale

Available Now?

No. Policy constrained as outside development boundary.

How long to fully develop the site?

2 years

Available within 5 Years?

No - No readily available form of access.

Conclusions

Reasonable site that may be suitable although an extension of development boundary in inaccessible location. Has potential alongside other sites including BX44 and 40 subject to satisfactory access and further consideration of capacity, having regard to overall impact of developments. ESCC Highways comments on site BX44 suggest access may cope with up to 175 dwellings from the east subject to traffic assessment. Whilst the outcome of the transport assessment may allow the development of BX42 and/or BX40 there is insufficient certainty to consider these neighbouring sites developable at present."
Part of broad location.

BX43

Land north of The Broadwalk

Site Details

Location

Settlement:

Bexhill

Address:

Land north of The Broadwalk

Parish:

N/a

Ward:

St Marks

South Coast Sub Region:

Yes

Brownfield or Greenfield?

G

Size (Ha)

8.94

Current Land Use

Fallow/Vacant

Wholly within development boundary

☐

Partially within development boundary

☐

Abut development boundary

☒

Outside development boundary

☐

Policy Context and Identified Need

Core Strategy Preferred Strategy for Bexhill: Provide for additional business and employment opportunities within the town, with early development of new space and as part of new mixed use developments. Improve key community infrastructure, especially schools, further education, leisure and health facilities, housing for younger people, and support for older people. Invest in improving the range and quality of existing open spaces and the wider public realm, with additional multi-functional green space within the urban fringe. Strengthen the commercial and "civic centre" role of the town centre, including through additional shopping floorspace. Accommodate most business and housing needs through a combination of urban sites and existing allocations for major mixed use developments to the north-east of the town, with further allocations that most effectively support the objectives and vision, and meet locational criteria.

Planning History

●Inspector's Conclusion - Omission Site no.3744 - 30 hectare site proposed for housing (2006 Local Plan Inquiry):
"Large greenfield site for which there is no identified need and where development would impact adversely on the landscape and traffic conditions".

Environmental Factors

Right of Way.

ESCC Landscape Assessment Capacity to Accept Change - Housing:

High

On-Site Appraisal

Summary of Constraints identified from On-Site Appraisals

Access.

Character of area.

Layout/design parameters

Central and northern parts of site very exposed to wider countryside

Potential Mitigation Measures:

Limit any development south of high ground forming spur off Barnhorn Road ridge

Highways and Accessibility Issues

Access to nearest

Distance from

Convenience Food Shop

est 1.1km (Little Common Shopping Area)

Primary School

est. 1.5km (Little Common Primary School)

Bus Route:

est. 220m

Railway Station

est. 2.5km (Cooden Beach)

Main Doctors Surgery

est. 1.4km (Little Common Surgery)

On-Site Access Issues

(as further advised by ESCC Highways)

Needs adjacent land to gain access; potential from Barnhorn Road or Sandhurst Lane, although latter very narrow and unsuited to significant extra traffic. HA view that overall development proposals in locality should be subject to a Transport Assessment due to impact on A259, as well as on the local road network.

Utilities and Infrastructure

Gas Cables:

No high pressure gas mains impacting on site

SFRA Issues (+ Southern Water Advice where sought):

Flood Surface Water Less 2009 affects area to S and W

Contamination Issues:

Environmental Health (March 2010)
Historic - Nursery to south

Other Factors / Constraints

Availability / Ownership Constraints:

None - acquired by developers

Awaiting Relocation of Current Use:

No

Level of Developer Interest:

High

Recommendations for How Constraints Could Be Overcome:

Viability Assessment

e.g: cost factors, market factors based on HMP site archetypes

Archetype 2 - Large Edge of Settlement Greenfield Site (when considered alongside wider area of strategic site including sites BX38, 39, 43, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 52, 63)
Discussion at Housing Market Partnership (22/02/2010) suggests this type of site is likely to be viable.

Development Opportunities

Total Residential Units

100-250

Affordable Units

Indicative Density (units per ha)

30 dw/ha

Availability/Timescale

Available Now?

No

How long to fully develop the site?

Estimated 2-4 years

Available within 5 Years?

Maybe as part of broader strategic area.

Conclusions

Development potential of southern and eastern parts in conjunction with adjacent land worthy of further consideration given housing requirements. Access study needed. (Part of Broad Location)

BX44Land r/o Marlings, Maple Walk

Site Details

Location

Settlement:

Bexhill

Address:

Land r/o Marlings, Maple Walk

Parish:

N/a

Ward:

St Marks

South Coast Sub Region:

Yes

Brownfield or Greenfield?

G

Size (Ha)

3.63

Current Land Use

Fallow/Vacant

Wholly within development boundary

☐

Partially within development boundary

☐

Abut development boundary

☒

Outside development boundary

☐

Policy Context and Identified Need

Core Strategy Preferred Strategy for Bexhill: Provide for additional business and employment opportunities within the town, with early development of new space and as part of new mixed use developments. Improve key community infrastructure, especially schools, further education, leisure and health facilities, housing for younger people, and support for older people. Invest in improving the range and quality of existing open spaces and the wider public realm, with additional multi-functional green space within the urban fringe. Strengthen the commercial and "civic centre" role of the town centre, including through additional shopping floorspace. Accommodate most business and housing needs through a combination of urban sites and existing allocations for major mixed use developments to the north-east of the town, with further allocations that most effectively support the objectives and vision, and meet locational criteria.

Planning History

●Inspector's Conclusion - Omission Site no. 1022, 1023 & 1024 (2006 Local Plan Inquiry): "Although the landscape impact of development would be less harmful than at other West Bexhill sites, this is a greenfield site which is not needed for housing and which has access constraints."

Environmental Factors

Adj TPO

ESCC Landscape Assessment Capacity to Accept Change - Housing:

High

On-Site Appraisal

Summary of Constraints identified from On-Site Appraisals

Access, Character of area

Layout/design parameters

Dependent on access

Potential Mitigation Measures:

Replacement planting

Highways and Accessibility Issues

Access to nearest

Distance from

Convenience Food Shop

est. 300m (Little Common Shopping Area)

Primary School

est. 550m (Little Common Primary School)

Bus Route:

est. 320m

Railway Station

est. 1.7km (Cooden Beach)

Main Doctors Surgery

est. 320m (Little Common Surgery)

On-Site Access Issues (as further advised by ESCC Highways)

Possible access point on east side at Spindlewood Drive. ESCC Highways advice on BX42 and BX44 "There is a potential point of access off Spindlewood Drive. HA would need to know numbers if sites are combined and consider impact on Meads Road/Cooden Sea Road junction. If BX44 in isolation is considered for service via Spindlewood Drive, then the proposed (up to) 175 units would need traffic assessment. Preference for BX42 to be isolated from BX44 just from looking at scale of land availability."

Utilities and Infrastructure

Gas Cables:

No high pressure gas mains impacting on site

SFRA Issues (+ Southern Water Advice where sought):

Flood Surface Water Less & Intermediate 2009 (to south)

Contamination Issues:

Environmental Health (March 2010)
Historic - Piggery adjacent/nearby

Other Factors / Constraints

Availability / Ownership Constraints:

No constraints.

Awaiting Relocation of Current Use:

No

Level of Developer Interest:

High

Recommendations for How Constraints Could Be Overcome:

Transport assessment.

Viability Assessment e.g: cost factors, market factors based on HMP site archetypes

Archetype 2 - Large Edge of Settlement Greenfield Site (when considered alongside wider area of strategic site including sites BX40, 42, 44)
Discussion at Housing Market Partnership (22/02/2010) suggests this type of site is likely to be viable.

Development Opportunities

Total Residential Units

Submitter '70-100 (RES 144), 100- 175 (RES 585)'

Affordable Units

In line with standard

Indicative Density (units per ha)

Submitter '20-30 per ha (RES 144), 30- 50ha'

Availability/Timescale

Available Now?

No. Policy constrained as outside development boundary.

How long to fully develop the site?

Submitter "2-4 years" Planning officer "4 years"

Available within 5 Years?

Maybe, subject to transport assessment.

Conclusions

Submitter 'The scale of development has not yet been determined. Site well related to existig urban area with good access to public transport and local services.'
Planning Officer "Yes, potentially suitable for residential alongside other sites including BX42, 44, 40 subject to satisfactory access and further consideration of capacity, having regard to overall impact of developments. ESCC Highways comments on site BX44 suggest access may cope with up to 175 dwellings from the east subject to traffic assessment.As this site can access the road network, it is considered developable for at least some residential. Whilst the outcome of the transport assessment may allow the development of BX42 and/or BX40 there is insufficient certainty to consider these neighbouring sites developable at present."
Part of broad location.

BX45Land north of Howards Crescent

Site Details

Location

Settlement:

Bexhill

Address:

Land north of Howards Crescent

Parish:

N/a

Ward:

St Marks

South Coast Sub Region:

Yes

Brownfield or Greenfield?

G

Size (Ha)

7

Current Land Use

Fallow/Vacant

Wholly within development boundary

☐

Partially within development boundary

☐

Abut development boundary

☒

Outside development boundary

☐

Policy Context and Identified Need

Core Strategy Preferred Strategy for Bexhill: Provide for additional business and employment opportunities within the town, with early development of new space and as part of new mixed use developments. Improve key community infrastructure, especially schools, further education, leisure and health facilities, housing for younger people, and support for older people. Invest in improving the range and quality of existing open spaces and the wider public realm, with additional multi-functional green space within the urban fringe. Strengthen the commercial and "civic centre" role of the town centre, including through additional shopping floorspace. Accommodate most business and housing needs through a combination of urban sites and existing allocations for major mixed use developments to the north-east of the town, with further allocations that most effectively support the objectives and vision, and meet locational criteria.

Planning History

●Inspector's Conclusion - Omission Site no.3744 - 30 hectare site proposed for housing (2006 Local Plan Inquiry):
"Large greenfield site for which there is no identified need and where development would impact adversely on the landscape and traffic conditions".

Environmental Factors

Right of Way

ESCC Landscape Assessment Capacity to Accept Change - Housing:

High

On-Site Appraisal

Summary of Constraints identified from On-Site Appraisals

Rural character; public access; highway access

Layout/design parameters

Twin overhead power lines north-south in west of site. High tree cover; need additional land ot achieve access

Potential Mitigation Measures:

Underground lines, TPO/but some loss very likely

Highways and Accessibility Issues

Access to nearest	Distance from
Convenience Food Shop	"Considered as part of broad location" - See BX43
Primary School	"Considered as part of broad location" - See BX43
Bus Route:	"Considered as part of broad location" - See BX43
Railway Station	"Considered as part of broad location" - See BX43
Main Doctors Surgery	"Considered as part of broad location" - See BX43

On-Site Access Issues

(as further advised by ESCC Highways)

Narrow access point to Kites Nest Walk (understood to be third party land), with mature trees in way of extending road.

Utilities and Infrastructure

Gas Cables:

No high pressure gas mains impacting on site

SFRA Issues (+ Southern Water Advice where sought):

Flood Surface Water Less 2009 affects small area to SW

Contamination Issues:

Environmental Health (March 2010)
Historic - Howards Farm to south; nursery to south

Other Factors / Constraints

Availability / Ownership Constraints:

None - land acquired by developers

Awaiting Relocation of Current Use:

N/A - agricultural

Level of Developer Interest:

High

Recommendations for How Constraints Could Be Overcome:

Viability Assessment

e.g: cost factors, market factors based on HMP site archetypes

Archetype 2 - Large Edge of Settlement Greenfield Site (when considered alongside wider area of strategic site including sites BX38, 39, 43, 45, 46, 47, 48, 52, 63)
Discussion at Housing Market Partnership (22/02/2010) suggests this type of site is likely to be viable.

Development Opportunities

Total Residential Units

Submitter '240'

Affordable Units

As required by policy.

Indicative Density (units per ha)

35ha

Availability/Timescale

Available Now?

No

How long to fully develop the site?

Estimated 2-4 years

Available within 5 Years?

Maybe as part of broader strategic area.

Conclusions

Only developable, if necessary, with other adjacent land to secure proper access with acceptable environmental impact. (Part of Broad Location)

BX46Land west of The Broadwalk

Site Details

Location

Settlement:

Bexhill

Address:

Land west of The Broadwalk

Parish:

N/a

Ward:

St Marks

South Coast Sub Region:

Yes

Brownfield or Greenfield?

G

Size (Ha)

2.3

Current Land Use

Fallow/Vacant

Wholly within development boundary

☐

Partially within development boundary

☐

Abut development boundary

☒

Outside development boundary

☐

Policy Context and Identified Need

Core Strategy Preferred Strategy for Bexhill: Provide for additional business and employment opportunities within the town, with early development of new space and as part of new mixed use developments. Improve key community infrastructure, especially schools, further education, leisure and health facilities, housing for younger people, and support for older people. Invest in improving the range and quality of existing open spaces and the wider public realm, with additional multi-functional green space within the urban fringe. Strengthen the commercial and "civic centre" role of the town centre, including through additional shopping floorspace. Accommodate most business and housing needs through a combination of urban sites and existing allocations for major mixed use developments to the north-east of the town, with further allocations that most effectively support the objectives and vision, and meet locational criteria.

Planning History

●Inspector's Conclusion - Omission Site no.3744 - 30 hectare site proposed for housing (2006 Local Plan Inquiry):
"Large greenfield site for which there is no identified need and where development would impact adversely on the landscape and traffic conditions".

Environmental Factors

Right of Way

ESCC Landscape Assessment

High (north)

Capacity to Accept Change - Housing:

Not assessed (south)

On-Site Appraisal

Summary of Constraints identified from On-Site Appraisals

Landlocked site distant from services and facilities and forming urban fringe

Layout/design parameters

Only in conjunction with adjoining land, if necessary given distance from services

Potential Mitigation Measures:

Frequent bus services; effective land management if not developed in whole or part

Highways and Accessibility Issues

Access to nearest

Distance from

Convenience Food Shop

"Considered as part of broad location" - See BX43

Primary School

"Considered as part of broad location" - See BX43

Bus Route:

"Considered as part of broad location" - See BX43

Railway Station

"Considered as part of broad location" - See BX43

Main Doctors Surgery

"Considered as part of broad location" - See BX43

On-Site Access Issues

(as further advised by ESCC Highways)

No direct access. Would involve either demolition or access via BX63.

Utilities and Infrastructure

Gas Cables:

No high pressure gas mains impacting on site

SFRA Issues (+ Southern Water Advice where sought):

Sewerage Flooding Incident affects SE corner

Contamination Issues:

Environmental Health (March 2010)
Confirmed "No issues"

Other Factors / Constraints

Availability / Ownership Constraints:

TBC

Awaiting Relocation of Current Use:

TBC

Level of Developer Interest:

Medium. Developer promoting adjacent land interested in serving area.

Recommendations for How Constraints Could Be Overcome:

Viability Assessment

e.g: cost factors, market factors based on HMP site archetypes

Archetype 2 - Large Edge of Settlement Greenfield Site (when considered alongside wider area of strategic site including sites BX38, 39, 43, 45, 46, 47, 48, 52, 63)
Discussion at Housing Market Partnership (22/02/2010) suggests this type of site is likely to be viable.

Development Opportunities

Total Residential Units

TBC

Affordable Units

Indicative Density (units per ha)

TBC

Availability/Timescale

Available Now?

Maybe as part of broader strategic area.

How long to fully develop the site?

Available within 5 Years?

Maybe as part of broader strategic area.

Conclusions

As Form A/B plans: (Part of Broad Location)

BX47Land at Fantails, Sandhurst Lane

Site Details

Location

Settlement:

Bexhill

Address:

Land at Fantails, Sandhurst Lane

Parish:

N/a

Ward:

St Marks

South Coast Sub Region:

Yes

Brownfield or Greenfield?

B

Size (Ha)

1.1

Current Land Use

Existing bungalow/Paddock/Gardens/Field

Wholly within development boundary

☐

Partially within development boundary

☐

Abut development boundary

☒

Outside development boundary

☐

Policy Context and Identified Need

Core Strategy Preferred Strategy for Bexhill: Provide for additional business and employment opportunities within the town, with early development of new space and as part of new mixed use developments. Improve key community infrastructure, especially schools, further education, leisure and health facilities, housing for younger people, and support for older people. Invest in improving the range and quality of existing open spaces and the wider public realm, with additional multi-functional green space within the urban fringe. Strengthen the commercial and "civic centre" role of the town centre, including through additional shopping floorspace. Accommodate most business and housing needs through a combination of urban sites and existing allocations for major mixed use developments to the north-east of the town, with further allocations that most effectively support the objectives and vision, and meet locational criteria.

Planning History

Relevant history:
●RR/2005/2925/P dismissed on appeal in 2006 for erection of one dwelling on land within NW of site BX47 (issues - not harmful to character/appearance of area but contrary to principles of sustainable development and have a detrimental effect on highway safety).

Environmental Factors

None

ESCC Landscape Assessment Capacity to Accept Change - Housing:

Part of site assessed as High

On-Site Appraisal

Summary of Constraints identified from On-Site Appraisals

Intensification of traffic on Sandhurst Lane is inappropriate

Layout/design parameters

Alternative access needed

Potential Mitigation Measures:

Consider alongside potential of wider area

Highways and Accessibility Issues

Access to nearest	Distance from
Convenience Food Shop	"Considered as part of broad location" - See BX43
Primary School	"Considered as part of broad location" - See BX43
Bus Route:	"Considered as part of broad location" - See BX43
Railway Station	"Considered as part of broad location" - See BX43
Main Doctors Surgery	"Considered as part of broad location" - See BX43

On-Site Access Issues

(as further advised by ESCC Highways)

Planning officer "Access onto Sandhurst Lane, which is very narrow; also close to bend. Therefore, access for new development inappropriate, but may consider site in conjunction with adjacent land, all subject to further traffic assessment of cumulative impacts on the A259 and local road network"

Utilities and Infrastructure

Gas Cables:

No high pressure gas mains impacting on site

SFRA Issues (+ Southern Water Advice where sought):

Flood Surface Water Less 2009 affects small strip to NW

Contamination Issues:

Environmental Health (March 2010) Confirmed "No issues"

Other Factors / Constraints

Availability / Ownership Constraints:
Reliant on thrid party land for acceptable access

Awaiting Relocation of Current Use:

Level of Developer Interest:
Medium (as High on adjacent land)

Recommendations for How Constraints Could Be Overcome:

Viability Assessment

e.g: cost factors, market factors based on HMP site archetypes

Archetype 2 - Large Edge of Settlement Greenfield Site (when considered alongside wider area of strategic site including sites BX38, 39, 43, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 52, 63)
Discussion at Housing Market Partnership (22/02/2010) suggests this type of site is likely to be viable.

Development Opportunities

Total Residential Units

10

Affordable Units

As policy requires

Indicative Density (units per ha)

30 net

Availability/Timescale

Available Now?

No

How long to fully develop the site?

Available within 5 Years?

Maybe as part of broader strategic area.

Conclusions

Only investigate as part of consideration of wider area. May include as part of a broad location.

BX49

Land North of Third House, Howards Crescent

Site Details

Location

Settlement:

Bexhill

Address:

Land North of Third House, Howards Crescent

Parish:

N/a

Ward:

St Marks

South Coast Sub Region:

Yes

Brownfield or Greenfield?

G

Size (Ha)

4.1

Current Land Use

Agricultural

Wholly within development boundary

☐

Partially within development boundary

☐

Abut development boundary

☒

Outside development boundary

☐

Policy Context and Identified Need

Core Strategy Preferred Strategy for Bexhill: Provide for additional business and employment opportunities within the town, with early development of new space and as part of new mixed use developments. Improve key community infrastructure, especially schools, further education, leisure and health facilities, housing for younger people, and support for older people. Invest in improving the range and quality of existing open spaces and the wider public realm, with additional multi-functional green space within the urban fringe. Strengthen the commercial and "civic centre" role of the town centre, including through additional shopping floorspace. Accommodate most business and housing needs through a combination of urban sites and existing allocations for major mixed use developments to the north-east of the town, with further allocations that most effectively support the objectives and vision, and meet locational criteria.

Planning History

●Inspector's Conclusion - Omission Site no.3744 - 30 hectare site proposed for housing (2006 Local Plan Inquiry):
"Large greenfield site for which there is no identified need and where development would impact adversely on the landscape and traffic conditions".

Environmental Factors

Flood Zones 2 & 3. Right of Way. Adj TPO.

ESCC Landscape Assessment Capacity to Accept Change - Housing:

Part of site assessed as High

On-Site Appraisal

Summary of Constraints identified from On-Site Appraisals

Overhead power lines. Access. Drainage. Rural, tranquil character

Layout/design parameters

Only in part, in much larger scheme. Even then possible open space use or water storage.

Potential Mitigation Measures:

Underground cables.

Highways and Accessibility Issues

Access to nearest

Distance from

Convenience Food Shop

"Considered as part of broad location" - See BX43

Primary School

"Considered as part of broad location" - See BX43

Bus Route:

"Considered as part of broad location" - See BX43

Railway Station

"Considered as part of broad location" - See BX43

Main Doctors Surgery

"Considered as part of broad location" - See BX43

On-Site Access Issues

(as further advised by ESCC Highways)

Could connect to Spring Lane (BX39) shows potential. However, very long and many dwellings off single access (Fontwell Avenue). Also access potential in conjunction with development of adjacent land (BX39, 45). HA view that overall development proposals in locality should be subject to a Transport Assessment due to impact on A259, as well as on the local road network.

Utilities and Infrastructure

Gas Cables:

No high pressure gas mains impacting on site

SFRA Issues (+ Southern Water Advice where sought):

Flood Surface Water Less, Intermediate & More 2009 affects areas to North.

Contamination Issues:

Environmental Health (March 2010)
Confirmed "No issues"

Other Factors / Constraints

Availability / Ownership Constraints:

Yes, see plan

Awaiting Relocation of Current Use:

Level of Developer Interest:

Recommendations for How Constraints Could Be Overcome:

Viability Assessment

e.g: cost factors, market factors based on HMP site archetypes

Archetype 2 - Large Edge of Settlement Greenfield Site (when considered alongside wider area of strategic site including sites BX38, 39, 43, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 52, 63)
Discussion at Housing Market Partnership (22/02/2010) suggests this type of site is likely to be viable.

Development Opportunities

Total Residential Units

Submitter '250-300'

Affordable Units

Submitter '30%'

Indicative Density (units per ha)

Submitter "30-35ha (net)"

Availability/Timescale

Available Now?

No

How long to fully develop the site?

Estimated 2 - 4 years

Available within 5 Years?

Maybe as part of broader strategic area.

Conclusions

Only retain for further investigation as may have some potential, albeit limited, if it is concluded that development in this locality is appropriate as a large scale site. Developable subject to sequential and exception test.
Part of broad location.

BX5

Knole Road

Site Details

Location

Settlement:

Bexhill

Address:

Knole Road

Parish:

N/a

Ward:

Sackville

South Coast Sub Region:

Yes

Brownfield or Greenfield?

Greenfield

Size (Ha)

0.7

Current Land Use

Bowling Green

Wholly within development boundary

☒

Partially within development boundary

☐

Abut development boundary

☐

Outside development boundary

☐

Policy Context and Identified Need

Core Strategy Preferred Strategy for Bexhill: Provide for additional business and employment opportunities within the town, with early development of new space and as part of new mixed use developments. Improve key community infrastructure, especially schools, further education, leisure and health facilities, housing for younger people, and support for older people. Invest in improving the range and quality of existing open spaces and the wider public realm, with additional multi-functional green space within the urban fringe. Strengthen the commercial and "civic centre" role of the town centre, including through additional shopping floorspace. Accommodate most business and housing needs through a combination of urban sites and existing allocations for major mixed use developments to the north-east of the town, with further allocations that most effectively support the objectives and vision, and meet locational criteria.

Planning History

●RR/2006/2226/P (allowed on Appeal Aug 2007 but later quashed at High Court - reconsideration of Appeal pending) - redevelopment to form 41 sheltered apartments for the elderly and new outdoor bowls green, indoor rink & club facilities.
●Refused outline RR/2002/3123/P in March 2003 for demolition of existing bowling club facilities, erection of 16 town houses & 18 apartments. (reasons - not demonstrated replacement recreational facility will be suitable or existing site could not suit an alternative recreational need, town houses detrimental to neighbouring amenities, loss of acceptable recreational facility, detrimental to character of area).

Environmental Factors

Listed buildings to the south.

ESCC Landscape Assessment Capacity to Accept Change - Housing:

Not assessed

On-Site Appraisal

Summary of Constraints identified from On-Site Appraisals

Any development could potentially have an adverse impact upon the amenities of neighbouring properties.

Layout/design parameters

Any scheme for residential development should have regard to the relationship with neighbouring properties.

Potential Mitigation Measures:

Adequate hard and soft landscaping

Highways and Accessibility Issues

Access to nearest

Distance from

Convenience Food Shop

est. 350m (Bexhill Town Centre Shopping Area)

Primary School

est. 1km (St Peter and St Paul CE Primary School)

Bus Route:

est. 120m

Railway Station

est. 520m (Bexhill)

Main Doctors Surgery

est. 570m (Albert Road Surgery)

On-Site Access Issues

(as further advised by ESCC Highways)

ESCC advise (19/02/2010) "No objection in principle. Would wish for single point of access into site, ideally from Knole Rd."

Utilities and Infrastructure

Gas Cables:

No high pressure gas mains impacting on site

SFRA Issues (+ Southern Water Advice where sought):

Sewerage Flooding Incident (De La Warr Parade) to south-west corner

Contamination Issues:

Environmental Health (March 2010) Confirmed "No issues"

Other Factors / Constraints

Availability / Ownership Constraints:

Site owned by prospective developer

Awaiting Relocation of Current Use:

Yes

Level of Developer Interest:

High

Recommendations for How Constraints Could Be Overcome:

Very high quality design

Viability Assessment

e.g: cost factors, market factors based on HMP site archetypes

N/a

Development Opportunities

Total Residential Units

41 (source: Planning Application)

Affordable Units

In line with standard

Indicative Density (units per ha)

59 per hectare (Planning Application)

Availability/Timescale

Available Now?

No, as subject to demonstration that a scheme would not adversely affect the setting of the listed buildings

How long to fully develop the site?

Approx. 2 years

Available within 5 Years?

Maybe

Conclusions

Maybe. However, this would need to be of a very high quality given adjoining listed buildings. It could also be retained as a bowling green. Letter was received by Head of DC on 10/05/2008 outlining that the Planning Permission was quashed on a legal technicality due to High Court challenge. Further leave to appeal to High Court has been granted. RDC current position is supportive of some development subject to High Court decision.

BX52Land West of Spring Lane

Site Details

Location

Settlement:

Bexhill

Address:

Land west of Spring Lane

Parish:

N/a

Ward:

St Marks

South Coast Sub Region:

Yes

Brownfield or Greenfield?

G

Size (Ha)

2.32

Current Land Use

Agricultural

Wholly within development boundary

☐

Partially within development boundary

☐

Abut development boundary

☒

Outside development boundary

☐

Policy Context and Identified Need

Core Strategy Preferred Strategy for Bexhill: Provide for additional business and employment opportunities within the town, with early development of new space and as part of new mixed use developments. Improve key community infrastructure, especially schools, further education, leisure and health facilities, housing for younger people, and support for older people. Invest in improving the range and quality of existing open spaces and the wider public realm, with additional multi-functional green space within the urban fringe. Strengthen the commercial and "civic centre" role of the town centre, including through additional shopping floorspace. Accommodate most business and housing needs through a combination of urban sites and existing allocations for major mixed use developments to the north-east of the town, with further allocations that most effectively support the objectives and vision, and meet locational criteria.

Planning History

- Two historic refusals for residential development as part of a larger scheme for residential development (B/71/459 and B/73/0842) (Reasons - land not shown for residential use on Town Map, objection from Minister of Agriculture, Highway concerns, unsatisfactory drainage).

Environmental Factors

Flood Zones 2 & 3. TPO. Adj Ancient Woodland. Adj Wet Woodland.

ESCC Landscape Assessment Capacity to Accept Change - Housing:

Not assessed

On-Site Appraisal

Summary of Constraints identified from On-Site Appraisals

Access, trees

Layout/design parameters

Needs access created either across third party land or if land to the south to be developed.

Potential Mitigation Measures:

Bridge stream and floodplain; retain woodland and manage; develop only western area, with buffer to north west.

Highways and Accessibility Issues

Access to nearest	Distance from
Convenience Food Shop	"Considered as part of broad location" - See BX43
Primary School	"Considered as part of broad location" - See BX43
Bus Route:	"Considered as part of broad location" - See BX43
Railway Station	"Considered as part of broad location" - See BX43
Main Doctors Surgery	"Considered as part of broad location" - See BX43

On-Site Access Issues (as further advised by ESCC Highways)

Not for scale of development proposed. May be for larger scheme.
No direct access; closest access via end of Fontwell Avenue. Alternative access over stream if development to south

Utilities and Infrastructure

Gas Cables:

No

SFRA Issues (+ Southern Water Advice where sought):

Flood Surface Water Less, Intermediate & More 2009 affects areas mostly to S

Contamination Issues:

Environmental Health (March 2010)
Confirmed "No issues"

Other Factors / Constraints

Availability / Ownership Constraints:

TBC

Awaiting Relocation of Current Use:

TBC

Level of Developer Interest:

High - client has approaches from interested parties

Recommendations for How Constraints Could Be Overcome:

Viability Assessmente.g: cost factors, market factors based on HMP site archetypes

Archetype 2 - Large Edge of Settlement Greenfield Site (when considered alongside wider area of strategic site including sites BX38, 39, 43, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 52, 63)
Discussion at Housing Market Partnership (22/02/2010) suggests this type of site is likely to be viable.

Development Opportunities

Total Residential Units

Submitter '100- 300 depending on density and layout'
Planning Officer '10 dwellings'

Affordable Units

to accord with requirements

Indicative Density (units per ha)

30- 50ha

Availability/Timescale

Available Now?

No

How long to fully develop the site?

2 - 5 years depending on scale.

Available within 5 Years?

Maybe as part of broader strategic area.

Conclusions

Marginal development potential, with many safeguards needed. Viability doubtful. Only retain for further consideration as part of larger area, possibly for amenity provision, otherwise disbenefits would outweigh housing potential. Developable subject to sequential and exception test.
However still forms part of wider strategic broad location.

BX63Land to north of The Broadwalk

Site Details

Location

Settlement:

Bexhill

Address:

Land to north of The Broadwalk, Barnhorn Road, Bexhill

Parish:

N/a

Ward:

St Marks

South Coast Sub Region:

Yes

Brownfield or Greenfield?

Size (Ha)

1.078

Current Land Use

Field

Wholly within development boundary

☐

Partially within development boundary

☐

Abut development boundary

☒

Outside development boundary

☐

Policy Context and Identified Need

Core Strategy Preferred Strategy for Bexhill: Provide for additional business and employment opportunities within the town, with early development of new space and as part of new mixed use developments. Improve key community infrastructure, especially schools, further education, leisure and health facilities, housing for younger people, and support for older people. Invest in improving the range and quality of existing open spaces and the wider public realm, with additional multi-functional green space within the urban fringe. Strengthen the commercial and "civic centre" role of the town centre, including through additional shopping floorspace. Accommodate most business and housing needs through a combination of urban sites and existing allocations for major mixed use developments to the north-east of the town, with further allocations that most effectively support the objectives and vision, and meet locational criteria.

Planning History

●Two historic refusals for residential development as part of a larger scheme for residential development of 62-68 acres of land (B/71/52 and B/71/459) (Reasons - land not shown for residential use on Town Map, objection from Minister of Agriculture, Highway concerns).
●A number of historic refusals for residential development of 10 building plots to extend The Broadwalk (B/55/216, B/62/366, B/64/598, B/66/233) (Reasons: outside development area, land beyond gravitational level of sewer, layout showed cul-de-sac in excess of 600ft - excessive).

Environmental Factors

Right of Way

ESCC Landscape Assessment Capacity to Accept Change - Housing:

High

On-Site Appraisal

Summary of Constraints identified from On-Site Appraisals

Access; character

Layout/design parameters

Small scale, consistent with 'Access Way' design approach of 'The Broadwalk'

Potential Mitigation Measures:

Limit housing numbers

Highways and Accessibility Issues

Access to nearest

Distance from

Convenience Food Shop

est. 870m (Little Common Shopping Area)

Primary School

est. 1.1km (Little Common Primary School)

Bus Route:

est. 120m

Railway Station

est. 2.4km (Cooden Beach)

Main Doctors Surgery

est. 1.2km (Little Common Surgery)

On-Site Access Issues (as further advised by ESCC Highways)

Potential access off 'private' The Broadwalk. Otherwise, access if adjacent, larger area is developed.

Utilities and Infrastructure

Gas Cables:

No high pressure gas mains impacting on site

SFRA Issues (+ Southern Water Advice where sought):

None

Contamination Issues:

Environmental Health (March 2010)
Historic - Howards Farm to south; nursery

Other Factors / Constraints

Availability / Ownership Constraints:

Awaiting Relocation of Current Use:

Level of Developer Interest:

Recommendations for How Constraints Could Be Overcome:

Viability Assessment e.g: cost factors, market factors based on HMP site archetypes

Archetype 2 - Large Edge of Settlement Greenfield Site (when considered alongside wider area of strategic site including sites BX38, 39, 43, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 52, 63)
Discussion at Housing Market Partnership (22/02/2010) suggests this type of site is likely to be viable.

Development Opportunities

Total Residential Units

15-19 (if developed in isolation)

Affordable Units

As policy requires

Indicative Density (units per ha)

Availability/Timescale

Available Now?

No

How long to fully develop the site?

Available within 5 Years?

Maybe as part of broader strategic area.

Conclusions

Check access situation; otherwise consider as part of wider countryside swathe. Part of broad location

BX66

Land at Turkey Farm, Bexhill

Site Details

Location

Settlement:

Bexhill

Address:

Land at Turkey Farm, Bexhill

Parish:

N/a

Ward:

Sidley

South Coast Sub Region:

Yes

Brownfield or Greenfield?

G

Size (Ha)

32.94

Current Land Use

Pasture

Wholly within development boundary

☐

Partially within development boundary

☐

Abut development boundary

☐

Outside development boundary

☒

Policy Context and Identified Need

An ESCC Notified Site - Waste Disposal and ESCC Notified Site - Mineral Site adjoin the site to the south-west.

An ESCC Notified Site - Highway Scheme is close to the site to the north-east.

Core Strategy Preferred Strategy for Bexhill:

Broad Location for Major Development.

Bexhill generally: Provide for additional business and employment opportunities within the town, with early development of new space and as part of new mixed use developments. Improve key community infrastructure, especially schools, further education, leisure and health facilities, housing for younger people, and support for older people. Invest in improving the range and quality of existing open spaces and the wider public realm, with additional multi-functional green

Planning History

●Extensive planning history relating to existing uses within the site.

●Refused outline RR/87/2910 in 1988 for erection of dwelling - adj Bramble Cottage, St Marys Lane (reasons: outside development area, detrimental to character/appearance of area, highway objections, precedent).

●Refused outline B/61/600 in 1961 for erection of 7 dwellings - east part of site fronting St Marys Lane (reason: outside a development area).

●Refused outline B/55/189 in 1955 for erection of dwelling - nw part of site fronting Pear Tree Lane (reasons: outside a development area, should remain agricultural)

Environmental Factors

Right of Way. Mineral Site. Waste Disposal. Adj Ancient Woodland. Adj Wet Woodland. Adj SNCI

ESCC Landscape Assessment Capacity to Accept Change - Housing:

Moderate (*check Landscape Assessment for specific areas within site)

On-Site Appraisal

Summary of Constraints identified from On-Site Appraisals

Landscape, Character of area, impact upon road network. Overhead power lines.

Layout/design parameters

TBC

Potential Mitigation Measures:

TBC

Highways and Accessibility Issues

Access to nearest

Distance from

Convenience Food Shop

est. 1.5km (One-Stop, Southlands Road)

Primary School

est. 1.8km (All Saints CE Primary) if access to n.e.

Bus Route:

est. 75m if access to n.e.

Railway Station

est. 3.9km (Bexhill) if access to n.e.

Main Doctors Surgery

est. 1.8 km (Sidley Surgery) if access to n.e.

On-Site Access Issues

(as further advised by ESCC Highways)

Four possible access points to road network, two via St Marys Lane at mid east boundary and one via an access track to Ninfield Road at North boundary.

ESCC advise "Have observed various points of access from the public highway. St Mary's Lane is unsuitable; Peartree lane is unsuitable due to narrow width of lane; Ninfield Road adjacent to footway 47 has insufficient visibility and width, and conflicts with public rights of way." ESCC highways would object to its inclusion in the SHLAA on this basis. RDC query this further RE: proposed 'spur road' coming off the Hastings Bexhill link road will facilitate access to this site (source:core strategy)

Awaiting further clarification from ESCC.

Utilities and Infrastructure

Gas Cables:

No high pressure gas mains impacting on site

SFRA Issues (+ Southern Water Advice where sought):

Small areas throughout site affected by Flood Surface Water Less & Intermediate 2009.

Contamination Issues:

Environmental Health (March 2010)
Historic - Turkey Farm within site, cemetery to South East.
2004 EA Landfill Rother DC
St. Mary's Recreation Ground 100m to East
EA Landfill Sussex Peartree Lane 260m to North

Other Factors / Constraints

Availability / Ownership Constraints:

Awaiting Relocation of Current Use:

Level of Developer Interest:

Recommendations for How Constraints Could Be Overcome:

Viability Assessment

e.g; cost factors, market factors based on HMP site archetypes

Archetype 2 - Large Edge of Settlement Greenfield Site.

Discussion at Housing Market Partnership (22/02/2010) suggests this type of site is likely to be viable.

Development Opportunities

Total Residential Units

TBC

Affordable Units

TBC

Indicative Density (units per ha)

TBC

Availability/Timescale

Available Now?

No. Policy constrained as outside development boundary.

How long to fully develop the site?

Available within 5 Years?

Maybe. Part of Broad location for major development.

Conclusions

Yes - in line with Core Strategy with development potential of land immediately to rear of existing Thorne Crescent development plus land parcels generally south of ridgeline. Broad Location for Major Development.

ESCC HIGHWAYS ADVICE REQUIRES FURTHER CONFIRMATION

BX67Land West of Watermill Lane, Bexhill

Site Details

Location

Settlement:

Bexhill

Address:

Land West of Watermill Lane, Bexhill

Parish:

N/a

Ward:

Sidley

South Coast Sub Region:

Yes

Brownfield or Greenfield?

G

Size (Ha)

54.04

Current Land Use

Grazing land

Wholly within development boundary

☐

Partially within development boundary

☐

Abut development boundary

☒

Outside development boundary

☐

Policy Context and Identified Need

Core Strategy Preferred Strategy for Bexhill: Provide for additional business and employment opportunities within the town, with early development of new space and as part of new mixed use developments. Improve key community infrastructure, especially schools, further education, leisure and health facilities, housing for younger people, and support for older people. Invest in improving the range and quality of existing open spaces and the wider public realm, with additional multi-functional green space within the urban fringe. Strengthen the commercial and "civic centre" role of the town centre, including through additional shopping floorspace. Accommodate most business and housing needs through a combination of urban sites and existing allocations for major mixed use developments to the north-east of the town, with further allocations that most effectively support the objectives and vision, and meet locational criteria.

Planning History

Relevant history:
●A number of historic applications relating to residential development on areas within the site. Most recently:
●Refused outline RR/2004/236/P in 2004 for construction of 45 homes on an area of land to the north in the centre of the site (reason: outside development area, criteria to be considered exception site not met, highway objections, wider transport infrastructure issues need to be addressed, unacceptable impact on landscape).

Environmental Factors

Rights of Way. Adj TPO. Ghyll Woodland. Adj Ancient Woodland. Adj Wet Woodland.

ESCC Landscape Assessment Capacity to Accept Change - Housing:

High

On-Site Appraisal

Summary of Constraints identified from On-Site Appraisals

Character of area. Access.

Layout/design parameters

Potential Mitigation Measures:

Highways and Accessibility Issues

Access to nearest

Distance from

Convenience Food Shop

est. 1.2km (One Stop, Turkey Road)

Primary School

est. 1.6km (All Saints)

Bus Route:

est. 50m (Ninfield Road)

Railway Station

est. 3.7km (Bexhill)

Main Doctors Surgery

est. 1.5km (Sidley Surgery)

On-Site Access Issues

(as further advised by ESCC Highways)

Possible access points - Freezeland Lane, Ninfield Road (A269) and Watermill Lane with linkage to Bexhill-Hastings Link Road.
This site is part of our 'Broad Location for major Development' . As such it would be accessed via a Countryside Avenue/Spur Road connecting the North-east Bexhill development to A269(as outlined in our Core Strategy Consultation on Strategy Directions). Subject to seperate on-going modeeliing work. ESCC Highways advise (03/10) "Point of access ruled out onWatermill Lane based on width constraints and alignment."

Utilities and Infrastructure

Gas Cables:

No high pressure gas mains impacting on site

SFRA Issues (+ Southern Water Advice where sought):

Flood Surface Water Less, Intermediate & More 2009 affects strips of land throughout site

Contamination Issues:

Environmental Health (March 2010)
Historic - Mayo Farm to South
Freezeland Farm to North. Tank at South boundary.
Cockerels Farm to North. Allotment gardens within.

Other Factors / Constraints

Availability / Ownership Constraints:

Awaiting Relocation of Current Use:

Level of Developer Interest:

Recommendations for How Constraints Could Be Overcome:

Viability Assessmente.g; cost factors, market factors based on HMP site archetypes

Archetype 2 - Large Edge of Settlement Greenfield Site
Discussion at Housing Market Partnership (22/02/2010) suggests this type of site is likely to be viable.

Development Opportunities

Total Residential Units

TBC

Affordable Units

Indicative Density (units per ha)

Availability/Timescale

Available Now?

No. Policy constrained as outside development boundary.

How long to fully develop the site?

Available within 5 Years?

Maybe as part of broad location. Highways depending

Conclusions

Yes. Part of broad location

CA2

The White Hart, Catsfield

Site Details

Location

Settlement:

Rural: Catsfield

Address:

The Green, Catsfield

Parish:

Catsfield

Ward:

Crowhurst

South Coast Sub Region:

Yes

Brownfield or Greenfield?

B (south side), G (North side)

Size (Ha)

0.22

Current Land Use

Village Pub

Wholly within development boundary

☒

Partially within development boundary

☐

Abut development boundary

☐

Outside development boundary

☐

Policy Context and Identified Need

Core Strategy 'Consultation on Strategy Directions' identifies need for up to 40 new houses. RSS notes fair amount of out commuting from Catsfield. Rother District Council's 'Open Space, Sport and Recreation Audit and Assessment 2007' recommended a new facility for older children/teenagers, albeit as a low priority.

Planning History

- Planning history relating to existing use of building as a public house.
- RR/2008/1993/L & RR/2008/1989/P approved in 2008 for conversion of existing store to holiday accommodation.
- RR/1999/1366/P - dismissed on appeal for erection of 2 detached cottages (issues - harmful to AONB).
- A number of refused outline applications (A/70/522, A/70/526, RR/1999/512/P) for residential development of land adjoining the public house. Most recently:

Environmental Factors

Listed building. Adjacent AONB and public footpath.

ESCC Landscape Assessment Capacity to Accept Change - Housing:

Moderate

On-Site Appraisal

Summary of Constraints identified from On-Site Appraisals

Existing Pub. Trees and shrubs on north side. Possible need for access to rear.

Layout/design parameters

Pub not suitable for development.Frontage development would be appropriate for north side if considered suitable, allowing for access to rear site as necessary.

Potential Mitigation Measures:

TBC

Highways and Accessibility Issues

Access to nearest

Distance from

Convenience Food Shop

est. 65m

Primary School

est. 480m (Catsfield CE Primary School)

Bus Route:

on road frontage

Railway Station

est. 4.1km (Battle)

Main Doctors Surgery

est. 2.6km (Ninfield Surgery)

On-Site Access Issues

(as further advised by ESCC Highways)

Straightforward access to B2204 from site CA2. If site CA9 which is adjacent to to the north west were to be developed, access may be acieved via site CA2. ESCC advice "Agree with comments. May prove to be value in using site for access of development sites CA9 and CA3. Would allow minimum number of dwellings to front onto the B2204. Access would need to provide visibility splays of 2.4m x 45m."

Utilities and Infrastructure

Gas Cables:

Appears to be no gas at all in vicinity - source UtilityMaps. British Gas Transco consulted on 07/01/10.

Feb 2010 Southern Gas Networks (Scotia) comment that

SFRA Issues (+ Southern Water Advice where sought):

Highway Flooding Hotspot (south-west corner). Southern Water advise (11/02/10) "Small redevelopment site, remove surface water from foul sewer"

Contamination Issues:

Environmental Health (March 2010) Confirmed "No issues"

Other Factors / Constraints

Availability / Ownership Constraints:

Owners written to (15.2.10) to ascertain interest in development.

Awaiting Relocation of Current Use:

No

Level of Developer Interest:

Low-Medium - some planning history in vicinity, but does not appear to relate to this site.

Recommendations for How Constraints Could Be Overcome:

Contact owners

Viability Assessment

e.g: cost factors, market factors based on HMP site archetypes

Archetype 1 - Small Edge of Settlement Greenfield Site, Discussion at Housing Market Partnership (22/02/2010) suggests this type of site is likely to be viable. Archetype 4 - Development on unused or underused areas Discussion at Housing Market Partnership (22/02/2010) suggests this type of site will probably be viable in most circumstances, subject to land contamination costs.

Development Opportunities

Total Residential Units

Possible access point for development of wider site CA9. Unlikely to provide significant numbers of dwellings in own right.

Affordable Units

In line with standard

Indicative Density (units per ha)

TBC

Availability/Timescale

Available Now?

Maybe - owners dependent

How long to fully develop the site?

Available within 5 Years?

Maybe - owners dependent

Conclusions

Only the Northern section has potential, as a possible access point for development of wider site CA9. The southern area of the site on which the White Hart pub is located, is not suitable for development, since there need to retain viable uses that support community and village cohesiveness.

CA9

Land r/o The White Hart, Catsfield

Site Details

Location

Settlement:

Rural: Catsfield

Address:

R/o the White Hart, The Green, Catsfield

Parish:

Catsfield

Ward:

Crowhurst

South Coast Sub Region:

Yes

Brownfield or Greenfield?

G

Size (Ha)

1.65

Current Land Use

Vacant scrub.

Wholly within development boundary

☐

Partially within development boundary

☐

Abut development boundary

☒

Outside development boundary

☐

Policy Context and Identified Need

Core Strategy 'Consultation on Strategy Directions' identifies need for up to 40 new houses. RSS notes fair amount of out commuting from Catsfield. Rother District Council's 'Open Space, Sport and Recreation Audit and Assessment 2007' recommended a new facility for older children/teenagers, albeit as a low priority.

Planning History

- Planning permission RR/1999/2494/P (approved Feb 2000) for formation of a new access and car park. (The site area for this application covers a small part of Site CA9).
- Refused outline A/70/522 in 1970 for residential development (reasons: outside development area, highway objections).

Environmental Factors

AONB. Setting of listed buildings.

ESCC Landscape Assessment Capacity to Accept Change - Housing:

Moderate

On-Site Appraisal

Summary of Constraints identified from On-Site Appraisals

Access is major constraint.

Layout/design parameters

Dependent on access point, but straightforward site with few physical constraints. Need to respect adjacent curtilages.

Potential Mitigation Measures:

Planting at boundaries.

Highways and Accessibility Issues

Access to nearest

Distance from

Convenience Food Shop

est. 120m (assuming access through White Hart)

Primary School

est. 550m (Catsfield CE Primary School)

Bus Route:

est. 15.2m (on road frontage)

Railway Station

est. 4.5km (Battle)

Main Doctors Surgery

est. 2.6km (Ninfield Surgery)

On-Site Access Issues

(as further advised by ESCC Highways)

Not direct access to road. Three obvious access possibilities. Firstly via narrow roadway on south side (5m width which also serves as public footpath). Secondly access via 3rd party land north of White Hart. Thirdly via White Hart Car Park. ESCC Highways comment "As previously mentioned would prefer access to site from CA2. Existing access between post office and white hart is not suitable for large numbers of dwellings. Concern would also be raised regarding the parking in front of the post office which results in near zero visibility from this access point. If access from CA2 can be achieved then no major concerns from Highway Authority regarding numbers of dwellings."

Utilities and Infrastructure

Gas Cables:

Appears to be no gas at all in vicinity - source UtilityMaps

Feb 2010 Southern Gas Networks (Scotia) comment that

The nearest relevant main is Low Pressure and 2337 metres(s) from the site

SFRA Issues (+ Southern Water Advice where sought):

None (although Highway Flooding Hotspot appears to affect southern-most corner of site). Southern Water advise (11/02/10) "Capacity in local sewer. Sewers crossing site. Where infrastructure crosses the site, development design should avoid building over existing infrastructure."

Contamination Issues:

Environmental Health (March 2010) Confirmed "No issues"

Other Factors / Constraints

Availability / Ownership Constraints:

Owners written to (15.2.10) to ascertain interest in development.

Awaiting Relocation of Current Use:

No

Level of Developer Interest:

Low - no redcent planning history

Recommendations for How Constraints Could Be Overcome:

Issues to resolve - highways access, gas mains, SFRA flooding issues with Southen water.

Viability Assessment

e.g: cost factors, market factors based on HMP site archetypes

Archetype 1 - Small Edge of Settlement Greenfield Site, Discussion at Housing Market Partnership (22/02/2010) suggests this type of site is likely to be viable. Archetype 5 - Development on access constrained land. Discussion at Housing Market Partnership (22/02/2010) suggests this type of site is likely to be viable, although access issues are a constraint.

Development Opportunities

Total Residential Units

up to 50

Affordable Units

in line with standards

Indicative Density (units per ha)

30ph

Availability/Timescale

Available Now?

No - outside development boundary so constrained by policy.

How long to fully develop the site?

Available within 5 Years?

Maybe - owners require confirmation.

Conclusions

Yes. Scale of site lends itself to residential alongside another use. SFRA flood issues need to be checked, particularly as they are at access point. Gas issues require confirmation. Rother District Council's 'Open Space, Sport and Recreation Audit and Assessment 2007' recommended a new facility for older children/teenagers - so maybe could be developed alongside.

ET15

Land r/o Oxenbridge Row, Etchingham

Site Details

Location

Settlement:

Rural: Etchingham

Address:

Land r/o Oxenbridge Row, Etchingham

Parish:

Etchingham

Ward:

Ticehurst and Etchingham

South Coast Sub Region:

No

Brownfield or Greenfield?

G

Size (Ha)

0.44

Current Land Use

Green field and car park at east point.

Wholly within development boundary

☐

Partially within development boundary

☐

Abut development boundary

☒

Outside development boundary

☐

Policy Context and Identified Need

Core Strategy Consultation on Strategy Directions recommends 15-40 dwellings, including the outstanding allocation of 17 units. The Rural Settlement Study suggests need for new employment uses alongside any new housing. The 'Open Space, Sport and Recreation Study' recommends that a new allotment is needed (medium priority).

Planning History

●A/69/947 approved in 1969 for provision of car parking area for adjoining Council houses (within east of site).

Environmental Factors

AONB, Flood risk.

ESCC Landscape Assessment Capacity to Accept Change - Housing:

Low

On-Site Appraisal

Summary of Constraints identified from On-Site Appraisals

Landscape, Access, Flooding, drainage.

Layout/design parameters

TBC

Potential Mitigation Measures:

Thickening of tree and hedge lines at boundaries. Need to protect and enhance the river corridor, floodplain and surrounding area.

Highways and Accessibility Issues

Access to nearest

Distance from

Convenience Food Shop

est. 230m

Primary School

est. 1.4km (Etchingham CE Primary School)

Bus Route:

est. 120m

Railway Station

est. 810m (Etchingham)

Main Doctors Surgery

est. 3.9km (Fairfield Surgery, Burwash)

On-Site Access Issues

(as further advised by ESCC Highways)

Access from Oxenbridge Lane to east requiring removal or re-sting of existing small car-park. ESCC advice "Access currently serves a car park. Visibility to the southeast not to standard though could be overcome through removal of vegetation and some hard landscaping. Site is on edge of village where speed limits change. May require extension of 30 mph zone." NOTES: research into OWNERS AND ISSUES WITH CAR PARK ON-GOING. The car park was built following a 1969 planning application to ESCC (A/69/947). It does not appear to have been built at the same time as the adjacent housing. REQUEST BOTH ESCC HIGHWAYS & RDC ESTATES FOR OWNERSHIP OF CAR PARK.

Utilities and Infrastructure

Gas Cables:

Appears to be no gas at all in vicinity - source UtilityMaps. British Gas Transco consulted on 07/01/10.

SFRA Issues (+ Southern Water Advice where sought):

None

Contamination Issues:

Environmental Health (March 2010) Confirmed "No issues"

Other Factors / Constraints

Availability / Ownership Constraints:

TBC

Awaiting Relocation of Current Use:

Small car park at east side may need to re-located.

Level of Developer Interest:

Low

Recommendations for How Constraints Could Be Overcome:

Access needs to be secured

Viability Assessment

e.g: cost factors, market factors based on HMP site archetypes

Archetype 1 - Small Edge of Settlement Greenfield Site, Discussion at Housing Market Partnership (22/02/2010) suggests this type of site is likely to be viable.

Archetype 5 - Development on access constrained land Discussion at Housing Market Partnership (22/02/2010) suggests this type of site is likely to be viable, although access issues are a constraint.

Development Opportunities

Total Residential Units

Approx 13

Affordable Units

Up to 100%

Indicative Density (units per ha)

30ph

Availability/Timescale

Available Now?

No - policy constrained as outside development boundary.

How long to fully develop the site?

Available within 5 Years?

Maybe - pending ownership of wider site (access is owned bv RDC)

Conclusions

Yes, although extension of development boundary within AONB. Developable subject to sequential and exception test. Environment Agency advise "need to investigate the environmental and physical capacity at the Weald and Burwash waste water treatment works and where necessary consider the need for tightening the water quality discharge standards." Transco advice sought. Maybe developable - pending ownership of wider site (access is owned by RDC) and EA matters.

FO12

Land at Buddens Green, Four Oaks

Site Details

Location

Settlement:

Rural: Four Oaks

Address:

Land at Buddens Green, Four Oaks

Parish:

Beckley

Ward:

Rother Levels

South Coast Sub Region:

No

Brownfield or Greenfield?

Greenfield

Size (Ha)

1.64

Current Land Use

Field

Wholly within development boundary

☐

Partially within development boundary

☐

Abut development boundary

☒

Outside development boundary

☐

Policy Context and Identified Need

The site is situated outside of a recognised development boundary and is within the High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. The Rural Settlements Study states that with its almost non-existent level of service provision in combination with environmental constraints, Four Oaks is not a sustainable location for new development of any significant scale. Development should therefore be limited to small scale permissions for infill to meet local needs.

Planning History

●Outline RR/2004/498/P dismissed on Appeal in March 2005 for 47 social and affordable dwellings (issues: no proven need for development of scale proposed - Beckley unsuitable location on housing and sustainability grounds, harmful to AONB and character/appearance of area).
●Refused applications relating to development of North-West corner of site (adj to The Gables) as follows: ●RR/2002/232/P appeal dismissed in Sept 2002 for pair of affordable semi-det houses (issues: not suitable site for housing development, adverse impact on character and appearance of countryside). ●RR/2001/1048/P refused in 2001 for two dwellings; ●RR/88/2672 appeal dismissed in 1988 for one dwelling.

Environmental Factors

The site is within the High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and a Public Footpath abuts the eastern boundary.

ESCC Landscape Assessment

Capacity to Accept Change - Housing:

Low - None

On-Site Appraisal

Summary of Constraints identified from On-Site Appraisals

Any development could potentially have an adverse impact upon the amenities of adjoining residential properties.

Layout/design parameters

Potential Mitigation Measures:

N/a

N/a

Highways and Accessibility Issues

Access to nearest

Distance from

Convenience Food Shop

est. 3.3km (Peasmarsh)

Primary School

est. 835m (Beckley CE Primary School)

Bus Route:

est. 500m

Railway Station

est. 12.7km (Winchelsea)

Main Doctors Surgery

est. 3.6km (Northiam Surgery)

On-Site Access Issues

(as further advised by ESCC Highways)

None. Straightforward access to and from the site. ESCC Highways advise "Access from Buddens Green is considered most appopriate in this location. Bus stops in convenient proximity."

Utilities and Infrastructure

Gas Cables:

No high pressure gas mains impacting on site

SFRA Issues (+ Southern Water Advice where sought):

Flood Surface Water Less 2009 (strip of land mid North boundary to South West corner)

Contamination Issues:

No apparent issues.

Other Factors / Constraints

Availability / Ownership Constraints:

Awaiting Relocation of Current Use:

Level of Developer Interest:

Recommendations for How Constraints Could Be Overcome:

Viability Assessment

e.g: cost factors, market factors based on HMP site archetypes

Archetype 1 - Small Edge of Settlement Greenfield Site
Discussion at Housing Market Partnership (22/02/2010) suggests this type of site is likely to be viable.

Development Opportunities

Total Residential Units

Affordable Units

Indicative Density (units per ha)

Perhaps 10 additional dwellings to meet local need in Beckley/Four Oaks. Site would not need to be developed in its entirety.

TBC

30ph

Availability/Timescale

Available Now?

How long to fully develop the site?

Available within 5 Years?

No. Policy constrained as outside development boundary.

Maybe - owners depending

Conclusions

Although the site is situated outside of a recognised development boundary and the Rural Settlements Study states that Four Oaks is not a sustainable location for new development of any significant scale, the site has potential. It is sufficiently close to Beckley village that it would arguably help meet Beckley's needs as well. Furthermore, existing housing on site has been laid out in such a way so as to allow for further extension and development.

HF6

Land adj to Rock Lane, Hastings

Site Details

Location

Settlement:

Hastings Fringes

Address:

Land adj. To Rock lane, Hastings

Parish:

Guestling

Ward:

Marsham

South Coast Sub Region:

Yes

Brownfield or Greenfield?

G

Size (Ha)

4.52 (3.31 in Parish)

Current Land Use

Vacant greenfield

Wholly within development boundary

☐

Partially within development boundary

☐

Abut development boundary

☒

Outside development boundary

☐

Policy Context and Identified Need

Hastings Fringes earmarked for 200-450 new houses up to 2026 with Core Strategy Consultation on Strategy Directions Nov 2008. Same document discusses need to develop multi-functional green spaces as part of the management of the urban frine of Hastings, including specific regard to land between Ivyhouse lane and Rock Lane (an area including sites HF6, HF8 and HF9)

Planning History

●A/49/655 approved in 1950 (lapsed) for agricultural bungalow (north east corner of HF6).

Environmental Factors

AONB. Adj Ancient Woodland. Adj Wet Woodland.

ESCC Landscape Assessment Capacity to Accept Change - Housing:

Not assessed

On-Site Appraisal

Summary of Constraints identified from On-Site Appraisals

Landscape

Layout/design parameters

N/A

Potential Mitigation Measures:

N/A

Highways and Accessibility Issues

Access to nearest	Distance from
Convenience Food Shop	est. 400m (Grove Road Stores) (via NE- Rock Lane)
Primary School	est. 700m (Sandown or Red Lake Primary Schools)
Bus Route:	est. 500m (A259)
Railway Station	est. 2.4km (Ore)
Main Doctors Surgery	est. 700m (Ore Clinic)

On-Site Access Issues (as further advised by ESCC Highways)

Rock Lane to east abuts boundary. ESCC Highways advise (03/10) "Not ideal for the creation of a new junction as a position for gaining appropriate visibility is difficult. Based on actual speeds, it would seem that visibility to south would be 43m and to north 59m from a set back point of 2.4m."

Utilities and Infrastructure

Gas Cables:

No high pressure gas mains impacting on site

SFRA Issues (+ Southern Water Advice where sought):

Flood Surface Water Less 2009 affects small area to S.

Contamination Issues:

No apparent issue

Other Factors / Constraints

Availability / Ownership Constraints:

No.

Awaiting Relocation of Current Use:

No

Level of Developer Interest:

High

Recommendations for How Constraints Could Be Overcome:

Access needs to be confirmed.

Viability Assessment

e.g: cost factors, market factors based on HMP site archetypes

Archetype 2 - Large Edge of Settlement Greenfield Site
Discussion at Housing Market Partnership (22/02/2010) suggests this type of site is likely to be viable.

Development Opportunities

Total Residential Units

Estimated 35 dwellings on 0.85ha of east side.

Affordable Units

In line with standard

Indicative Density (units per ha)

Approx 40ph

Availability/Timescale

Available Now?

No. Policy constrained as outside development boundary.

How long to fully develop the site?

2 - 3 years

Available within 5 Years?

Maybe for small discrete section at eastern third - pending ESCC Highways advice. No for maiority of site.

Conclusions

Yes - eastern third of site may be suitable for residential and employment.

NO15

Land South of Northiam C of E Primary School

Site Details

Location

Settlement:	Rural: Northiam		
Address:	Land south of Northiam C of E Primary School		
Parish:	Northiam	Ward:	Rother Levels
South Coast Sub Region:	No		
Brownfield or Greenfield?	g	Size (Ha)	0.36
Current Land Use	Vacant green field		
Wholly within development boundary☐Partially within development boundary☐ Abut development boundary☒Outside development boundary☐			

Policy Context and Identified Need

Core Strategy identifies Northiam as suitable for housing growth of 10-50 dwellings as well as new employment. The 'Open Space, Sport and Recreation Study' identifies the need for a new play area as a high priority.

Planning History

● Refused outline RR/88/2594 in 1989 for 3 dwellings (reasons: undesirable ribbon development, detrimental to visual amenities of locality, harmful to AONB, outside development area, traffic hazards).

Environmental Factors

AONB. Adjacent Conservation Area.	
ESCC Landscape Assessment Capacity to Accept Change - Housing:	None - Low

On-Site Appraisal

Summary of Constraints identified from On-Site Appraisals	
Extension of development boundary. Not in centre of village. Loss of trees and hedgerows.	
Layout/design parameters	Development extending back from frontage into site would be feasible.
Potential Mitigation Measures:	Replace lost trees or hedgerows at boundary

Highways and Accessibility Issues

Access to nearest	Distance from
Convenience Food Shop	est. 680m (Northiam)
Primary School	adj to north (Northiam CE Primary School)
Bus Route:	on road frontage
Railway Station	est. 9.2km (Doleham)
Main Doctors Surgery	est. 325m (Northiam Surgery)

On-Site Access Issues (as further advised by ESCC Highways)

Most obvious access point to A28 is adjacent to school where site lines are good, although opposite a junction. ESCC Highways advise "Visibility achievable along whole of site frontage onto Main Street. Access position should be at either furthest north or south points of the site frontage."

Utilities and Infrastructure

Gas Cables:	No high pressure gas mains impacting on site
SFRA Issues (+ Southern Water Advice where sought):	None
Contamination Issues:	Environmental Health (March 2010) Confirmed "No issues"

Other Factors / Constraints

Availability / Ownership Constraints:
TBC
Awaiting Relocation of Current Use:
No
Level of Developer Interest:
Medium - past history of development application.
Recommendations for How Constraints Could Be Overcome:

Viability Assessment e.g: cost factors, market factors based on HMP site archetypes

Archetype 1 - Small Edge of settlement greenfield site
Discussion at Housing Market Partnership (22/02/2010) suggests this type of site is likely to be viable

Development Opportunities

Total Residential Units	Approximately 12-14
Affordable Units	40 - 100%
Indicative Density (units per ha)	30dph

Availability/Timescale

Available Now?	No - Policy constrained as outside development boundary
How long to fully develop the site?	
Available within 5 Years?	Maybe - owners dependent.

Conclusions

Yes, dependent on agreement from all owners.

NO19n Land at Blue Cross Animal Hospital, Beales Lane

Site Details

Location

Settlement:

Rural: Northiam

Address:

Land at Blue Cross Animal Hospital, Beales Lane

Parish:

Northiam

Ward:

Rother Levels

South Coast Sub Region:

No

Brownfield or Greenfield?

B

Size (Ha)

0.471

Current Land Use

Animal hospital, including fields for horses grazing.

Wholly within development boundary

☐

Partially within development boundary

☒

Abut development boundary

☐

Outside development boundary

☐

Policy Context and Identified Need

Core Strategy identifies Northiam as suitable for housing growth of 10-50 dwellings as well as new employment. The 'Open Space, Sport and Recreation Study' identifies the need for a new play area as a high priority.

Planning History

●Planning history relating to existing use. Most recently:
●RR/2004/144/P approved in 2004 for extension to form an equine vetinary centre with part change of use of paddock to car parks.

Environmental Factors

AONB. Small part Conservation Area. Adjacent Listed Buildings.

ESCC Landscape Assessment Capacity to Accept Change - Housing:

Low - Moderate

On-Site Appraisal

Summary of Constraints identified from On-Site Appraisals

Access. Impact upon neighbouring amenities.

Layout/design parameters

TBC

Potential Mitigation Measures:

Planting at boundaries

Highways and Accessibility Issues

Access to nearest

Distance from

Convenience Food Shop

est. 240m (access Beales Lane)

Primary School

est. 910m (Northiam CE Primary School)

Bus Route:

est. 70m (access Beales Lane)

Railway Station

est. 9.8km (Doleham)

Main Doctors Surgery

est. 675m (Northiam Surgery)

On-Site Access Issues

(as further advised by ESCC Highways)

ESCC Highways comments (03/10) "Would certainly not suggest that it is ruled out as any one-way design would be dependent on a safety audit/future of PH site/relocation of the PH car park. These access roads cannot accommodate 2 way flows or pedestrians currently - suggested that a suitably laid out one-way circuit could work though reconstruction of the access roads would still be necessary, in order to create either a shared surface (if ped use is envisaged on road) and/or improve forward visibility. Current width restrictions would not necessarily rule out this site if such a scheme can be achieved. The points of access would not need to be relocated though egress and ingress should be selected on the basis of optimal visibility - my understanding of the site is that ingress is better suited to the hospital access and egress from Hylands. There is an issue with regard to whether road remain private or become adopted. Ideally, all roads should be constructed to an adoptable standard in the event that if in the future, the estate managers do not wish to privately maintain them, they can be offered for adoption through the s 28 process. It is important that this option remains open in the event that there

Utilities and Infrastructure

Gas Cables:

No high pressure gas mains impacting on site

SFRA Issues (+ Southern Water Advice where sought):

Flood Surface Water Less 2009 (north-west corner). Southern Water advise (11/02/10) "Redevelopment site, remove surface water from foul sewer"

Contamination Issues:

Environmental Health (March 2010)
Historic - St. Francis Fields of Rest (Blue Cross) (?pet/animal cemetery).

Current - St. Francis Fields of Rest (Blue Cross) (animal sanctuary

Other Factors / Constraints

Availability / Ownership Constraints:

Owners contacted. Continuing dialogue with the Blue Cross.

Awaiting Relocation of Current Use:

Yes

Level of Developer Interest:

TBC

Recommendations for How Constraints Could Be Overcome:

Access needs to be achieved.

Viability Assessment e.g; cost factors, market factors based on HMP site archetypes

North: Archetype 5 - Access constrained land, Discussion at Housing Market Partnership (22/02/2010) suggests this type of site is likely to be viable, although access issues are a constraint.

Archetype 4 - Development on unused or underused areas.

South:

Development Opportunities

Total Residential Units

At least 20 across the 2 sites (NO19n & NO19s).

Affordable Units

In line with standards.

Indicative Density (units per ha)

30-50ph

Availability/Timescale

Available Now?

No - in another use.

How long to fully develop the site?

TBC

Available within 5 Years?

No, not at present - north site

Conclusions

NO19n and NO19s together comprise a very small fraction (6.8%) of wider Blue Cross site. Both are centrally located site accessible to key services, but access is a difficult issue. North site very flat, but single vehicle access and close to listed properties. Although offering many advantages in terms of proximity to the village core, access issues constrain this site from being considered developable at this point in time. Maybe as part of broad location.

NO19s

Land at Blue Cross Animal Hospital, Beales Lane

Site Details

Location

Settlement:

Rural: Northiam

Address:

Land at Blue Cross Animal Hospital, Beales Lane

Parish:

Northiam

Ward:

Rother Levels

South Coast Sub Region:

No

Brownfield or Greenfield?

B

Size (Ha)

0.437

Current Land Use

Animal hospital, including fields for horses grazing

Wholly within development boundary

☐

Partially within development boundary

☒

Abut development boundary

☐

Outside development boundary

☐

Policy Context and Identified Need

Core Strategy identifies Northiam as suitable for housing growth of 10-50 dwellings as well as new employment. The 'Open Space, Sport and Recreation Study' identifies the need for a new play area as a high priority.

Planning History

●Planning history relating to existing uses (Blue Cross).

●It is also noteworthy that a development of 3 dwellings on the land immediately adj to the East of the site has been allowed on appeal (RR/2008/2574/P) in May 2009.

Environmental Factors

AONB. Conservation Area. Adjacent Listed Buildings.

ESCC Landscape Assessment Capacity to Accept Change - Housing:

Low - Moderate

On-Site Appraisal

Summary of Constraints identified from On-Site Appraisals

Access. Impact upon neighbouring amenities.

Layout/design parameters

TBC

Potential Mitigation Measures:

Planting at boundaries

Highways and Accessibility Issues

Access to nearest

Distance from

Convenience Food Shop

est. 55m

Primary School

est. 550m (Northiam CE Primary School)

Bus Route:

on road frontage

Railway Station

est. 9.8km (Doleham)

Main Doctors Surgery

est. 305m (Northiam Surgery)

On-Site Access Issues

(as further advised by ESCC Highways)

ESCC advice on southern site "From the southernmost point between The White House and Highfields, there could potentially be a site levels issue and certainly a loss of trees. As this section accommodates a lay-by for car parking, there would be a loss as a result of an access in this position. If there is an ideal position for an access, furthest west would be better in terms of visibility."
RDC - It may also be possible to access the south site through land to the south-east which has two unimplemented permissions (RR/2008/2574/P and RR/2008/1843/P)
Further ESCC advice 03/10 "NO19s has easier options available then NO19n. There is an option to tap into the access arrangements at adjacent permission given that development has been allowed on appeal. Depending on the number of houses being allocated, the access construction may need slight adjustment. This would certainly be the preferred option over creating a new access across the lay-by."

I hope this is helpful. Pleased do not hesitate to contact me should you have any further questions.

Utilities and Infrastructure

Gas Cables:

No high pressure gas mains impacting on site

SFRA Issues (+ Southern Water Advice where sought):

None

Contamination Issues:

Environmental Health (March 2010)
Historic - St. Francis Fields of Rest (Blue Cross) (?pet/animal cemetery).

Other Factors / Constraints

Availability / Ownership Constraints:

Owners contacted. Continuing dialogue with the Blue Cross.

Awaiting Relocation of Current Use:

Yes

Level of Developer Interest:

TBC

Recommendations for How Constraints Could Be Overcome:

Access needs to be achieved.

Viability Assessment

e.g; cost factors, market factors based on HMP site archetypes

North: Archetype 5 - Access constrained land, Discussion at Housing Market Partnership (22/02/2010) suggests this type of site is likely to be viable, although access issues are a constraint.

Archetype 4 - Development on unused or underused areas.

South:

Development Opportunities

Total Residential Units

Perhaps 10

Affordable Units

In line with standards.

Indicative Density (units per ha)

30-50ph

Availability/Timescale

Available Now?

No - in another use.

How long to fully develop the site?

TBC

Available within 5 Years?

Maybe. Some access issues to be resolved.

Conclusions

NO19n and NO19s together comprise a very small fraction (6.8%) of wider Blue Cross site. Centrally located site accessible to key services, but access is a difficult issue. At the southern field access between The White House and Highfields, there could potentially be a site levels issue and certainly a loss of trees. As this section accommodates a lay-by for car parking, there would be a loss as a result of an access in this position. If there is an ideal position for an access, furthest west would be better in terms of visibility. Althernatively it may be possible to access the site through land to the south-east which has an unimplemented residential permission.

Sites Appendix ii: Suitable but not Currently Developable Sites (Amber)

PS7

Land at Oaklands, Main Street, Peasmarsh

Site Details

Location

Settlement:

Rural: Peasmarsh

Address:

Land at Oaklands, Main Street, Peasmarsh

Parish:

Peasmarsh

Ward:

Rother Levels

South Coast Sub Region:

No

Brownfield or Greenfield?

B

Size (Ha)

2.35

Current Land Use

Residential/grazing land/keeping horses

Wholly within development boundary

☐

Partially within development boundary

☒

Abut development boundary

☐

Outside development boundary

☐

Policy Context and Identified Need

Strategy Directions - 10-40 additional dwellings.
RSS - High housing need and high demand from Register (and existing high social housing stock).
Limited need for additional local job opportunities.
New play area required and provision of cycleways. Parish Council comment - little choice for those who want to downsize.

Planning History

Relevant history:
● RR/1999/1156/P approved 1999 for change of use of land from field to sand school for private use.
●RR/98/318/P approved in 1998 (Oaklands) for demolition of double garage, erect 2 storey extension & double garage and change of use of land to residential curtilage.
●RR/74/0831 approved in 1974 for change of use from orchard to recreation ground.

Environmental Factors

AONB. Rights of Way.

ESCC Landscape Assessment

Capacity to Accept Change - Housing:

Moderate

On-Site Appraisal

Summary of Constraints identified from On-Site Appraisals

Rural in character that reads part of the wider countryside.

Layout/design parameters

North eastern part of site relates to built form only

Potential Mitigation Measures:

Part of site only in any allocation in association with adjacent sites.
Landscape buffer to edge of any area for development would help create

Highways and Accessibility Issues

Access to nearest

Distance from

Convenience Food Shop

est. 320m (Jempsons)

Primary School

est. 900m (Peasmarsh CE Primary School)

Bus Route:

on road frontage

Railway Station

est. 7km (Rye)

Main Doctors Surgery

est. 4.4km (Rye Medical Centre)

On-Site Access Issues

(as further advised by ESCC Highways)

ESCC Highways (19/02/10) "Can only be utilised if suitable access can be achieved through either PS10 or PS21."

Utilities and Infrastructure

Gas Cables:

No high pressure gas mains impacting on site

SFRA Issues (+ Southern Water Advice where sought):

No issues on site, but sewerage flooding incident to south-east. Therefore site sent to Southern Water for consultation. SW advise (03/10) "Analysis suggests foul water capacity for the site. No plant crossing the site."

Contamination Issues:

Environmental Health (March 2010)
Confirmed "No issues"

Other Factors / Constraints

Availability / Ownership Constraints:

No

Awaiting Relocation of Current Use:

No

Level of Developer Interest:

High - Identified via external consultation

Recommendations for How Constraints Could Be Overcome:

Viability Assessment

e.g: cost factors, market factors based on HMP site archetypes

Archetype 2 - Large, Edge of Settlement Greenfield Site
Discussion at Housing Market Partnership (22/02/2010) suggests this type of site is likely to be viable.

Development Opportunities

Total Residential Units

Submitter "40"
Planning officer "12 (on 0.4 hectares)"

Affordable Units

4-5

Indicative Density (units per ha)

30ha

Availability/Timescale

Available Now?

No

How long to fully develop the site?

Submitter "Difficult to estimate"

Available within 5 Years?

No. Not currently accessible.

Conclusions

Northern section of the site has limited potential although ESCC Highways will only accept access via site PS21, which is problematic since owners of PS9 are unwilling to develop. Therefore the site is not considered developable. PS21 is the preferred development site for Peasmarsh in any event.

RB11

Bracken Hill House

Site Details

Location

Settlement:

Rural: Robertsbridge

Address:

Bracken Hill House, Knelle Road, Robertsbridge

Parish:

Salehurst & Robertsbridge

Ward:

Salehurst

South Coast Sub Region:

No

Brownfield or Greenfield?

B

Size (Ha)

0.49

Current Land Use

Private chalet bungalow and garden

Wholly within development boundary

☒

Partially within development boundary

☐

Abut development boundary

☐

Outside development boundary

☐

Policy Context and Identified Need

Core Strategy recommends 55-100 houses and need for employment. RSS indicates relatively high need for affordable housing and AIRS study identified 36 households in need. The Parish Council would like to see the inclusion of a sheltered/assisted housing scheme. PPG 17 study identified needs for play areas and amenity open space in west Robertsbridge and a facility for older children/teenagers in Robertsbridge. LAP identified aspiration for all year round footpath/cyclepath/bridleway.

Planning History

Relevant history:
●Refused outline RR/89/2099/P in 1989 for demolition of Bracken Hill and erection of 5 detached houses (reasons: over-development, out of character, detrimental to local amenities, loss of important natural gap in streetscene, loss of trees).

Environmental Factors

AONB. Abuts TPO to West.

ESCC Landscape Assessment
Capacity to Accept Change - Housing:

Not assessed

On-Site Appraisal

Summary of Constraints identified from On-Site Appraisals

Access only from Knelle Road - need to be shared to limit impacts.

Layout/design
parameters

Low density to reflect character of area.

Potential Mitigation
Measures:

Protect and maintain boundary trees and hedges.

Highways and Accessibility Issues

Access to nearest	Distance from
Convenience Food Shop	est. 710m
Primary School	est. 990m (Salehurst CE Primary School)
Bus Route:	est. 840m
Railway Station	est. 490m (Robertsbridge)
Main Doctors Surgery	est. 640m (Oldwood Surgery)

On-Site Access Issues (as further advised by ESCC Highways)

Via Knelle Road only. Not Brightling Road because of landscape/visual impacts and proximity to other road junctions. ESCC confirm access would be achievable from Knelle Road, but not possible from Brightling Road to south (03/12/2009). May be possible form north but TBC, change of levels would be a difficulty.
ESCC Written advice (19/02/10) "Access to site to be from Knelle Road. Access off Station Rd / Brightling Rd unlikely due to existing access points opposite site frontage. Access width of 4.5m x 10m required for 5 dwellings or more."

Utilities and Infrastructure

Gas Cables:

No high pressure gas mains impacting on site

SFRA Issues
(+ Southern Water Advice where sought):

None

Contamination Issues:

Environmental Health (March 2010)
Confirmed "No issues"

Other Factors / Constraints

Availability / Ownership Constraints:
TBC following contact

Awaiting Relocation of Current Use:

No

Level of Developer Interest:

Low - no recent history of development interest.

Recommendations for How Constraints Could Be Overcome:

Contact owners

Viability Assessment

e.g: cost factors, market factors based on HMP site archetypes

Archetype 7 - Redevelopment of Existing Properties in Large Grounds
Discussion at Housing Market Partnership (22/02/2010) suggests this type of site is likely to be viable.

Development Opportunities

Total Residential Units	14 at 30ph but likely to be lower to reflect surrounding density.
Affordable Units	40%
Indicative Density (units per ha)	30

Availability/Timescale

Available Now?

Maybe - depending on owner

How long to fully develop the site?

Available within 5 Years?

Maybe - depending on owner

Conclusions

Yes, although small scale intensification refused 20 years ago.

RY18

Land at Tilling Green School

Site Details

Location

Settlement:	Rye		
Address:	Land at Tilling Green School, Mason Road		
Parish:	Rye	Ward:	Rye
South Coast Sub Region:	Yes		
Brownfield or Greenfield?	B	Size (Ha)	0.93
Current Land Use	School		
Wholly within development boundary ☒ Partially within development boundary ☐ Abut development boundary ☐ Outside development boundary ☐			

Policy Context and Identified Need

22 new dwellings to be allocated, opportunities for cycle and footpaths 1650sqm retail floorspace, new library and cultural facility, consideration to sports provision.
priority site as within the development boundary

Planning History

● RR/1522/CC granted in 1984 (Rother ref. RR/94/559/C) for provision of additional office accommodation.

● ESX/178 granted in 1951 for primary school.

Environmental Factors

Flood zone.	
ESCC Landscape Assessment Capacity to Accept Change - Housing:	Not assessed

On-Site Appraisal

Summary of Constraints identified from On-Site Appraisals	
Potential overlooking.	
Layout/design parameters	retain trees and hedgerows and good linkages to recreation space adajcent
Potential Mitigation Measures:	

Highways and Accessibility Issues

Access to nearest	Distance from
Convenience Food Shop	est. 200m (Tilling Green Stores)
Primary School	est. 1.5km (Rye Community Primary School)
Bus Route:	on road frontage
Railway Station	est. 700m (Rye)
Main Doctors Surgery	est. 375m (Ferry Road Health Centre)

On-Site Access Issues

(as further advised by ESCC Highways)

ESCC Highways advise "Site has advantage of having former traffic movements associated with it, good quality vehicular access point is available. Close to bus stops, good quality footways. 15 units here is likely to be a reduction in traffic compared with a school."

Utilities and Infrastructure

Gas Cables:	No high pressure gas mains impacting on site
SFRA Issues (+ Southern Water Advice where sought):	Sewerage Flooding Incident (Old Brickyard & Udimore Road); Flood Surface Water Less 2009 (small area to east)
Contamination Issues:	Environmental Health (March 2010) Historic - Cadborough Brick and Tile works to South (not sure of exact spot) Electricity Sub-station

Other Factors / Constraints

Availability / Ownership Constraints:
No
Awaiting Relocation of Current Use:
New school being constructed and due to open September 2008
Level of Developer Interest:
High
Recommendations for How Constraints Could Be Overcome:
Flood mitigation

Viability Assessment

e.g: cost factors, market factors based on HMP site archetypes

Archetype 8 - Development on School site
Discussion at Housing Market Partnership (22/02/2010) suggests this type of site is likely to be viable.

Development Opportunities

Total Residential Units	10-15
Affordable Units	40%
Indicative Density (units per ha)	medium

Availability/Timescale

Available Now?	No
How long to fully develop the site?	Submitter "1 year"
Available within 5 Years?	Maybe for residential, although other uses, particularly community uses would also be an option. possibly as part

Conclusions

Yes, although issues related to flood zone. Developable subject to sequential and exception test. Site is also suitable for other uses, particularly community uses, possibly as part of a mixed use scheme.

RY40

Land at Rye Station

Site Details

Location

Settlement:	Rye		
Address:	Land at Rye Station		
Parish:	Rye	Ward:	Rye
South Coast Sub Region:	Yes		
Brownfield or Greenfield?	B	Size (Ha)	0.45
Current Land Use	car park, café, sheds for business and shopping		
Wholly within development boundary ☒ Partially within development boundary ☐ Abut development boundary ☐ Outside development boundary			

Policy Context and Identified Need

Site within Local Plan defined Rye Shopping Area. LDF Core Strategy Consultation on Strategy Directions indicates 22 new dwellings to be allocated, opportunities for cycle and footpaths 1650sqm retail floorspace, new library & cultural facility. Sites within development boundary prioritised

Planning History

●Considered during Local Plan process but withdrawn April 2004 (omission site no. 1043).

Environmental Factors

Flood zones, Adjacent listed buildings	
ESCC Landscape Assessment Capacity to Accept Change - Housing:	Not assessed

On-Site Appraisal

Summary of Constraints identified from On-Site Appraisals

Adj Conservation Area.	Traffic impact.
Layout/design parameters	opportunity to improve the character and appeal of the site and better relate it to the adjacent Conservation Area
Potential Mitigation Measures:	

Highways and Accessibility Issues

Access to nearest

Distance from

Convenience Food Shop	within Rye Shopping Area
Primary School	est. 800m (Rye Community Primary School)
Bus Route:	adj to (Station Approach)
Railway Station	adj to Rye Railway Station
Main Doctors Surgery	est. 340m (Ferry Road Health Centre)

On-Site Access Issues

(as further advised by ESCC Highways)

no major

Utilities and Infrastructure

Gas Cables:	No high pressure gas mains impacting on site
SFRA Issues (+ Southern Water Advice where sought):	Highway Flooding Hotspot; Flood Surface Water Less & Intermediate 2009
Contamination Issues:	Environmental Health (March 2010) Historic - Railway Station 'Electric' Coal Yard

Other Factors / Constraints

Availability / Ownership Constraints:	Yes - owners unwilling to release the land
Awaiting Relocation of Current Use:	
Level of Developer Interest:	
Recommendations for How Constraints Could Be Overcome:	

Viability Assessment

e.g: cost factors, market factors based on HMP site archetypes

Archetype 4) Development on unused or underused areas for car parking or otherwise unused. Discussion at Housing Market Partnership (22/02/2010) suggests this type of site will probably be viable in most circumstances, subject to land contamination costs.

Development Opportunities

Total Residential Units	#Deleted
Affordable Units	in line with standard.
Indicative Density (units per ha)	Hign.

Availability/Timescale

Available Now?	No - owners unwilling to release the land
How long to fully develop the site?	
Available within 5 Years?	No - owners unwilling to release the land

Conclusions

BROAD LOCATION. May be suitable for a comprehensive mixed use town centre development, but cannot be defined as currently developable in terms of SHLAA definitions.

RY7

Former Council Depot, Cyprus Place

Site Details

Location

Settlement:

Rye

Address:

Former Council Depot, Cyprus Place, Rye

Parish:

Rye

Ward:

Rye

South Coast Sub Region:

Yes

Brownfield or Greenfield?

B

Size (Ha)

0.0833

Current Land Use

Garages and collection of small buildings

Wholly within development boundary

☐

Partially within development boundary

☒

Abut development boundary

☐

Outside development boundary

☐

Policy Context and Identified Need

22 new dwellings to be allocated, opportunities for cycle and footpaths 1650sqm retail floorspace, new library and cultural facility. site is within the development boundary

Planning History

●RR/2001/2103/P approved in 2001 for change of use to include sale of building materials along with current use as tool hire/sales centre.

●RR/98/1528/P approved in 1998 for continued use of former council depot for tool hire and sales centre on a permanent basis.

●RR/92/2178/P approved in 1993 (time limited) for change of use of vacant council depot to tool hire and sales centre.

●Outline RR/91/2141/R5 deemed granted in 1991 for erection of 5 residential units, garages and parking and alterations to existing access.

Environmental Factors

Flood zone, archaeological sensitive area.

ESCC Landscape Assessment Capacity to Accept Change - Housing:

Not assessed

On-Site Appraisal

Summary of Constraints identified from On-Site Appraisals

Demolition likely to be required

Layout/design parameters

design appropriate to surrounding character

Potential Mitigation Measures:

high quality materials

Highways and Accessibility Issues

Access to nearest

Distance from

Convenience Food Shop

est. 60m (Rye Shopping Area)

Primary School

est. 1.1km (Rye Community Primary School)

Bus Route:

on road frontage (Wish Street)

Railway Station

est.300m (Rye)

Main Doctors Surgery

est. 350m (Ferry Road Health Centre)

On-Site Access Issues

(as further advised by ESCC Highways)

Directly off main road, small site. ESCC advise as follows (03/10) "This site currently has existing traffic movements and is located well in terms of proximity to public transport. Any proposed development should include carparking facilities off street as there are parking restrictions in place in this street."

Utilities and Infrastructure

Gas Cables:

No high pressure gas mains impacting on site

SFRA Issues (+ Southern Water Advice where sought):

Sewerage Flooding Incident (Wish Street). Southern Water advise (11/02/10) "Small redevelopment site, remove surface water from foul sewer"

Contamination Issues:

Environmental Health (March 2010) "Historic - Council Depot"

Current - Depot

Other Factors / Constraints

Availability / Ownership Constraints:

Owned by RDC

Awaiting Relocation of Current Use:

Level of Developer Interest:

Recommendations for How Constraints Could Be Overcome:

Viability Assessment

e.g: cost factors, market factors based on HMP site archetypes

Archetype 6 - Development on used or underused land with legacy of industrial activity. Discussion at Housing Market Partnership (22/02/2010) suggests the viability of this type of site may depend to a large extent of Section 106 contribution levels and that the local authority may need to be flexible in this regard. The type of site could be viable but there are likely to be complex issues that may act as a disincentive for developers.

Development Opportunities

Total Residential Units

7

Affordable Units

in line with standard

Indicative Density (units per ha)

High

Availability/Timescale

Available Now?

No. on lease till 2014.

How long to fully develop the site?

Available within 5 Years?

Maybe - Pending EA. RDC corporate aspirations for site mav need to be discussed further.

Conclusions

Yes, small site with potential for redevelopment. Opportunity to tie with with existing character and feel of area. RDC owned. On 10 year lease which expires 2014. Within flood zone - developable subject to sequential and exception test.

Sites Appendix ii: Suitable but not Currently Developable Sites (Amber)

SP2

Land west of The Tollgate, Staplecross

Site Details

Location

Settlement:

Rural: Staplecross

Address:

Land west of The Tollgate, Staplecross

Parish:

Ewhurst

Ward:

Ewhurst and Sedlescombe

South Coast Sub Region:

No

Brownfield or Greenfield?

G

Size (Ha)

0.68

Current Land Use

Pasture

Wholly within development boundary

☐

Partially within development boundary

☐

Abut development boundary

☒

Outside development boundary

☐

Policy Context and Identified Need

Rural Settlements Study states 'Given the locally expressed need it may be appropriate to investigate a small scale allocation of 0-10 dwellings that is predominantly for affordable housing with an emphasis on the needs of local residents'. It further suggests a possible need for local employment uses if an opportunity presents itself. In local plan as village with dev boundary and in Strategy Directions as village with potential for exception site.

Planning History

Relevant history:

●Outline RR/81/0635 dismissed on appeal in 1983 for residential development (issues: AONB, detract from character of area, no shortage of housing land, major part of site outside development area).

●Lapsed outline approval (A/73/1296) in 1974 for Council dwellings.

●Refused historic outlines (A/70/335 & A/71/1180) in 1970 and 1972 for residential development (reasons: outside development area, harm rural character of area, existing main drainage inadequate, highway objections.

Environmental Factors

AONB

ESCC Landscape Assessment

Capacity to Accept Change - Housing:

Low

On-Site Appraisal

Summary of Constraints identified from On-Site Appraisals

Fringe site with pond. Site quite exposed so mitigation would be needed to help any new development intigdate with existing development and protect character of rural finge location.

Layout/design parameters

To reduce impact of development on approaching village, 'Village Green' integral to design with green fronting main road would soften impact and respect listed building opposite

Potential Mitigation Measures:

Leave green area for informal open space, add pond here to replace possible one lost? Develop top two thirds of site and carry out deciduous

Highways and Accessibility Issues

Access to nearest

Distance from

Convenience Food Shop

est. 130m (assuming access via main road)

Primary School

est. 310m (Staplecross Methodist Primary School)

Bus Route:

on road frontage (if access via main road)

Railway Station

est. 7.5km (Robertsbridge)

Main Doctors Surgery

est. 4.8km (Sedlescombe Surgery)

On-Site Access Issues

(as further advised by ESCC Highways)

Potential access from Tollgate and main road without using 3rd party access. Approx 1 meter change in site level between site and Tollgate. ESCC Highways advise "Access provision is available from two locations, Staplecross Rd or Cricketers Field. From Cricketers Field is most suitable given that the potential devt can spur of the existig residential street which has footways in place. Distance from public transport (local bus stops) is less than 400m. From h/w point of view this is a feasible site."

Utilities and Infrastructure

Gas Cables:

No high pressure gas mains impacting on site

SFRA Issues (+ Southern Water Advice where sought):

None

Contamination Issues:

Environmental Health (March 2010) Confirmed "No issues"

Other Factors / Constraints

Availability / Ownership Constraints:

TBC

Awaiting Relocation of Current Use:

No

Level of Developer Interest:

Low

Recommendations for How Constraints Could Be Overcome:

Viability Assessment

e.g: cost factors, market factors based on HMP site archetypes

Archetype 1 - Small Edge of Settlement Greenfield Site

Discussion at Housing Market Partnership (22/02/2010) suggests this type of site is likely to be viable.

Development Opportunities

Total Residential Units

Approx 20 if 100% residential.Less with other uses.

Affordable Units

apprx 8

Indicative Density (units per ha)

30

Availability/Timescale

Available Now?

No - Policy constraints

How long to fully develop the site?

Available within 5 Years?

Maybe - ownership permitting

Conclusions

Yes. Site quite exposed so mitigation would be needed to help any new development intigdate with existing development and protect character of rural finge location.

Sites Appendix ii: Suitable but not Currently Developable Sites (Amber)

TC17

Land adj to Sub-Station

Site Details

Location

Settlement:

Rural: Ticehurst

Address:

Rear of Hillbury Gardens

Parish:

Ticehurst

Ward:

Ticehurst and Etchingham

South Coast Sub Region:

No

Brownfield or Greenfield?

G

Size (Ha)

2.12

Current Land Use

Vacant scrubland

Wholly within development boundary

☐

Partially within development boundary

☐

Abut development boundary

☒

Outside development boundary

☐

Policy Context and Identified Need

Core Strategy and Rural Settlements Study say 15 - 60 houses would be appropriate in Ticehurst which is identified as "Rural Service Centre". Accompanying employment also appropriate. Parish Council said there is demand for more outdoor sport facilities in their responses to the 'Open Space, Sport and Recreation Study'.

Planning History

- Withdrawn outline application RR/94/0075/P in 1994 for demolition of 4 bungalows & buildings and erection of 6 dwellings with workshop, offices & garaging.
- Refused outline A/60/948 in 1961 for residential development (reasons: outside development area, detrimental to visual amenities - especially when seen from high ground to south, inadequate access, existing agricultural use should remain).

Environmental Factors

Butterfly rich meadow. AONB. Adjacent Woodland. Wet Woodland & Ghyll Woodland.

ESCC Landscape Assessment

Capacity to Accept Change - Housing:

Low - Moderate

On-Site Appraisal

Summary of Constraints identified from On-Site Appraisals

Access

Layout/design parameters

TBC - dependent on access

Potential Mitigation Measures:

Planting at boundaries

Highways and Accessibility Issues

Access to nearest

Distance from

Convenience Food Shop

est. 460m

Primary School

est. 1.5km (Ticehurst & Flimwell CE Primary School)

Bus Route:

est. 60m (assuming access to west of Hillbury Gardens)

Railway Station

est. 4.8km (Stonegate)

Main Doctors Surgery

est. 335m (Ticehurst Surgery)

On-Site Access Issues (as further advised by ESCC Highways)

ESCC advise "Access between Hillbury House and 16 Hillbury Gardens has a steep gradient and width is inadequate to provide a 4.5m carriageway and footway to the site. Visibility is inadequate to the west." Possible access to north-east side through Warrens Coaches has been complicated by extant permission RR/2008/648 for 25 extra care apartments. The layout of the permission leaves potential to pass through on the east side although marked parking spaces present an obstacle. Alternatively, a revised layout of the scheme may allow through access west of the electricity sub-station. The west access may be preferable given the location of potential access to site TC8 on opposite side oif the road.

Utilities and Infrastructure

Gas Cables:

No high pressure gas mains impacting on site

SFRA Issues (+ Southern Water Advice where sought):

SFRA issues: Flood Surface Water Less 2009 (small area to west). Southern water site advice (11/2/10) "Capacity in local sewer, remove surface water from foul, if any"

Contamination Issues:

Environmental Health (March 2010) - Electricity Sub-station in NE corner

Other Factors / Constraints

Availability / Ownership Constraints:

Awaiting Relocation of Current Use:

Level of Developer Interest:

Recommendations for How Constraints Could Be Overcome:

Viability Assessment e.g; cost factors, market factors based on HMP site archetypes

Archetype 5 - Access constrained land Discussion at Housing Market Partnership (22/02/2010) suggests this type of site is likely to be viable, although access issues are a constraint.

Development Opportunities

Total Residential Units

60+

Affordable Units

In line with standard

Indicative Density (units per ha)

30ph

Availability/Timescale

Available Now?

No. Policy constrained as outside development boundary.

How long to fully develop the site?

Available within 5 Years?

Maybe - access dependent

Conclusions

Maybe - access may still be achievable at north east side as permssion RR/2008/648 for 25 extra care apartments has not yet been implemented. he layout of the permission leaves potential to pass through on the east side although marked parking spaces present an obstacle. Alternatively, a revised layout of the scheme may allow through access west of the electricity sub-station. The west access may be preferable given the location of potential access to site TC8 on opposite side oif the road.

TC19

Field west of Lower Platts

Site Details

Location

Settlement:

Rural: Ticehurst

Address:

Field west of Lower Platts

Parish:

Ticehurst

Ward:

Ticehurst and Etchingham

South Coast Sub Region:

No

Brownfield or Greenfield?

Greenfield

Size (Ha)

1.078

Current Land Use

Green field

Wholly within development boundary

☐

Partially within development boundary

☐

Abut development boundary

☐

Outside development boundary

☒

Policy Context and Identified Need

Core Strategy and Rural Settlements Study say 15 - 60 houses would be appropriate in Ticehurst which is identified as "Rural Service Centre". Accompanying employment also appropriate. Parish Council said there is demand for more outdoor sport facilities in their responses to the 'Open Space, Sport and Recreation Study'.

Planning History

Relevant history:

- Refused outline RR/89/2395/P in 1989 (reasons: outside development area, undesirable ribbon development - detrimental to visual amenities of locality, harmful to character and appearance of AONB, could encourage similar proposals in vicinity, application doesn't meet Council's requirements on affordable housing).
- Refused outlines A/57/444 and A/70/832 for residential development.

Environmental Factors

AONB, Ancient woodland, wet woodland, footpath.

ESCC Landscape Assessment Capacity to Accept Change - Housing:

Low - Moderate

On-Site Appraisal

Summary of Constraints identified from On-Site Appraisals

Character of area.

Layout/design parameters

TBC

Potential Mitigation Measures:

TBC

Highways and Accessibility Issues

Access to nearest

Distance from

Convenience Food Shop

est. 730m

Primary School

est. 780m (Ticehurst & Flimwell CE Primary)

Bus Route:

est. 240m

Railway Station

est. 5.8km (Stonegate)

Main Doctors Surgery

est. 800m (Ticehurst Surgery)

On-Site Access Issues

(as further advised by ESCC Highways)

Direct access onto B2099, the main road serving Ticehurst. There are at least two possible access points, all with good visibity. The NE corner and mid-way along the west boundary are access points on site. Alternatively it may be possible to share access with Greenacres at the west boundary. ESCC Highways advise (03/10) "Site falls just outside the 30mph zone, in a 40. The sightlines required would be 120m x 2.4m. Visibility is not achievable to the east. For site to be considered, 30mph zone would need to be extended so that a min of 70m visibility is achieved. Footways would need to be included as part of the development. Bus stops outside the acceptable walking distance. Mitigation necessary to enable this site to work."

Utilities and Infrastructure

Gas Cables:

No high pressure gas mains impacting on site

SFRA Issues (+ Southern Water Advice where sought):

None

Contamination Issues:

No apparent issues

Other Factors / Constraints

Availability / Ownership Constraints:

Awaiting Relocation of Current Use:

Level of Developer Interest:

Recommendations for How Constraints Could Be Overcome:

Viability Assessment

e.g: cost factors, market factors based on HMP site archetypes

Archetype 1 - Small Edge of Settlement Greenfield Site Discussion at Housing Market Partnership (22/02/2010) suggests this type of site is likely to be viable.

Development Opportunities

Total Residential Units

Up to 40

Affordable Units

TBC

Indicative Density (units per ha)

30ph

Availability/Timescale

Available Now?

No. policy constrained as outside of the development boundary.

How long to fully develop the site?

Available within 5 Years?

Maybe - Owners depending.

Conclusions

Yes. Although not abutting the development boundary this site nonetheless appears to offer potential. It does not appear to suffer from access constraints. It is perhaps less favourable in comparison to other opportunities in Ticehurst as it does not relate particularly well to the core of the village. Site falls just outside the 30mph zone, in a 40. The sightlines required would be 120m x 2.4m. Visibility is not achievable to the east. For site to be considered, 30mph zone would need to be extended so that a min of 70m visibility is achieved. Footways would need to be included as part of the development. Bus stops outside the acceptable walking distance. Mitigation necessary to enable this site to work.

WF13

Land at Tanyard Farm House, Fishponds Lane, Westfield

Site Details

Location

Settlement:

Rural: Westfield

Address:

Land at Tanyard Farm House, Fishponds Lane, Westfield

Parish:

Westfield

Ward:

Brede Valley

South Coast Sub Region:

No

Brownfield or Greenfield?

B & G

Size (Ha)

2.04

Current Land Use

Residential (west side) Paddock (east side)

Wholly within development boundary

☐

Partially within development boundary

☐

Abut development boundary

☒

Outside development boundary

☐

Policy Context and Identified Need

Core Strategy Consultation on Strategy Directions recommends between 55 and 70 new dwellings (including at least 40 from existing allocations). Other needs highlighted in evidence work include employment, an allotment and a new facility for older children/teenagers. The Westfield Parish Survey & Action Plan 2006 identified a number of local needs, including affordable housing for Westfield families, parking, more pedestrian pathways, Cycle routes, a youth club.

Planning History

Relevant history:

●RR/2008/477/P dismissed on Appeal in April 2009 for erection of two dwellings (issues: intrusive & visually harmful to character and appearance of AONB).

●Refused outline RR/74/1428 for 28 semi-detached houses (reasons: outside development area, drainage issues, highway issues).

Environmental Factors

AONB, footpath.

ESCC Landscape Assessment Capacity to Accept Change - Housing:

Moderate

On-Site Appraisal

Summary of Constraints identified from On-Site Appraisals

Access, trees, telegraph poles, existing buildings, possible drainage issue.

Layout/design parameters

Dependent on resolution of access and drainage.

Potential Mitigation Measures:

Additional planting at boundaries

Highways and Accessibility Issues

Access to nearest

Distance from

Convenience Food Shop

est. 530m

Primary School

est. 400m (Westfield School)

Bus Route:

est. 450m (if access NW - Fishponds Land)

Railway Station

est. 3.2km (Doleham)

Main Doctors Surgery

est. 590m (Westfield Surgery)

On-Site Access Issues

(as further advised by ESCC Highways)

Fishponds Lane on NW boundary is a narrow un-made track that would need highways works to function as an access road. Fishponds Lane connects to Moor Lane. ESCC Highways advise (19/02/2010) "Only possible if the access road along Fishponds Lane can be significantly upgraded to provide 5m carriageway with footway linked to existing network. Limit of 20 dwellings to be served from this access point (i.e. between sites WF13 and WF14)." On-going discussion with ESCC Estates. ESCC would also like to see a pedestrian / cycle way (potentially alongside an access road) provided from the Doctors Surgery to Workhouse Lane as part of any development of these sites.

Utilities and Infrastructure

Gas Cables:

No high pressure gas mains impacting on site

SFRA Issues (+ Southern Water Advice where sought):

SFRA Issues: Flood Surface Water Less & Intermediate 2009 (south). Southern Water advise (12/02/10) "Capacity in local sewer. Watercourse immediately adjacent, avoid inundation of foul system."

Contamination Issues:

Environmental Health (March 2010) Historic - Tanyard Farm and possible tannery; also landfill site to south. Tanyard Farmhouse.

Other Factors / Constraints

Availability / Ownership Constraints:

TBC

Awaiting Relocation of Current Use:

No - currently low density residential

Level of Developer Interest:

Medium - History of residential applications.

Recommendations for How Constraints Could Be Overcome:

Viability Assessment

e.g: cost factors, market factors based on HMP site archetypes

Archetype 1/2 - Edge of settlement greenfield site, Discussion at Housing Market Partnership (22/02/2010) suggests this type of site is likely to be viable. Archetype 7 - Redevelopment of Existing Properties in Large Grounds. Discussion at Housing Market Partnership (22/02/2010) suggests this type of site is likely to be viable.

Development Opportunities

Total Residential Units

Depending on extent of other uses incorporated into site. Highways concern suggests limit site to 20, although site size suggests a higher

Affordable Units

At least in line with standard.

Indicative Density (units per ha)

30 ph

Availability/Timescale

Available Now?

No

How long to fully develop the site?

Available within 5 Years?

Maybe - depending on owners

Conclusions

Maybe as part of broad location - for residential, employment, cycle way, facility for older children/teenagers.

Sites Appendix ii: Suitable but not Currently Developable Sites (Amber)

WF14

Land west of Fishponds Farm, Fishponds Lane, Westfield

Site Details

Location

Settlement:

Rural: Westfield

Address:

Land west of Fishponds Farm, Fishponds Lane, Westfield

Parish:

Westfield

Ward:

Brede Valley

South Coast Sub Region:

No

Brownfield or Greenfield?

G

Size (Ha)

0.47

Current Land Use

Pasture

Wholly within development boundary

☐

Partially within development boundary

☐

Abut development boundary

☒

Outside development boundary

☐

Policy Context and Identified Need

Core Strategy Consultation on Strategy Directions recommends between 55 and 70 new dwellings (including at least 40 from existing allocations). Other needs highlighted in evidence work include employment, an allotment and a new facility for older children/teenagers. The Westfield Parish Survey & Action Plan 2006 identified a number of local needs, including affordable housing for Westfield families, parking, more pedestrian pathways, Cycle routes, a youth club.

Planning History

●No planning history.

Environmental Factors

AONB. Footpath.

ESCC Landscape Assessment Capacity to Accept Change - Housing:

Moderate

On-Site Appraisal

Summary of Constraints identified from On-Site Appraisals

Access, character of area.

Layout/design parameters

Dependent on access and if other sites to south were to be developed.

Potential Mitigation Measures:

Highways and Accessibility Issues

Access to nearest

Convenience Food Shop

est. 610m

Primary School

est. 460m (Westfield School)

Bus Route:

est. 520m (access - Fishponds Lane)

Railway Station

est. 3.4km (Doleham)

Main Doctors Surgery

est. 640m (Westfield Surgery)

On-Site Access Issues

(as further advised by ESCC Highways)

Via Fishponds Lane - at present a rough narrow track seems to offer the most viable possibility. ESCC advise (19/02/2010) "Only possible if the access road along Fishponds Lane can be significantly upgraded to provide 5m carriageway with footway linked to existing network. Limit of 20 dwellings to be served from this access point (i.e. between sites WF13 and WF14)." ESCC would also like to see a pedestrian / cycle way (potentially alongside an access road) provided from the Doctors Surgery to Workhouse Lane as part of any development of these sites.

Utilities and Infrastructure

Gas Cables:

No high pressure gas mains impacting on site

SFRA Issues (+ Southern Water Advice where sought):

None

Contamination Issues:

Environmental Health (March 2010)
Current - Fishponds Farm adjacent to east

Other Factors / Constraints

Availability / Ownership Constraints:

Awaiting Relocation of Current Use:

No

Level of Developer Interest:

Low

Recommendations for How Constraints Could Be Overcome:

Viability Assessment

e.g; cost factors, market factors based on HMP site archetypes

Archetype 5 - Access constrained land Discussion at Housing Market Partnership (22/02/2010) suggests this type of site is likely to be viable, although access issues are a constraint.

Development Opportunities

Total Residential Units

Up to 15

Affordable Units

At least in line with standards

Indicative Density (units per ha)

30 ph

Availability/Timescale

Available Now?

No. Policy constraints as outside development boundary.

How long to fully develop the site?

Available within 5 Years?

Maybe - dependent on owners aspirations for this and for other sites (WF13) as well as on further advice from

Conclusions

Maybe as part of broad location - for residential, employment, cycle way, facility for older children/teenagers. However access is a constraint. Adjacent to ESCC land that was formerly retained for a by-pass. Although the scheme was rescinded in 2005, the ESCC land may offer ptential for a cycle route.

WF3

Land at Fishponds Farm and east of Workhouse Lane, Westfield

Site Details

Location

Settlement:

Rural: Westfield

Address:

Land at Fishponds Farm and east of Workhouse Lane, Westfield

Parish:

Westfield

Ward:

Brede Valley

South Coast Sub Region:

No

Brownfield or Greenfield?

B/G

Size (Ha)

2.07

Current Land Use

Grassland

Wholly within development boundary

☐

Partially within development boundary

☐

Abut development boundary

☒

Outside development boundary

☐

Policy Context and Identified Need

Core Strategy Consultation on Strategy Directions recommends between 55 and 70 new dwellings (including at least 40 from existing allocations). Other needs highlighted in evidence work include employment, an allotment and a new facility for older children/teenagers. The Westfield Parish Survey & Action Plan 2006 identified a number of local needs, including affordable housing for Westfield families, parking, more pedestrian pathways, Cycle routes, a youth club.

Planning History

- Refused RR/2006/2549/P in 2006 for re-development of site with 4 holiday homes (reasons: harmful to AONB, adverse affect on neighbouring amenities, inadequate access/junction).
- Relevant historic affecting southern part of site - land at Menadews, as follows:-
- Historic refusals/dismissed appeals (A/68/299, RR/81/0315, RR/86/2277 & RR/87/2241) for re-development. Most recently, refused outline RR/91/2478/P in 1992 for one bungalow (reasons: outside development area, harmful to AONB, undesirable backland development, highway objections).

Environmental Factors

AONB, footpath.

ESCC Landscape Assessment

Capacity to Accept Change - Housing:

Moderate

On-Site Appraisal

Summary of Constraints identified from On-Site Appraisals

Access, trees, landscape.

Layout/design parameters

Dependent on access and whether other sites in vicinity are included in development.

Potential Mitigation Measures:

Strengthening of boundaries.

Highways and Accessibility Issues

Access to nearest

Distance from

Convenience Food Shop

est. 300m

Primary School

est. 270m (Westfield School)

Bus Route:

est. 110m

Railway Station

est. 2.7km (Doleham)

Main Doctors Surgery

est. 20m (Westfield Surgery)

On-Site Access Issues

(as further advised by ESCC Highways)

Submitter: "The site is bisected by land owned by ESCC originally intended for a bypass for the village. The scheme to divert the A28 around the village is no longer proceeding and the land is not protected by the Highway Authority. The land in the control of the County Council offers the potential to provide access to the site from Moor Lane running parallel to Fishponds Lane, which was recognised as a potential access route when the site was identified as a proposed housing site in January 2003 by the planning authority (see attached plan- Towards a Planning Strategy for Rother District - Westfield Plan No.15). There is also potential to access the site from the allocated housing site at Westfield Down shown in the adopted local plan and from the road serving the Doctor's Surgery off the A28."

Planning Officer: A further potential access may be to Workhouse Lane to the west. Although requiring third part land this would offer the best accessibility to the village core. ESCC Highways advise (19/02/10) "Access off of Workhouse Lane would be unsuitable for further development. Potential to link with the Surgery access road to the north of the site." and on 07/03/10 "The whole site could be served from the surgery access if required." + "The access width connecting the site to Workhouse Lane would need to be a minimum of 4.5m"

Utilities and Infrastructure

Gas Cables:

No high pressure gas mains impacting on site.

SFRA Issues (+ Southern Water Advice where sought):

None

Contamination Issues:

Environmental Health (March 2010)
Historic - Works - more checks needed.

Gasworks and ex-gas works sites. Top of WF3 east polygon. What is it exactly?

Other Factors / Constraints

Availability / Ownership Constraints:

ESCC control adjoining land which is likely to be required to secure access to the site. It is likely that the CC would be a willing partner of the development as the land is surplus to

Awaiting Relocation of Current Use:

No

Level of Developer Interest:

High - Identified via external consultation

Recommendations for How Constraints Could Be Overcome:

Viability Assessment e.g: cost factors, market factors based on HMP site archetypes

Archetype 5 - Access constrained land
Discussion at Housing Market Partnership (22/02/2010) suggests this type of site is likely to be viable, although access issues are a constraint.

Development Opportunities

Total Residential Units

Submitter "62"

Affordable Units

Submitter "25"

Indicative Density (units per ha)

30ha

Availability/Timescale

Available Now?

No - policy constraints

How long to fully develop the site?

Don't know.

Available within 5 Years?

TBC - access & highways issues depending

Conclusions

Maybe as part of broad location (in combination with other sites in vicinity) - for residential, employment, cycle way, facility for older children/teenagers.
West side preferable for landscape reasons. ESCC Highways have indicated that the whole site could be served from the surgery access if required, but discussions ongoing regarding other possible access routes. Bisected by ESCC land that was formerly retained for a by-pass. Although the scheme was rescinded in 2005, the ESCC land may offer pntial for a cycle route.

Sites Appendix iii: Sites Excluded following On-Site Appraisal (Red)

ID	Site Name	Location	Parish	Summary of Environmental Policy	Summary of On-Site Constraints	Suitable Option for Development
AS1	Land at Brownbread Street, Ashburnham	Rural: Ashburnham	Ashburnham	AONB, Right of Way, Adjacent listed properties.	Setting. Visual impact. Loss of hedgerows.	In the event of Parish Council seeking an exception site this may offer an opportunity if developed alongside adjacent grazing site by roadway. It is is preferable to the other sites in Ashburnham (AS2, 3 and 4). However, there would still be landscape issues and current evidence does not suggest a particular need for affordable housing or an exception site in this area, so it is ruled out for the time being.
AS2	Ponts Green Farm, Main Road, Ashburnham	Rural: Ashburnham (Ponts Green)	Ashburnham	AONB, Listed building and Groundwater protection zone 3 on site. BAP habitats (wet woodland and ghyll woodland) in vicinity.	Tranquil, rural location not suited to development.	No. Not suitable for development allocation. Tranquil rural location removed from services and not related to an existing development boundary. Within exposed section of AONB. Within GPZ and contains listed building. Restrictive rural road network.
AS3	Newbuildings Farm, Main Road, Ashburnham	Rural: Ashburnham	Ashburnham	AONB, adjacent listed buildings.	Tranquil rural location with no accessible services. Landscape. Unsuitable for development.	No. Development not suited to this location.
AS4	Village Hall, Akehurst Field, Ashburnham	Rural: Ashburnham	Ashburnham	AONB. BAP habitat (Wet woodland 70m to south)	Tranquil, rural location. Landscape - extensive views east.	No. Not suitable for development. Already functions as Community hall/car park. Not well related to existing development boundary, services. Landscape impact on AONB.
BA1	Virgins Lane, Battle	Battle	Battle	AONB	Multi-ownership, access	Suitable in many ways, but not a reasonable prospect of coming forward. Development constrained by land parcel shape, trees, multi-ownership and access.
BA10	Vale Road, Off North Trade Road	Battle	Battle	AONB	Multi-ownership, 3rd party access, improving standard of Vale Road to highway authority's requirements may not be possible. Trees.	Suitable in many ways, but not a reasonable prospect of coming forward. Multi-ownership will be greatest constraint to development. Also, ESCC have expressed highways concerns in relation to previous applications. Relatively far from convenience shops.
BA12	Land r/o Battle Hospital	Battle	Battle	AONB Adjacent Ancient & Semi-Natural Woodland and Adjacent Wet Woodland	Part of site already has principle of development (southern side. Northern part at lower level and rural in character. Owner has advised that he would not want the land developed, so site not deliverable	No. Rural in character and reads as part of the surrounding countryside. Impact on AONB Adjacent Ancient & Semi-Natural Woodland and Adjacent Wet Woodland.
BA13	Land at western end of Vale Road	Battle	Battle	AONB	loss of trees, character of area.	No

ID	Site Name	Location	Parish	Summary of Environmental Policy	Summary of On-Site Constraints	Suitable Option for Development
BA16	Land North East of Isherwood	Battle	Battle	AONB, Rights of Way & Groundwater Source Protection Zone 3 within North of site	Any 3rd party access may prohibit development. Land locked site at present. Not clear on ownership so any multi-ownership may impact on deliverability.	The site has an advantage of proximity to built form. However it is constrained by access, groundwater source protection zone and impact on rural setting, as strongly emphasised in the Inspector's conclusions at the 2006 Local Plan Inquiry. Furthermore it is not within the preferred area of search as identified in the Core Strategy Urban Options Background Paper. May have multi-ownership implications which also may constrain development.
BA17	Land r/o Watchoak House	Battle	Battle	AONB, Groundwater Source Protection Zone 3 within north of site and adjacent Right of Way	Access constraints, needs to be considered with BA16, could be considered that footpath provides defensible boundary to development boundary. Loss of trees.	The site has an advantage of proximity to built form. However it is constrained by access, groundwater source protection zone and impact on rural setting. Furthermore it is not within the preferred area of search as identified in the Core Strategy Urban Options Background Paper.
BA18	Land at Almonry Farm (South), North Trade Road	Battle	Battle	AONB, partly within and adjacent to Ancient & Semi-Natural Woodland and Wet Woodland	A remote site, wholly rural	No
BA19	Land North of Caldbec Hill	Battle	Battle	AONB, adjacent to TPO	Important green space adjacent to Kingsmead open space, being a key rural element to Caldbec Hill. No direct access from the road as wide green verge lies between site and road. Landscape impact	No. Contrary to ESCC Landscape Character Assessment. Important AONB green space adjacent to Kingsmead open space, being a key rural element to Caldbec Hill. No direct access from the road as wide green verge lies between site and road.
BA20	Land South of Caldbec Hill	Battle	Battle	AONB, TPO, Rights of Way	Rural area of land that 'reads' as part of the wider landscape.	No
BA21	Land North of Car Park, Park Lane	Battle	Battle	AONB, Conservation Area, Archaeological Sensitive Area. Adj to Rights of Way & Bridleway. Close to SAM & listed buildings.	Historic core of Battle evidenced by Conservation Area designation. Development would impact upon historical boundaries, access constraints, setting of town	No
BA24	Land South of Greatwood Cottage, Marley Lane	Battle	Battle	AONB. Partly within and adjacent to Ancient & Semi-Natural Woodland and Wet Woodland. Near to Listed Buildings.	Site reads as wider landscape and important green edge to town built form.	No
BA25	Land at Lillybank Farm, London Road	Battle	Battle	AONB. Flood Zone 2.	Rural in context and character, on northern extremities of urban fringe	No

ID	Site Name	Location	Parish	Summary of Environmental Policy	Summary of On-Site Constraints	Suitable Option for Development
BA26	Land at Stream Farm	Battle	Battle	AONB. TPO. Flood Zones 2 & 3 to the North of site. Groundwater Protection Zone (SPZ) in South West corner. Adj listed building.	Wholly rural in character and reads as part of the AONB countryside	No
BA27	Land adj Tollgates and Claverham Way	Battle	Battle	AONB	Vehicular access needs to be investigated with Highway Authority. Site very exposed in countryside, with extensive views out.	No
BA29	Land at Whitehayes	Battle	Battle	AONB. TPO hedge adj north-west boundary. Right of Way close to north-west boundary.	Access main problem. Existing dwelling is very large and very wel maintained and is likely to cost a considerable sum. Given constraints of access which would constrain potential number of dwellings.	No
BA30	Land at Coultershaw	Battle	Battle	Registered Battlefield. AONB. Ancient Woodland and Wet Woodland to West. Right of Way adjacent to North.	Landscape impact. Trees and watercourse may restrict access from the west, smaller site than indicated due to school/institution use.	No. Registered battlefield - should not have come through initial assessment. Highways concerns.
BA32	Land r/o 116 Hastings Road	Battle	Battle	AONB. Strategic Gap. Adjacent Ancient Woodland and Wet Woodland crosses Southern boundary.	Site 'reads' as a wholly rural area, relatively unrelated to urban area of Battle	No
BA34	Field by Water Tower, Hastings Road	Battle	Battle	AONB. Strategic Gap. Archaeological Sensitive Area.	No existing access. Roadside ditch and trees. Open to view within the wider AONB.	No
BA35	Land at eastern end of Marley Lane Business Park, Battle	Battle	Sedlescombe	AONB. Ancient Woodland. TPO. Groundwater Source Protection Zones 1, 2 & 3.	Access should be via existing business park and only develop western part of site. Retain boundary trees/band of woodland.	Proposed for employment use. Multiple environmental constraints: AONB, Ancient Woodland, TPO, Groundwater Source Protection Zones 1, 2 & 3.
BA36	Land at Caldbec House, Caldbec Hill	Battle	Battle	AONB. Adjacent Rights of Way. Adj Listed Building.	Undeveloped valley side which forms important rural setting to northernmost part of town	No
BA37	Land at The Warren, Stevens Crouch, Battle	Battle	Catsfield	AONB	N/A Site visit not necessary as Environmental Policy factors rule out development	No

ID	Site Name	Location	Parish	Summary of Environmental Policy	Summary of On-Site Constraints	Suitable Option for Development
BA38	Land at Whitelands Cottage, North Trade Road	Battle	Battle	AONB	Relatively isolated site, away from development boundary	No
BA39	Land adj. To Frederick Thatcher Place, North Trade Road	Battle	Battle	AONB. Adjacent Listed Building.	Slightly elevated ground to adjacent development, access onto A271 at pinch point	No, ribbon development too far from shop. Not in preferred 'broad loaction for growth' as defined in Core Strategy Urban Options Background Paper November 2008.
BA40	Land adj to 73 North Trade Road	Battle	Battle	AONB	Forms an important gap in the otherwise developed frontage. Long distance views from ridge top location over countryside to the south.	No
BA41	Land at Netherfield Hill Farm, Netherfield Hill	Battle	Battle	AONB. Adjacent Ancient Woodland crosses boundary. Adjacent Wet Woodland. Adjacent Listed Buildings. Adjacent Right of Way.	Remote rural location some distance from services and facilities	No
BA42	Land at Fuller's Farm, Mount Street	Battle	Battle	AONB. Adjacent Right of Way.	Remote from town centre, rural landscape that 'reads' as part of the open countryside	No
BA43	Senlac Windows and Doors, Station Approach	Battle	Battle	AONB. Part of site within Archaeological Sensitive Area.	Split levels. Limited access. Relationships with neighbouring occupiers.	Existing employment site close to train station. Also in use as surface car park serving the station. Has potential for intensification/ redevelopment for mixed use but continuation of employment uses would be the priority. Any development would need to be phased with the provision of the necessary water/sewerage infrastructure.
BA44	Land at Almonry Farm (North), North Trade Road	Battle	Battle	AONB. Right of Way. Adjacent BAP habitats (Ancient Woodland and Wet Woodland crosses boundary). Adjacent Listed Building.	Care in design in north western corner, shaws/hedgerows and public footpath	No. Site adjacent to development boundary and in close walking distance from Battle town centre and recreational facilities. However, ESCC landscape study does not suggest any potential for development of any significant scale. Access is also a constraint.
BA45	Land at Stone Croft, Chain Lane, Battle	Battle	Battle	AONB. Adjacent to Right of Way.	Multi-ownership and access constraints	No
BA46	Land at Glengorse Farm (South West), Glengorse	Battle	Battle	AONB. Strategic Gap. Right of Way along boundary.	Remote from town and development boundary. Part of site quite elevated.	No. Distance from development boundary and remoteness from built form a key issue. Although site lies within favoured sector in 'Strategy Directions', the majority of this site lies some distance from existing built form.
BA47	Land at Glengorse Farm (South East), Glengorse	Battle	Battle	AONB. Strategic Gap. Right of Way along boundary.	Problems with accessibility. Impacts to neighbours and the highway network. Changes in level, trees, hedges and watercourse.	NO

ID	Site Name	Location	Parish	Summary of Environmental Policy	Summary of On-Site Constraints	Suitable Option for Development
BA5	Adjacent to Battle fire station, A2100	Battle	Battle	AONB.	Youth and community centre in use - loss contrary to Local Plan Policy CF2	No - unreliable to come forward at this time.
BA52	Land at North Trade Road, Battle	Battle	Battle	AONB. Listed building. Adjacent to BAP habitats (Ancient Woodland and Wet Woodland).	Comprehensive development likely to be unviable due to land costs, existence of low density housing, backland development	No
BA53	Land West of A2100, Battle	Battle	Battle	AONB. Archaeological Sensitive Area. Part of site within Conservation Area. Rights of Way.	Steep wooded site forming an important rural edge to historic core of the town	No
BA6	Car Park off Battle High Street	Battle	Battle	AONB. Conservation Area. Archaeological Sensitive Area. Right of Way.	Access forms part of character of Conservation Area	No
BA7	Battle High Street	Battle	Battle	AONB. Conservation Area. Archaeological Sensitive Area. Rights of Way. Adjacent to Listed Buildings.	Historic core of Battle evidenced by Conservation Area ASA designation. Development would impact upon historical boundaries, access constraints, setting of town and settlement pattern	No
BA8	Station Approach, Battle	Battle	Battle	AONB.	Changes in level. Limited access. Planting to north boundary.	Possible for employment. Sewerage flooding and surface flood water are a constraint, mixed use should not result in net loss of employment. Access is a constraint.
BA9	Land North of Abbots Close	Battle	Battle	AONB. Protected species.	No vehicle access. Sloping site. Proximity to railway (restrictions on development). Lots of trees with protected species.	No
BB2	Land adjoining Millward Gardens, Batchelors Bump	Rural: Bachelor's Bump	Guestling	Exposed AONB	Landscape, character of area	No
BB3	Land west of Winchelsea Road, Batchelors Bump	Rural: Bachelor's Bump	Guestling	AONB - BAP Habitats (Ghyll woodland and wet woodland)	Landscape, trees	No
BB4	Land at Thorsfield and Chatswood House	Rural: Bachelor's Bump	Guestling	Adjacent AONB.	Landscape	No. Exposed AONB.

ID	Site Name	Location	Parish	Summary of Environmental Policy	Summary of On-Site Constraints	Suitable Option for Development
BC1	Land at Luck Farm, Vicarage Lane, Burwash Common	Rural: Burwash Common	Burwash	AONB	Landscape. Access. Character of area and relationship to development boundary	No
BC2	Land to west of Westdown Lane, Burwash Common	Rural: Burwash Common	Burwash	AONB	Character of area. Relationship to development boundary. Access	No
BC3	Luck Farm, Burwash Common	Rural: Burwash Common	Burwash		Character of area. Road network	No
BE10	Land adj to community hall, Main Street, Beckley	Rural: Beckley	Beckley	AONB. Footpath	The site forms one of a few important gaps in the linear settlement pattern of Beckley, forming part of its special character	No
BL1	Land North of Park View, Brightling	Rural: Brightling	Brightling	AONB	Although within AONB, site is not visually intrusive. Access is the main constraint. Density of development may be limited by rural location and proximity of adjacent dwellings.	Although this site appears to offer the best prospect in an area of identified housing need, the character of the area and access are constraints. Planning history on sites elsewhere on the vicinity has weighed against creating new access points on Brightling Road, due to the rural character of the lane.
BL2	Land adj to Twelve Oaks Cottages, Brightling	Rural: Brightling	Brightling	AONB. BAP habitats (Wet woodland 20 metres to east on other side of road).	Serious visual impact upon landscape.	No.
BO1	Land west of Tillingham View, Broad Oak	Rural: Broad Oak	Brede	AONB. BAP habitats (Ghyll woodland and wet woodland adjacent to north).	Landscape impact. Lack of access opportunities.	Potentially suitable for employment and open space uses. Access is a constraint as well as landscape. Landscape issues are a particular concern at southern sections but less of a concern to north-east. Sites elsewhere within the development boundary in Broad Oak would be preferable for residential.
BO10	Sunbeam Farm Yard, Udimore Road, Broad Oak	Rural: Broad Oak	Brede	AONB, Public right of way, adjacent listed building.	Visual landscape and access. Availability of adjacent land.	Northern section may have potential for residential development if developed alongside neighbouring land to east (Site BO13) - 6 may just about be achievable across the two sites. But the northern section of this site is too small to be considered independently of BO13 which is not available. Despite the advantages of proximity to the village centre, the landscape constraints are significant to the south of the existing development boundary and residential development would not be appropriate.
BO11	Land South of the Old Manor House	Broad Oak	Brede	AONB, setting of listed building.	Access, trees, landscape.	No
BO12	Land to the Rear of Malvern Cottage	Broad Oak	Brede	AONB	Access, landscape.	No

ID	Site Name	Location	Parish	Summary of Environmental Policy	Summary of On-Site Constraints	Suitable Option for Development
BO13	Highlands	Rural: Broad Oak	Brede	AONB	Access, neighbouring amenities, vista from southern boundary.	Suitable, but developer not interested in developing. Otherwise a courtyard layout along lines of Rhias Glade might have been feasible. Potential to be developed alongsidenorthern section of site BO10 - 6 may just about be achievable across the two sites. Advantage of close proximity to the village centre.
BO2	Land to South of Goatham Lane, Broad Oak	Rural: Broad Oak	Brede	AONB, Ancient woodland, public footpath. BAP habitats (Ghyll woodland and wet woodland across south, east and west boundaries).	Exposed AONB landscape. Access. Trees and hedgerows.	No
BO4	Land at Burnt House Farm, Broad Oak	Rural: Broad Oak	Brede	AONB, right of way	Considerable landscape constraints at exposed AONB location limit scope for built development. Access also an issue.	Possible allotment potential
BO8	Land at Roundwood, Broad Oak	Rural: Broad Oak	Brede	AONB, nearby ancient woodland and SNCI. BAP habitats (Ghyll woodland and wet woodland at eastern boundary across road).	Access, Trees.	Originally submitted by external third party, although it has emerged that owners are not necessarily willing to develop. Therefore it cannot be considered a reasonable prospect. In the event of it becoming available, it may have potential for residential, possibly alongside other uses (open space, employment) as part of wider scheme across neighbouring sites. No capacity in local sewer, although redevelopment may offer scope for reduction in water/sewerage flows and developer would be required to investigate. As existing sewerage capacity is not currently available, development will need to be phased with the provision of the necessary infrastructure.
BO9	Land opposite Bell Hurst Cottage, Chitcombe Road	Broad Oak	Brede	AONB, Public footpath.	Exception Project reported "Development would potentially disrupt along open frontage, prominent site view from south"	Possibly suitable for allotment. Limited potential for built development given significant landscape constraints.
BR1	Land at Hilltop, Brede	Rural: Brede	Brede	AONB. GPZ Zone 3 within west of site.	Character of area, access. Landscape, trees, relationship to village core	Not sufficient scale to be considered as allocation. Treat as application for development boundary extension to rear garden boundary.
BR2	Land r/o The Red Lion Inn and 3 Peartree Croft, Brede Hill, Brede	Rural: Brede	Brede	AONB. Listed building.	Character of area. Relationship to existing development boundary	No
BR3	Land adj to Stubb Lane	Brede	Brede	AONB, adjacent listed buildings.	Narrow access road	Yes. May be suitable for play area.

ID	Site Name	Location	Parish	Summary of Environmental Policy	Summary of On-Site Constraints	Suitable Option for Development
BU10	Land at the east side of Burwash	Rural: Burwash	Burwash	Whole site in AONB. Stream running through site (East/West)	Limited opportunity for access. Some areas too steep, open to views or treed. Lack of footways. Character of area.	No. Rural setting, character of area, land scape setting and lack of footways not condusive to development.
BU11	Land at Burwash	Rural: Burwash	Burwash	Whole site in AONB. Several trees subject to TPO. Public paths border to North and South.	No direct access. Open to view from surrounding countryside. Steeply sloping. Stream through site - North-West to South-East.	Open space potential.
BU12	Shamrock Field, Land north west 40-49 Shrub Lane, Burwash	Rural: Burwash	Burwash	Whole site in AONB.	No access currently available. Loss of trees and impact on views to/from AONB.	Not at this time.
BU5	Land at Court Barn Farm, Burwash	Rural: Burwash	Burwash	Whole site in AONB. Good quality oak tree on west side.	Access. Contaminated land. Landscape.	No - rural setting, landscape, unlikley to achieve 6 in any event. Tree oficer advice as follows "The tree at the front of the site in Burwash is a middle aged oak tree, in good condition and with its prominent location next to the road it should be retained. However, any development in front of the oak tree would be harmful to its amenity value and bring about pressure to prune or fell it.The stem diameter (60cm) would indicate a root protection area of 163 m2, or a circle around the tree with a radius of approx 7.2 metres. This would affect the position of any access roads into the site. The future growth of the tree should also be taken into consideration as a constraint in the design of any development in relation to its size, dominance, movement in strong winds and shading. Another large tree to the south of the oak could be affected by the development. This tree is not particularly a good specimen and I do not consider it would be worthy of protection."
BU8	Land adj to The Brambles, Burwash	Rural: Burwash	Burwash	Whole site in AONB. Public path along South boundary.	Open views and loss of trees/hedges would be detrimental to AONB. Poor relationship to other built development.	No
BX10	Recycling Centre and Car Park Little Common	Bexhill	N/a	None	Access, neighbouring amenities, noise pollution from electricity sub station.	No
BX12	Bar One Car Park, Bexhill	Bexhill	N/a	None	Frontage development only to both roads. Probably better to develop London Road site to depth of 'Bar One and retain Buckhurst Place for parking/amenity area.	No. Highways objections.

ID	Site Name	Location	Parish	Summary of Environmental Policy	Summary of On-Site Constraints	Suitable Option for Development
BX14	Bexhill Post Office	Bexhill	N/a	Conservation Area.	Loss of existing use	Yes, but not for residential. RDC Regeneration project. Would possibly be facilitated by relocating post office counter elsewhere in town centre and relocating sorting office to an industrial area. Replacement uses would typically be retail/cafe at street level, offices above street level, therefore opening up Devonshire Square. Hotel would also be a suitable use of site.
BX17	1-4 Cranleigh Close	Bexhill	N/a	TPO within site and adjacent to.	Access, character of area, neighbouring amenities.	None. Recent appeal dismissed in April 2008 to replace 4 dwellings with 32 units and 11 garages.
BX20	Beeching Road	Bexhill	N/a	Right of Way.	Impact on residential. Character of area.	No. Retention for employment is preferable.
BX23	Sidley Car Park, Ninfield Road	Bexhill	N/a	None	Any development could potentially have an adverse impact upon the amenities of adjoining properties. Two trees on the south east boundary of the site might be worth preserving. Access improvements are required.	The acceptability of a loss of car parking is a likely issue, so the site cannot be defined as suitable or developable at this point in time.
BX24	Land at Worsham Farm	Bexhill	N/a	SNCI. Rights of Way. Adj Ancient Woodland. Adj Wet Woodland.	Landscape	No; area to south of eastern part of Combe Wood may be further considered for Countryside Park related uses.
BX33	St Marks Church Car Park	Bexhill	N/a	None	Access, neighbouring amenities, impact of traffic on character of road network.	No, in use as church car park. There appears to be little alternative in the way of on-street parking in the vicinity.
BX34	Gorses Car Park	Bexhill	N/a	None	Loss of existing use	No. Well used car park.
BX36	Land adj to Conifers	Bexhill	N/a	None	Access, landscape, drainage	No
BX41	Land west of Old Harrier Kennels, Maple Walk	Bexhill	N/a	Flood Zones 2 & 3. Archaeological Sensitive Area. Rights of Way. Adj SAM.	Access, trees.	Good quality woodland (likely to be ancient although unconfirmed) and extension of development boundary in inaccessible location. Could only really be considered as an access to a wider area (e.g BX44 and BX40) where loss of valued trees may possibly be justified in order to facilitate a more strategic level of development. However, permission for 5 dwellings granted on BX76 effectively blocks potential access from south and negates any need for this site. Therefore site is not considered to be developable.
BX48	Land at Gotham Farm, Sandhurst Lane	Bexhill	N/a	Flood Zones 2 & 3. Right of Way.	Part of washland area; tranquil, remote countryside. Reads as part of open valley, extending to west.	Not suitable for development by virtue of character, low-lying ground and access. However still forms part of wider strategic broad location.

ID	Site Name	Location	Parish	Summary of Environmental Policy	Summary of On-Site Constraints	Suitable Option for Development
BX50	Land adj to 163 Barnhorn Road	Bexhill	N/a	Adj TPO	Landscape, trees	No
BX51	Land north of Clavering Walk	Bexhill	N/a	Flood Zones 2 & 3. Archaeological Sensitive Area. Right of Way. Adj SAM.	Access, character of area, impact on road network	No
BX52	Land West of Spring Lane	Bexhill	N/a	Flood Zones 2 & 3. TPO. Adj Ancient Woodland. Adj Wet Woodland.	Access, trees	Marginal development potential, with many safeguards needed. Viability doubtful. Only retain for further consideration as part of larger area, possibly for amenity provision, otherwise disbenefits would outweigh housing potential. Developable subject to sequential and exception test. However still forms part of wider strategic broad location.
BX53	Land at Westfield, Highwoods Avenue	Bexhill	N/a	None	Access, character of area, landscape	Suitable in many ways, but not a reasonable prospect of coming forward. There is one potential access crossing private residential land, with no clear prospect that this would come forward. Also given the likely scale of development, viability remains an issue given the existence of this third part 'ransom strip'.
BX54	Land at 168 Peartree Lane	Bexhill	N/a	Adj Ancient Woodland. Adj Wet Woodland. Adj SNCI, Adj TPO.	Character of area	No. Access via sunken country lane with no footways. Site far from services. Would be an extension into area of rural character with environmental constraints.
BX55	Land adj and inc 126 Peartree Lane, Bexhill	Bexhill	N/a	Adj Right of Way	Character of area, access	No
BX56	Land at Pebsham farm (South West), Pebsham Lane, Bexhill	Bexhill	N/a	Strategic Gap. Byway.	Any development could potentially have an adverse impact upon the amenities of neighbouring properties and there is a pond on the site. Possible contamination issues regarding the commercial/industrial unit that is on the site.	No
BX57	Land at Pebsham Farm (North), Pebsham Lane, Bexhill	Bexhill	N/a	Strategic Gap.	Any development could potentially have an adverse impact upon the amenities of neighbouring properties. Poor access to the site from either a track or through existing commercial/industrial units. There is a pond on the southern boundary of the site.	No

ID	Site Name	Location	Parish	Summary of Environmental Policy	Summary of On-Site Constraints	Suitable Option for Development
BX58	Land at Pebsham Farm (South East), Pebsham Lane, Bexhill	Bexhill	N/a	Strategic Gap. Byway.	Any development could potentially have an adverse impact upon the amenities of neighbouring properties. Possible contamination issues as the existing buildings are commercial/industrial in nature.	No
BX6	De La Warr Parade	Bexhill	N/a	None of any significance, although 35 metres from flood zone 2.	Any development could potentially have an adverse impact upon the amenities of neighbouring properties.	Possible potential redevelopment and intensification of existing, as outlined in original urban capacity study. However it does not seem a likely prospect of coming forward.
BX60	Land at Beeches Farm, Bexhill	Bexhill	N/a	Right of Way. Adj Flood Zones 2 & 3. Adj Listed Building.		Only suitable for some open space uses, but limited by topography and access
BX61	Land at Old Town Field, Bexhill	Bexhill	N/a	Archaeological Sensitive Areas. Right of Way. Adj Wet Woodland. Adj Coastal & Floodplain Grazing Marsh. Adj Flood Zones 2 & 3. Adj Ancient Woodland. Adj Listed Building. Adj Ramsar. Adj SSSI	Landscape, access, trees, hedges, character of area	No
BX65	Land r/o 290 Turkey Road, Bexhill	Bexhill	N/a	None	Character of area	None. Too far from services. Rural area. Better options and more sustainable locations in Bexhill. Adjacent to ESCC notified site.
BX68	Land adj. To Holly Close, Bexhill	Bexhill	N/a	Adj Ancient Woodland. Adj SNCI. Adj TPO. Adj Wet Woodland.	Character of area, access, landscape	No
BX69	Land at Glovers farm (West of Link Road), Bexhill	Bexhill	N/a	Right of Way. Adj SNCI.	Landscape, character of area, access	No
BX70	Land at Glovers Farm (East of link road), Bexhill	Bexhill	N/a	An SNCI adjoins the north west corner of the site. Public Rights of Way on/adjoining the site.	Planning Officer 'See North East Bexhill SPD'	Planning Officer 'See North East Bexhill SPD' - Most appropriate for existing grazing uses with connections to Countryside Park.
BX71	Ninfield Road, Bexhill	Bexhill	N/a	Right of Way. TPO.	Character of area, trees, access, drainage.	Very limited potential because of existing tree cover and TPO but should review if site BX67 is developed around it.
BX72	Land at Coneyburrow Lane, Bexhill	Bexhill	N/a	None	Character of area, including road network	Coneyburrow Lane is narrow country lane not suited to large scale development.
BX73	Land at Ashdown Brickworks Site, Bexhill	Bexhill	N/a	None	Landscape, access.	No

ID	Site Name	Location	Parish	Summary of Environmental Policy	Summary of On-Site Constraints	Suitable Option for Development
BX75	Land adj. Peartree Lane, Bexhill	Bexhill	N/a	Adj Ancient Woodland. Adj SNCI. Adj Wet Woodland.	Rural setting and character.	No. No footways on surrounding road network. Site far from services. Would be an extensio
BX77	Beeching Road	Bexhill	N/a	Right of Way.	Access only from Wainwright Road.	No. retention for mployment preferred in thislocation.
BX78	Beeching Road	Bexhill	N/a	None	Access. Impact on residential.	No. ESCC Highways advise site not accessible from Windsor Road, so residential not suited at thislocation.
BX8	Land to the West of Ellerslie Lane	Bexhill	N/a	Right of Way. Adj TPO.	Character of area. Landscape. Access. Impact of traffic.	No.
BX9	Cooden Beach Golf Course frontage on Cooden Sea Road	Bexhill	N/a	Adj Flood Zones 2 & 3. Adj SSSI. Adj Ramsar.	Landscape, visual linkages, character of area	Site is in development boundary, but loss of recreational space and proximity to environmental constraints are limiting factors. ESCC Highways notified scheme also impacts upon site that would need to be resolved in the event of owners being interested in development. Owners have informed RDC that they are not interested in development, so although the site is suitable in many respects, there is not a reasonable prospect of coming forward within the plan period.
CA10	Land between Park Gate Bungalows and Ivy House, Catsfield	Rural: Catsfield	Catsfield	AONB, TPO.	Trees.	Suitable for protection/enhancement as publicly accessible natural greenspace.
CA2	The White Hart, Catsfield	Rural: Catsfield	Catsfield	Listed building. Adjacent AONB and public footpath.	Existing Pub. Trees and shrubs on north side. Possible need for access to rear.	Only the Northern section has potential, as a possible access point for development of wider site CA9. The southern area of the site on which the White Hart pub is located, is not suitable for development, since there need to retain viable uses that support community and village cohesiveness.
CA3	Land at Wilton House, Catsfield	Rural: Catsfield	Catsfield	AONB, public footpath, setting of adjacent listed properties.	Access is main on-site constraint.	No, ESCC Highways Authority raise concerns about access effectively ruling the site out unless accessed via sites CA2 and CA9. Developing this site as well for housing would result in an unsustainable level of growth for Catsfield. Therefore, given the scale of development proposed for Catsfield in the Core Strategy, this site is not required. There are also highway flooding issues at the proposed access point (as identified in SFRA) that require further investigation.
CA4	Land off Church Lane	Rural: Catsfield	Catsfield	AONB	Gradient, access, character of area, impact on neighbouring amenities and character of road network.	No. Rural character. Development would be out of keeping with grain of current built form. ESCC Landscape Character Area Assessment rules out development of any scale. Securing access across third party residential land becomes diifficult to finance for small scale development. Lack of gas mains is another possible constraint. Not worth pursuing for development opportunity.
CA5	Land adj to Park Gate Bungalows, Catsfield	Rural: Catsfield	Catsfield	AONB, footpath.	Character of area, access.	No - Unacceptable impact on AONB. Not well related to existing development boundary

ID	Site Name	Location	Parish	Summary of Environmental Policy	Summary of On-Site Constraints	Suitable Option for Development
CA6	Land South of Skinners Lane, Catsfield	Rural: Catsfield	Catsfield	None other than encroachment upon countryside.	Impact upon character of area.	No. Possible option for residential frontage scheme only. Gas issue would need to be addressed. However, the lack of any footway to connect todos not make this the most sustainable site in Catsfield. Other sites in the village also relate better to services. For these reasons the site is not considered suitable.
CA7	Land at The Warren Yard, Catsfield Road, Battle	Rural: Catsfield	Catsfield	AONB, public footpath. Adjacent BAP habitat (wet woodland).	Character of area, Landscape, trees.	No
CA8	The Brooks, Church Road	Rural: Catsfield	Catsfield	Although no environmental constraints in strict policy terms other than loss of countryside, the landscape here is of high quality despite it not being within the AONB boundary.	Wet, parish want it as village green	No. Landscape impact. There are preferable options to allow for sustainable growth in Catsfield.
CM1	Chapel Field, Camber	Rural: Camber	Camber	The site is within Flood Zones 2 & 3. Part of the north east boundary of the site abuts a SSSI.	Landscape, neighbouring amenities, traffic impact on road network.	Not for residential - Greenfield Site in Area at Risk of Flooding. Far removed from essential services.
CM11	Land west of Farm Lane, Camber	Rural: Camber	Camber	The site falls within Flood Zones 2 & 3. The north east corner of the site falls within a SSSI. Part of the south west boundary of the site abuts the SSSI. Two footpaths cross the site. The south west part of the site falls within a coastal and floodplain grazing marsh.	Subject to a SFRA. The site falls within Flood Zones 2 & 3. The north east corner of the site falls within a SSSI. Part of the south west boundary of the site abuts the SSSI. Two footpaths cross the site. The south west part of the site falls within a coastal and floodplain grazing marsh. Poor access from Farm Lane. Additional traffic could cause problems to the road network. Any development could potentially have an adverse impact upon the amenities of adjoining residential properties.	No

ID	Site Name	Location	Parish	Summary of Environmental Policy	Summary of On-Site Constraints	Suitable Option for Development
CM3	Land Adjoining Cedar Cottage, Draffin Lane, Camber (west side)	Rural: Camber	Camber	The site falls within Flood Zones 2 & 3. The north east boundary of the site abuts a SSSI.	Subject to a SFRA. Land in development plots since 1930s. Multiple ownerships, including several in hands of RDC and several in hands of private builder. The site is within Flood Zones 2 & 3 and the north east boundary of the site abuts a SSSI. If developed as a single site, access from Draffin Lane appears to be acceptable. Any development could potentially have an adverse impact upon the amenities of adjoining residential properties.	None.Greenfield Site in area at risk of flooding, far from services. Cannot be accessed unless through sites CM1 or CM4.
CM4	Land Adjoining Cedar Cottage, Draffin Lane, Camber (east side)	Rural: Camber	Camber	The site falls within Flood Zones 2 & 3.	Subject to a SFRA. Land in development plots since 1930s. Multiple ownerships, including several in hands of RDC and several in hands of private builder. The site is within Flood Zones 2 & 3. If developed as a single site, access from Draffin Lane appears to be acceptable. Any development could potentially have an adverse impact upon the amenities of adjoining residential properties.	Not for residential - Greenfield Site in area at risk of flooding, far from services. Combined with the east side of CM1 and CM3 the site could accommodate amenityopen space and/or play area.
CM5	Land adjoining Sands End, Farm Lane, Camber	Rural: Camber	Camber	The site falls within Flood Zones 2 and 3. The north east boundary of the site abuts a SSSI and the west side of the site is adjacent to a foorpath.	Subject to a SFRA. Land in development plots since 1930s. Multiple ownerships, including several in hands of RDC and several in hands of private builder. The site is within Flood Zones 2 & 3. If developed as a single site, access from Farm Lane appears to be acceptable. Any development could potentially have an adverse impact upon the amenities of adjoining residential properties.	No

ID	Site Name	Location	Parish	Summary of Environmental Policy	Summary of On-Site Constraints	Suitable Option for Development
CM6	Camber Car Park	Rural: Camber	Camber	Parts of the site fall within Flood Zone 2, Flood Zone 3, a SSSI, a SNCI and coastal sand dunes.	Parts of the site fall within Flood Zones 2 & 3. Any development could potentially have an adverse impact upon the amenities of adjoining residential properties. The beach encroaches on the south part of the site and there are sand dunes present on the north, east and west parts of the site.	Preference for retail, tourist and leisure development rather than residential, although the latter may possibly be incorporated as a small enabling component of overall scheme. Developable for retail, tourist and leisure uses subject to sequential and exception test. See The Camber Visitor Management Initiative for more details.
CM7	Pontins Holiday Centre, New Lydd Road, Camber	Rural: Camber	Camber	The site is within Flood Zones 2 & 3.	Planning Officer: The site falls within Flood Zones 2 & 3 and any development could potentially have an adverse impact upon the amenities of adjoining residential properties.	No. In tourist usage. Flood risk across whole site, so Environment Agency objections highly likely.
CM8	Land adj to Glendorie, Old Lydd Road, Camber	Rural: Camber	Camber	Parts of the site fall within Flood Zone 2 and Flood Zone 3. Adjacent BAP habitat (coastal sand dunes).	Parts of the site fall within Flood Zones 2 & 3 and any development could potentially have an adverse impact upon the amenities of adjoining residential properties.	The site is too small to accommodate a minimum of 6 dwellings. However, there appears to be potential for some form of employment, retail or open space/leisure use, subject to impact upon the amenities of neighbouring properties and taking into account flood risk.
CM9	Garage, Lydd Road, Camber	Rural: Camber	Camber	The site falls within Flood Zone 2 and Flood Zone 3.	The site falls within Flood Zones 2 & 3 and any development could potentially have an adverse impact upon the amenities of adjoining residential properties. The site may also be contaminated.	The site is too small to accommodate a minimum of 6 dwellings. However, there appears to be potential for some form of employment, retail or open space/leisure use, subject to impact upon the amenities of neighbouring properties and taking into account flood risk & contaminated land.
CR1	Land at Florida, Woodlands Way, Crowhurst	Rural: Crowhurst	Crowhurst	Setting of AONB. Impact upon proposed countryside park.	Neighbouring amenity, visual linkages, access, trees.	No. ESCC Highways rule out. Also unlikely to achieve 6 dwellings given prevailing plot sizes, local character and neighbouring amenities. One of minority of areas in Crowhurst not within AONB.
CR2	Land East of Station Road, Crowhurst	Rural: Crowhurst	Crowhurst	AONB, Flood zones, Ancient Woodland, SNCI, ASA, Footpaths. BAP habitats (Ghyll woodland, wet woodland and sandstone outcrops)	Access, landscape, possible drainage issue.	Yes - at small western section only, although Environment Agency comments require further investigation. EA state "As well as fluvial flooding, the site may be at risk of flooding from a variety of other sources including surface runoff, groundwater and poor drainage." Residential development should ideally incorporate a village shop. At western section there may also be potential to create a public space for the village alongside development. Unacceptable impact upon AONB across majority of site. Gas will all need to be confirmed. No capacity in local sewer, development will need to be phased with the provision of the necessary infrastructure.

ID	Site Name	Location	Parish	Summary of Environmental Policy	Summary of On-Site Constraints	Suitable Option for Development
CR3	Land East of Forewood Rise, Crowhurst	Rural: Crowhurst	Crowhurst	AONB, Setting of SSSI, SNCI, ASA, listed buildings. Adjacent BAP habitats (wet woodland)	Landscape visually exposed.	No.
CR4	Land west of Forewood Rise, Crowhurst	Rural: Crowhurst	Crowhurst	AONB, Flood plain, GPZ Zone 3, SNCI, SSSI, setting of listed buildings. Adjacent BAP habitats (Ghyll woodland and wet woodland)	Rural character of area	No.
CS1	Land West of Kingfield	Cackle Street	Brede	AONB, footpath. BAP habitats (Wet woodland and ghyll woodland (100m to west).	Rural character. Access.	No
CS10	Land South of Kingwoodland	Rural: Cackle Street	Brede	AONB, footpath, setting of listed building.	Landscape - extension into exposed AONB countryside.	No.
CS11	Gap Between Brede and Cackle Street, South of A28	Rural: Cackle Street	Brede	AONB, Adjacent to GSPZ3.	Landscape	No
CS2	Gap Between Brede and Cackle Street, North of A28	Rural: Cackle Street	Brede	AONB	Site visit not necessary as policy factors and findings of exception site report (including HA comments) weigh against development for anything but exception site.	No, unless possibly as exception site.
CS3	Land at Cackle Street, Cackle Street	Rural: Cackle Street	Brede	AONB, TPO.	Landscape	No
CS5	Land at Pottery Lane Brede	Rural: Cackle Street	Brede	AONB	Landscape, access.	No
CS6	Land to north of Brede Lane, Pottery Lane, Cackle Street	Rural: Cackle Street	Brede	AONB, Wet woodland (BAP priority habitat), Ancient woodland, public footpath.		No
CS7	Land at Three Wents, Pottery Lane, Cackle Street	Rural: Cackle Street	Brede	Exposed AONB. GPZ3, Ancient & Wet woodland all overlap with southern boundary.	Access, landscape.	No
CS8	Land at Smoles Yard, Cackle Street	Rural: Cackle Street	Brede	AONB, footpath, setting of listed buildings.	Possible encroachment into AONB countryside. Loss of farm buildings.	Not preferred. Broad Oak is a preferable location with a greater range of services.
CS9	Land at Steeplands, Cackle Street	Rural: Cackle Street	Brede	AONB	Landscape, access.	No

ID	Site Name	Location	Parish	Summary of Environmental Policy	Summary of On-Site Constraints	Suitable Option for Development
EG1	Land South East of St John's Cottages, Camber Road, East Guldeford	Rural: East Guldeford	East Guldeford	Flood Zones 2 & 3. SSSI, Reedbeds and Coastal & Floodplain Grazing Marsh adjacent.	Landscape. Access	No
EG2	Land North West of St John's Cottages, Camber Road, East Guldeford	Rural: East Guldeford	East Guldeford	Flood Zones 2 & 3. SSSI (x 2), Reedbeds and Coastal & Floodplain Grazing Marsh adjacent.	Landscape setting	No
EG3	Land adj. Old Bentley, Camber Road, East Guldeford	Rural: East Guldeford	East Guldeford	Flood Zones 2 & 3, SSSI (x2), Reedbeds and Coastal & Floodplain Grazing Marsh.	Landscape setting	No
EG4	Land adj. Hollybush House, Folkstone Road, East Gulderford	Rural: East Guldeford	East Guldeford	Flood Zones 2 & 3. SSSI (x 2). Reedbeds.	Rural character. Adjacent stream and telegraph poles. Views. Trees and shrubs.	No
ET1	Church Lane, Etchingham	Rural: Etchingham	Etchingham	AONB, Flood zone, ASA.	Employment use.	No
ET10	Land at Etchingham Station, Etchingham	Rural: Etchingham	Etchingham	AONB, Flood Zone, ASA.	Shared access with train station	Open space potential
ET11	Land at Etchingham Station, Etchingham	Rural: Etchingham	Etchingham	AONB, Flood zone, ASA, adjacent to BAP habitat	Landscape and views.	No
ET13	Land north of High Street	Rural: Etchingham	Etchingham	AONB, setting of listed building.	Access, ponds, trees.	Several obstacles - multiple ownerships, a pond (at least 15 m wide + with possibility of Great Crested Newts) blocking potential access, planning history of development being dismissed on appeal due to overlooking and loss of property. Conservation and design concerns relating to impact on setting of listed building. Satisfactory alternatives exist elsewhere in Etchingham.
ET14	Land north of Oaks Close	Rural: Etchingham	Etchingham	AONB	Landscape, Access	No
ET2	High Street, Etchingham	Rural: Etchingham	Etchingham	AONB	Loss of trees, possible landscape issues, access and affect on neighbouring amenities.	ESCC Highways advice effectively rules out development. Oaks Close is a ransom strip as it is not adopted highway so only landowners will be able to access. Visibility issue at southern access.
ET6	Land r/o Rivendell, High Street	Rural: Etchingham	Etchingham	AONB, Flood risk.	Landscape, access.	Yes, may be worth investigating east end for allotment potential.
ET7	Land at Primary School, Burgh Hill	Rural: Etchingham	Etchingham	AONB. Adjacent ancient woodland, SNCI, wet woodland.	Landscape. Access.	Yes - re-use existing buildings for tourism or business.
ET8	Land north of A265, Etchingham	Rural: Etchingham	Etchingham	AONB, setting of listed building, nearby ancient woodland sn wet woodland.	None that were not adequately addressed at Local Plan allocation stage.	Yes - proceed with allocation.

ID	Site Name	Location	Parish	Summary of Environmental Policy	Summary of On-Site Constraints	Suitable Option for Development
ET9	Land at Church House Farm, Etchingham	RDC SHLAA site search	Etchingham	AONB, Flood risk.	Topography, landscape.	Yes, investigate further for allotment and possibly for business uses.
FA1	Land at Churchfields, Fairlight	Rural: Fairlight	Fairlight	AONB, Ancient woodland, setting of listed building.	Attractive AONB landscape, poor access.	No
FC3	Land r/o Red Roofs, Farley Way, Fairlight Cove	Rural: Fairlight Cove	Fairlight	Footpath.	Land assembly. Impact on neighbouring amenities.	Considerable land assembly and access difficulties. Small site would not be viable to create new access.
FC4	Land at Broadlands, Fairlight Cove	Rural: Fairlight Cove	Fairlight	TPO along southern boundary.	Access is major constraint.	Not currently accessible. ESCC would require the proposed access road into the site to be widened to a minimum of 4.5m to allow the safe two-way passing of vehicles. However this would impact upon the area Tree Preservation Order that exists along the access. Therefore the site may only developable if an alternative access could be found which would also have to be subject to ESCC Highways approval.
FC5	Land at Seahome, Fairlight Cove	Rural: Fairlight Cove	Fairlight	Adjacent AONB, TPO, SNCI and ancient woodland.	Landscape, Access, gradient, tree coverage.	No. Outside development boundary on visually exposed area of land with extensive tree cover. Abutting areas of rich habitat.
FC6	Land r/o Sea Breeze, Battery Hill, Fairlight	Rural: Fairlight Cove	Fairlight	Intrusion into countryside. Proximity and connectedness to designations and habitats (SNCI, Ancient woodland, Ghyll and wet woodland)	Access, gradient, tree coverage.	No. Outside development boundary on visually exposed area of land with extensive tree cover. Close proximity to areas of rich habitat.
FC7	Warren Farm Commanders Walk	Rural: Fairlight Cove	Fairlight	AONB, Strategic Gap.	Landscape. Topography in relation to neighbouring dwellings	No. Not suitable for housing allocation given scale of site. Negative impact on neighbouring amenities.
FL10	Land at Flimwell & Improvements to A21 Trunk Road	Rural: Flimwell	Ticehurst	AONB, public footpath, impact upon ancient and wet woodland.	Exposed AONB landscape.	No
FL11	Land adj. Wardsdown Nursery, Flimwell	Rural: Flimwell	Ticehurst	AONB, adjacent ancient woodland, adjacent wet woodland.	Extension of development boundary into AONB countryside. Loss of trees. Access.	No.
FL3	The Country Furniture Barns Site, Flimwell	Rural: Flimwell	Ticehurst	AONB	Existing retail business.	Already developed as retail use. Planning Officer "Business or community uses preferable at this central location".
FL4	Corner Farm Crossroads, Flimwell	Rural: Flimwell	Ticehurst	AONB, setting of listed building.	None apparent	Local Plan Allocation for Village hall and Amenity Open Space. Not suitable for SHLAA.
FL5	Land r/o Fruitfields, High Street, Flimwell	Rural: Flimwell	Ticehurst	AONB, Ancient woodlands and BAP habitats nearby.	Access, rural character, views.	No, although probably the most preferable site in Flimwell. Access and ownership issues to be resolved. Flimwell village not suited to large volume of development.

ID	Site Name	Location	Parish	Summary of Environmental Policy	Summary of On-Site Constraints	Suitable Option for Development
FL6	Junction of London Road and A268 (North)	Rural: Flimwell	Ticehurst	AONB, setting of listed buildings.	Trees, landscape.	At present, development would be an intrusion into AONB east of A21 The A21 acts as a severance barrier to the village. Only suitable post completion of proposed by-pass realignment. If the proposed A21 bypass were to go ahead this site may have potential for development around a re-aligned village centre and for a number of different uses (including residential and local retail).
FL7	Junction of London Road and A268 (South)	Rural: Flimwell	Ticehurst	AONB, adjacent SNCI, wet woodland and ancient woodland.	Presence of existing business.	Not for housing, but possible for employment on areas of site to west not included in proposed by-pass realignment.
FL8	Land at Berners Hill, Flimwell	Rural: Flimwell	Ticehurst	AONB, Footpath, adjacent ancient woodland and wet woodland.	Views, visual linkages.	No
FL9	Land at Flimwell & Improvements to A21 Trunk Road	Rural: Flimwell	Ticehurst	AONB. Impact upon ancient woodland, BAP habitats, listed buildings.	Landscape. Access. Trees.	No
FO1	Land at Ilex Cottage, Four Oaks	Rural: Four Oaks	Beckley	The site is within the High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and a grade II listed dwellinghouse lies at the southern end of the site. Grade II listed stables abut the west of the site.	Any development could potentially have an adverse impact upon the amenities of adjoining residential properties. There is a group of trees in the middle of the site and a grade II listed dwellinghouse lies at the southern end of the site.	No
FO10	Land at King Bank Lane, Beckley	Rural: Four Oaks	Beckley	The site is within the High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.	Any development could potentially have an adverse impact upon the amenities of adjoining residential properties.	No
FO13	Land adj to Frog Field, Main Street, Four Oaks	Rural: Four Oaks	Beckley	The site is within the High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and grass snakes are present.	Amenity of neighbouring properties, trees at boundaries.	No. FO12 is a preferable site in the Beckley/Four oaks area.
FO2	Former Vineyard site, Whitebread Lane, Four Oaks	Rural: Four Oaks	Beckley	The site is within the High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.	Any development could potentially have an adverse impact upon the amenities of the adjoining residential property.	No
FO3	Land at Pear Orchard, Four Oaks	Rural: Four Oaks	Beckley	The site is within the High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.	There are areas of woodland to the front and rear of the site.	No

ID	Site Name	Location	Parish	Summary of Environmental Policy	Summary of On-Site Constraints	Suitable Option for Development
FO4	Land west of Oakley Cottages, Main Street, Four Oaks	Rural: Four Oaks	Beckley	The site is within the High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.	Any development could potentially have an adverse impact upon the amenities of the adjoining residential property. There is a group of trees at the front of the site.	No
FO5	Land at The Retreat, Whitebread Lane, Four Oaks	Rural: Four Oaks	Beckley	The site is within the High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.	Any development could potentially have an adverse impact upon the amenities of the adjoining residential property. There is a group of trees to the rear of the site.	No
FO6	Land to east of Coombs Cottages, Peasmarsh Road, Four Oaks	Rural: Four Oaks	Beckley	The site is within the High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Ancient and semi-natural woodland abuts the east of the site. A Public Footpath crosses the southern part of the site. Wet woodland and Gyll woodland abuts the east of the site. Eurasian Curlew are present on the site.	Open, Access Planning Officer: Any development could potentially have an adverse impact upon the amenities of adjoining residential properties. The site slopes to the north, north east, east and south east. Overhead lines cross the site. Poor access to and from the site.	No
FO7	Land north of Beckley Gallery, Four Oaks	Rural: Four Oaks	Beckley	The site is within the High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.	Planning Officer: Any development could potentially have an adverse impact upon the amenities of the adjoining residential property. The site slopes to the north and to the east.	No
FO8	Land at Westlands, Four Oaks	Rural: Four Oaks	Beckley	The site is within the High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.	Any development could potentially have an adverse impact upon the amenities of adjoining residential properties. There is a pond to the north west of the site.	No
FO9	Land adj. Roberts Row, Whitebread Lane, Four Oaks	Rural: Four Oaks	Beckley	The site is within the High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and the access is adjacent to a listed building.	Any development could potentially have an adverse impact upon the amenities of adjoining residential properties. Narrow access that passes between two dwellings.	No

ID	Site Name	Location	Parish	Summary of Environmental Policy	Summary of On-Site Constraints	Suitable Option for Development
GU1	Land at Mount Pleasant Farm, Guestling	Rural: Guestling Green	Guestling	AONB. Ancient Woodland. Ghyll Woodland. Wet Woodland. Adjacent listed building. Adjacent Right of Way.	Landscape, access, hedges, trees	No
GU2	Land at Vine Cottage, Guestling	Rural: Guestling Green	Guestling	AONB. Right of Way. Adjacent to Ancient Woodland and Wet Woodland.	Access, probable highway objections Landscape	No
GU3	Land r/o Guestling Bradshaw Primary School	Rural: Guestling Green	Guestling	AONB. Adjacent to Bridleway.	Parish Council looking at affordable housing. Bridleway	No
HF2	Land adj to Capricorn, Chown's Hill Road	Hastings Fringes	Guestling	AONB.	landscape, access.	No
HF3	Land on Stonestile Lane	Hastings Fringes	Westfield	AONB.	Landscape, character of area.	no
HF4	Land at the Michael Tyler Furniture Site	Hastings Fringes	Westfield	Ancient Woodland. Wet Woodland.	Main issue is would appear to be loss of employment which appears to still be in operation. North end of site has spectacular views to north, but it is unlikely that residential would be any more of a landscape issue than existing business units.	No. Conflict of iinterest between on-site and neighbouring uses not accepted. Therefore loss of this industrial site would be resisted, in line with the principles of Local Plan policy EM2.
HF5	Land at Breadsell Farm	Hastings Fringes	Battle	Strategic Gap. Right of Way. Adj AONB. Adj Ancient Woodland. Adj Ghyll Woodland.	Main issue is strategic gap between Battle and Hastings, coupled with exposed position of site from south (views to sea). Also density specified (50 per hectare) may be too much at this location. Rother DC also fought and won an appeal on southern tip, which is now planted as a result.	No. Originally necessary to facilitate development in HBC, but no longer required.
HF8	Land North of A265, Ivyhouse Lane	Hastings Fringes	Guestling	AONB. Ghyll Woodland. Adj Ancient Woodland. Adj Wet Woodland.	Landscape. Access	None

ID	Site Name	Location	Parish	Summary of Environmental Policy	Summary of On-Site Constraints	Suitable Option for Development
HF9	Land at Rock Lane, Guestling	Hastings Fringes	Guestling	AONB. Ancient Woodland. Wet Woodland. Ghyll Woodland. Rights of Way.	Landscape, access and character of area	Site not suitable due to a mix of environmental, landscape and highways constraints. Most of site has environmental and landscape constraints. Small portion (1.75ha) east of Rock lane and adjacent to development boundary was subject to more detailed investigation, but ESCC highways advise it can only be accessed via Austen Way which would require land acquisition to create a junction on the north side. This small section is therefore not considered to be a reasonable prospect of coming forward.
HG11	Land adj. To the White House, Burgh Hill, Hurst Green	Rural: Hurst Green	Hurst Green	AONB adjacent TPO	Important green gap in fringe location, elevated location, low density adjacent development.	Clear constraints and obstacles to further ribbon development in AONB. Loss of critical green gap at this fringe location may well outweigh any positive drivers for development. Other sites in Hurst Green relate much better to central core of village.
HG3	Iridge Place, London Road, Hurst Green – Grade 2 listed Georgian Mansion	Rural: Hurst Green	Hurst Green	AONB, Listed buildings, ancient woodland, BAP habitats (ghyll woodland, wet woodland)	Character of area (even allowing for proposed bypass) is not suited to residential intensification.	No
HG4	Land south of playing field, Hurst Green	Rural: Hurst Green	Hurst Green	AONB. SNCI.	Access, site by itself remote from built form of village.	No. Ruled out by ESCC Highways advice.
HG5	Land South of Church of our Lady, Hurst Green	Rural: Hurst Green	Hurst Green	AONB	Access, tree loss.	No. Ruled out by ESCC Highways advice.
HG6	Land South of Lodge Farm	Rural: Hurst Green	Hurst Green	AONB Ancient woodland	Landscape issues - views out of site northwards. Could be argued that definitive footpath provides defensible boundary to village.	Site 'reads' as part of wider landscape. Other sites in Hurst Green are preferred. Part of the site may be suitable for allotments.
HG8	Land between Brambles and Atherstone, Hurst Green	Rural: Hurst Green	Etchingham	AONB	Character of area, landscape, access.	No. Far removed from village core. Given character of area and size of site, this site is not suitable for 6 dwellings. It may therefore be considered as a development boundary extension, although still not a preferred location given AONB location, outside development boundary, prominence in landscape and distance from services. Need to avoid further ribbon development and coalescence with neighbouring Etchingham.
HG9	Land at Yew Tree Farm, Hurst Green	Rural: Hurst Green	Hurst Green	AONB	Wholly rural area detached from built form of village and which relates to the wider landscape.	No
IC2	Land at Mayors Field, Icklesham	Rural: Icklesham	Icklesham	No	Landscape impact overwhelming reason for site not to be pursued.	No

ID	Site Name	Location	Parish	Summary of Environmental Policy	Summary of On-Site Constraints	Suitable Option for Development
IC3	Land at Bramleys, Icklesham	Rural: Icklesham	Icklesham	AONB	Inappropriate access Environmental and policy reasons would prohibit development	No
IC4	Little Sheerwood Industry Park, Icklesham	Rural: Icklesham	Icklesham	AONB	Remote from facilities, A259 Physical Barrier	No
IC7	Shelter, Main Street, Icklesham	Rural: Icklesham	Icklesham	AONB	Greenfield unrelated to built form of the settlement. Hedgerows to boundary edge	No
IC8	Land r/o Maple Cottage, Main Road	Rural: Icklesham	Icklesham	AONB and public footpath	Constraints in the main relate to access and impact on residential amenities, but these are not insurmountable.	Owners unwilling to develop so not a reasonable prospect of coming forward. This site seems to offer the best development opportunity in Icklesham although the site has some constraints with regard to the residential amenities of the adjacent dwellings and the setting of listed building to north needs to be treated sensitively. The eastern site offers the more suitable prospect for development as it relates better to the built up area of the village. Southern sections of both sites are preferable since they impact less on the setting of the listed building.
ID1	Land at Conkers, Iden	Rural: Iden	Iden	The site is within the High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and there is a listed building in the south east corner.	Access from Main Street appears to be unsuitable as it would pass through the front garden of a listed building and between two listed residential properties. Any development would need to preserve the amenities of neighbouring properties. The site could possibly be accessed from Elmstead.	Suitable in many ways, but not a reasonable prospect of coming forward. Access from Main St not favoured from Conkers access for Highways and setting of listed building reasons. Only viable access is therefore via Elmstead which has a ransom strip. Thus, there is one potential access crossing private residential land, with no clear prospect that this would come forward. Also given the likely scale of development, viability remains an issue given the existence of this third party 'ransom strip'.
ID2	Land adj to Meadow View, Main Street	Rural: Iden	Iden	The site is within the High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.	Landscape, neighbouring amenities..	No.

ID	Site Name	Location	Parish	Summary of Environmental Policy	Summary of On-Site Constraints	Suitable Option for Development
ID3	Land at Grove Farm, Iden	Rural: Iden	Iden	The site is within the High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.	Any development could potentially have an adverse impact upon the amenities of neighbouring properties. Grove Lane runs through the middle of the site dividing it into two halves. There are also three dwellings on the southern part of the site. A listed building is adjacent to the western boundary and a pond is in the eastern corner.	Yes - possibility of open space/recreation facility in the north east corner of the site.
JC2	Land at Johns Cross	Rural: John's Cross	Mountfield	AONB. Adjacent Right of Way.	Landscape. Village with few services	No
MO1	Land west of Hoath Hill, Mountfield	Rural: Mountfield	Mountfield	AONB.	Unacceptable landscape impact.	No
MO3	Land adj. Harestone, Solomons Lane, Mountfield	Rural: Mountfield	Mountfield	AONB, Flood risk on southern half of site.	Character of area.	No
NB1	Land at Norman's Bay, Bexhill	Rural: Norman's Bay	N/a	Flood Zones 2 & 3. Archaeological Sensitive Area. Coastal & Floodplain Grazing Marsh. Adj SNCI, Adj Ramsar. Adj SSSI. Adj SAM. Adj Coastal Vegetated Shingle.	Character of areas, landscape, access, drainage	No
NE10	Land north east of Darvel Down	Rural: Netherfield	Battle	AONB.	Loss of trees	Only as improved open space
NE2	Land east of Darvel Down, Netherfield	Rural: Netherfield	Battle	AONB. Ghyll woodland. Adjacent Ancient Woodland and Wet Woodland crosses northern boundary.	Landscape, drainage, access.	Not suited to development at this location. ESCC notified site. Poorly related to existing development boundary. Other sites in Netherfield area are preferable.
NE3	Land west of Netherfield Court, Netherfield	Rural: Netherfield	Battle	AONB. ESCC Notified Minerals Site.	Access, rural location, trees.	Not worthy of further investigation. Rural location not well related to existing development boundaries or development. Landscape impact. ESCC Notified minerals site.
NE4	Land North of Darvel Down, Netherfield	Rural: Netherfield	Battle	AONB. Adjacent to Ancient Woodland and Wet Woodland and ESCC Notified Mineral Site.	Trees	No
NE6	White House Poultry Farm, Netherfield	Rural: Netherfield	Battle	AONB. ESCC Notified Mineral Site. Adj listed building.	Access	No

ID	Site Name	Location	Parish	Summary of Environmental Policy	Summary of On-Site Constraints	Suitable Option for Development
NE7	Land at Darvel Down, Netherfield	Rural: Netherfield	Battle	AONB.	Loss of open space. Landscape.	No
NO1	Land r/o 23 Goddens Gill (Hall), Northiam	Rural: Northiam	Northiam	AONB. Ancient Woodland. Wet Woodland. Right of Way.	Access, impact upon neighbouring amenities.	None
NO11	Land east of Hayes Plat, Northiam	Rural: Northiam	Northiam	AONB. Ancient Woodland. Wet Woodland. Ghyll Woodland. Rights of Way. Adjacent Conservation Area and Listed Buildings.	Character of area, landscape, trees and hedges.	No
NO12	Land at Donsmead, Station Road, Northiam	Rural: Northiam	Northiam	AONB. Right of Way.	Possible adverse effect on neighbouring amenities. Landscape.	No. Pleasing AONB countryside to the rear of ribbon development extending alongside the A28. Not well related to village core or village developoment boundary, so not a particularly sustainable location for development.
NO13	Land r/o Donsmead, Station Road, Northiam	Rural: Northiam	Northiam	AONB. Ancient Woodland. Wet Woodland. Ghyll Woodland. Right of Way.	Character of area. Landscape. Access via NO12. Possible adverse effect on neighbouring amenities.	No. Pleasing AONB countryside to the rear of ribbon development extending alongside the A28. Not well related to village core or village developoment boundary, so not a particularly sustainable location for development.
NO14	Land at Newlands, Northiam	Rural: Northiam	Northiam	AONB.	Landscape. Access. Character of area	No
NO16	Land r/o Swallows, Main street, Northiam	Rural: Northiam	Northiam	AONB. Adjacent Listed Building. Adjacent Conservation Area. Right of Way.	Access, Landscape	No
NO18	Land adj to Little Haven, Station Road	Rural: Northiam	Northiam	AONB. Ancient Woodland. Wet Woodland.	Landscape. Impact on road network.	No
NO20	Ballards, Station Road, Northiam	Rural: Northiam	Northiam	AONB.	Landscape	No
NO22	Goddens Gill Amenity Area	Rural: Northiam	Northiam	AONB. Ancient woodland and wet woodland 20m from south boundary.	Potential adverse impacts upon neighbouring amenities.	Yes for play area.
NO3	Coppards Lane Industrial Estate	Rural: Nothiam	Northiam	AONB.	Landscape, semi industrial character of area	No
NO4	A H S Limited, Coppards Lane, Northiam	Rural: Northiam	Northiam	AONB.	Landscape. Semi-industrial character of area	Not suitable for development other than that permissable under existing policy/use class
NO5	Land at Timber Lodge, Northiam	Rural: Northiam	Northiam	AONB.	Character of area	No

ID	Site Name	Location	Parish	Summary of Environmental Policy	Summary of On-Site Constraints	Suitable Option for Development
NO7	Land at Friars Cote Farm Buildings, Northiam	Rural: Northiam	Northiam	AONB. Ancient Woodland and Wet Woodland adjacent.	Access. Landscape	If redundant farm building, employment and tourism prioritised in line with policy. Access issue.
NO8	Land at Friars Cote Farm Field, Northiam	Rural: Northiam	Northiam	AONB. Ancient Woodland and Wet Woodland adjacent.	Landscape. Character of area and road network. Loss of trees and hedges	No
NO9	Land east of Frewen College, Northiam	Rural: Northiam	Northiam	AONB. Adjacent Conservation Area.	Character of area, poorly related to Northiam	No
PL1	Land at Stargazy, Pett Level Road, Pett Level	Rural: Pett Level	Pett	Although not a policy designation, the site contains a wildlife rich drainage channel.	Access and Drainage	Flood zone and drainage channel constraints mean this site would not be capable of accommodating 6 dwellings. 'Repose' (not within site and within flood zone) is derelict to north
PL2	Land at Toot Rock, Pett Level	Rural: Pett Level	Pett	Flood Zones 2 & 3. SNCI. Adjacent AONB.	Landscape. Access. Treess	No
PS10	Land to the Rear of the Cock Horse Inn, Main Street	Rural: Peasmarsch	Peasmarsch	AONB. Right of Way. Listed Building adjacent.	3rd party access, tourist accommodation therefore possible query over deliverability, impact on rural setting.	No. Extension of development boundary. Loss of tourist accommodation (Local Plan Policy EM9). Preferable sites elsewhere in Peasmarsch.
PS11	Land east of Sharvels Farm House, Main Street, Peasmarsch	Rural: Peasmarsch	Peasmarsch	AONB. Adjacent to Listed Building. Adjacent to Right of Way.	North side of A268 relatively undeveloped in this part of the village. Loss of this area to development would create pressure to release other large tracts of land, which would create a detrimental impact on the character of this part of Peasmarsch. (Owner may be unwilling to sell.)	Not suitable
PS12	Land west of Pond Cottage, Tanhouse Lane, Peasmarsch	Rural: Peasmarsch	Peasmarsch	AONB.	Semi-rural location and village fringe	Worthy of further investigation for employment or possibly for exception site. Distance from development boundary is a hindrance.
PS13	Land at Woodside Cottage, Main Street, Peasmarsch	Rural: Peasmarsch	Peasmarsch	AONB. Adjacent Listed Building.	Forms part of wooded edge to western end of the village	No further investigation
PS14	Land east of Woodside Barn, Peasmarsch	Rural: Peasmarsch	Peasmarsch	AONB. Adjacent to Ancient Woodland and Wet Woodland. Bridleway adjacent.	Wholly rural location which relates to wider landscape	No further investigation

ID	Site Name	Location	Parish	Summary of Environmental Policy	Summary of On-Site Constraints	Suitable Option for Development
PS15	Land north of Leyland Cottage, Main Street, Peasmarsh	Rural: Peasmarsh	Peasmarsh	AONB. Adjacent to Ancient Woodland and Wet Woodland. Bridleway adjacent. Listed Building adjacent.	Village edge, contained site by virtue of Ancient Woodland, frontage trees at present form dense screen, as well as woodland to east of site. (site area minus woodland to east is 0.8h).	No - character of area and environmental constraints. There are preferable sites within the village.
PS16	Land west of Redford Farmhouse, Peasmarsh	Rural: Peasmarsh	Peasmarsh	AONB.	Wholly rural site with a sense of remoteness even though it abuts development boundary. Land locked so access would be an issue.	No
PS18	Land at Stream Farm, Main Street, Peasmarsh	Rural: Peasmarsh	Peasmarsh	AONB. Adjacent to Listed Buildings.	Village fringe with vegetation and stream dissecting the site. Both potential accesses may pose problems.	No. Design issues relating to setting of listed building.
PS2	Land to rear of Farleys Way, Peasmarsh	Rural: Peasmarsh	Peasmarsh	AONB. TPO adjacent.	Access, drainage, gradient. Elevated ground so impact on properties in Farleys Way	No. Site has many obstacles to development and therefore uncertainty over deliverability. Previously not pursued at Local Plan stage due to drainage problems and residential impact.
PS20	Land r/o Welbeck, Main Street	Rural: Peasmarsh	Peasmarsh	AONB. Adjacent to listed building.	Multi-ownership and therefore deliverability an issue.	No - although if investigation reveals that PS21 is appropriate for allocation, area of land would naturally fall within new development boundary
PS22	Kings Head Land, Tanhouse Lane. Peasmarsh	Rural: Peasmarsh	Peasmarsh	AONB. Adjacent to listed building.	village edge forming part of the rural setting of the settlement	No
PS3	Land at Tanyard Field, Peasmarsh	Rural: Peasmarsh	Peasmarsh	AONB. Right of Way.	Unimplemented permission to small area north east of the site that is designated within the development boundary	No - landscape impact overriding issue
PS4	Land at Old House Paddock, Peasmarsh	Rural: Peasmarsh	Peasmarsh	AONB. Adjacent listed building.	Semi-rural location with high visibility	No - too far removed from development boundary. Exception site potential as although does not abut development boundary it is in close proximity to shopping facilities. School would be a 10 minute walk
PS6	Land adj. To Superstore - South East, Peasmarsh	Rural: Peasmarsh	Peasmarsh	AONB. Right of Way.	Part of wider rural landscape, land locked, 3rd party access required	Although in close proximity to Jempsons, the site reads as part of the wider landscape by virtue of the change in levels between the site and the supermarket

ID	Site Name	Location	Parish	Summary of Environmental Policy	Summary of On-Site Constraints	Suitable Option for Development
PS9	Land r/o Welbeck, Main Street, Peasmarsh	Rural: Peasmarsh	Peasmarsh	AONB.	Site as a whole reads as part of the wider rural landscape, whilst area close to ribbon development is village fringe in character.	Not developable, owners object. If had been available would have needed to be developed alongside, and accessed via, neighbouring PS21. Whilst forms part of wider landscape, area of site abutting development boundary may have potential if consolidation of development on western edge of village considered appropriate.
PT1	Land adjoining 'Fairview', Pett	Rural: Pett	Pett	AONB	Trees and hedgerows. Neighbouring amenities	No, not suitable. Lack of an existing footway to connect to is a particular concern. Pett is not a service village and the site has a rural AONB character.
PT3	Land at Watermill House, Pett	Rural: Pett	Pett	AONB, Ancient wet woodland	Access, loss of valued woodland habitat.	No
PT4	Land r/o Two Sawyers, Pett Road, Pett	Rural: Pett	Pett	AONB, footpath, adjacent ancient wet woodland and listed buildings.	Potential negative impacts upon ancient wet woodland, listed buildings. Access	Possible exception site if demonstrable local need.
PT6	Land at north western side of Pett	Rural: Pett	Pett	AONB	Rural, north of ribbon development. Settlement pattern of the village essentially linear. Site for consideration in conflict with this established pattern	No
PT7	Lunsford Farm, Pett Road	Rural: Pett	Pett	AONB and Listed buildings	Rural location which reads as part of the wider countryside	No - not for shlaa. Opportunities may exist for C.O.U of farm buildings to residential or business use under existing policy framework.
RB1	Land at Bishops Lane, Robertsbridge	Rural: Robertsbridge	Salehurst and Rob	Whole site within AONB. Part Flood Zones 2 & 3 Public footpath.	Landscape impact.	Two discrete sections worthy of further investigation. (i) Eastern corner and (ii) Frontage development on Bishops Lane. Whilst these are suitable in many ways there is not a reasonable prospect of the site coming forward. ESCC Highways advice suggest site can only be accessed via third party land through Willow Bank. Given the plot sizes at Willow bank this would probably require the loss of more than one dwelling and there is no clear prospect that these would come forward. Also given the likely scale of development, viability remains an issue given the existence of this third part 'ransom strip'. Findings of ESCC Landscape Study suggest land east of the village would be preferable for development.
RB11	Bracken Hill House	Rural: Robertsbridge	Salehurst & Rober	AONB. Abuts TPO to West.	Access only from Knelle Road - need to be shared to limit impacts.	Owners unwilling to develop so not a reasonable prospect of coming forward. Otherwise offered an opportunity to make better use of a large plot, although small scale intensification refused 20 years ago.
RB14	Land at Brook House, Northbridge Street, Robertsbridge	Rural: Robertsbridge	Salehurst and Rob	AONB. Tiny area of Flood Zones 2 & 3.	Avoid trees and embankment and flood zone. No existing viable access.	No

ID	Site Name	Location	Parish	Summary of Environmental Policy	Summary of On-Site Constraints	Suitable Option for Development
RB15	Land at Northbridge Street, Robertsbridge	Rural: Robertsbridge	Salehurst and Rob	AONB	Unacceptable landscape impact and lack of viable access	No
RB16	Land at Northbridge Street, Robertsbridge	Rural: Robertsbridge	Salehurst and Rob	AONB. Completely within Flood Zones 2 & 3. Dissected by river.	All in flood zone and forms part of flood protection works.	No
RB3	Land North East of Salehurst C E Primary School, Robertsbridge	Rural: Robertsbridge	Salehurst and Rob	AONB, ASA. Right of Way.	Access. Access constraints may mean the site is only accessible via George Hill through site RB2, which would mean all sites between A21 and Robertsbridge would be better developed as part of single masterplan. Would require tree belt on A21 frontage.	No. It would also seem prudent to reserve the greater part of the site in case of school expansion or public open space.
RB6	Land West of Salehurst C E Primary School, Robertsbridge	Rural: Robertsbridge	Salehurst and Rob	AONB. ASA. Conservation Area.	Shared access to school. Trees to frontage.	This site has some development potential but it should not be at the cost of losing the existing community facility. Any redevelopment should include replacement facilities.
RB7	Land East of John's Cross Road, Robertsbridge	Rural: Robertsbridge	Salehurst and Rob	AONB	Access constraints may mean the site is only accessible via George Hill through site RB2, which would mean all sites between A21 and Robertsbridge would be better developed as part of single masterplan. Would require tree belt on A21 frontage.	Northern sections of the site have potential as part of wider development with RB2 and RB5. Sensitive landscape so development will need to be carefully planned. May be necessary to leave higher and more visually exposed sections of site to the south free of development.
RH2	The Saltings, Harbour Road	Rye Harbour	Icklesham	Flood zone. SSSI designation removed - NE have written to RDC and the EA confirming this though no legal denotification has taken place.	Character of area not suited to residential.	yes for wharfage/employment uses
RH3	Land adj. To Rye Waste Water Treatment Works, Harbour Road	Rye Harbour	Icklesham	Flood zone. Site is in close proximity to the SAC and SPA and SSSI	Proposals for B1-B8 uses in this policy area. Industrial area.	yes for employment/industrial uses
RH4	Land south of Churchfields, Harbour Road	Rye Harbour	Icklesham	Flood zone. Site removed from SSSI - should site also have been removed from SPA designation?	Site wholly within the SPA. Open countryside on three sides, industrial on one side, site is exposed in the landscape and not well related to Rye Harbour Rd.	Site is not suitable for residential development, not well related to Rye Harbour Village residential area, is a SPA and is at risk of flooding. Site may have lost its nature conservation value as appears to have been scrapped of its vegetation. Possibility that site may be suitable for employment use if no longer a SPA

ID	Site Name	Location	Parish	Summary of Environmental Policy	Summary of On-Site Constraints	Suitable Option for Development
RH5	Land east of Churchfields, Harbour Road	Rye Harbour	Icklesham	Flood zones.	Character of area - industrial site facing open countryside to the south. Not well related to key services.	yes for employment/industrial uses
RH6	Land south of former ARC spun concrete site, Harbour Road, Rye Harbour	Rye Harbour	Icklesham	Flood zone, SPA, SSSI.	open countryside, nature conservation on two sides, industry on other, site is exposed in the landscape. Third party access may be required.	No - site not suitable for development as SPA, greenfield, flood zone 3
RH7	Land at Frenchmans Beach Caravan Park, Rye Harbour	Rye Harbour	Icklesham	Flood zone, scheduled ancient monument, archaeological sensitive area, adjacent SSSI, LNR and UK BAP habitats.		No - Rye Harbour, and this site in particular is not a sustainable location for significant expansion of the development boundary/residential development. The village has a limited range of services and there would be significant environmental constraints at this location.
RY12	Land north of Gateborough Farm	Rye	Rye	AONB, Flood Zone, footpaths, Coastal and floodplain grazing marsh (UK BAP habitat)	landscaping, flood resilience, retaining views	Not suitable for residential. Only part of the sites that has an accessible road frontage is Coastal and floodplain grazing marsh (a UK BAP habitat), an area that is also quite separate from the village envelope. The northern section is well related to existing housing but has no access. Possible open space uses.
RY13	Land West of Hillcrest	Rye	Rye Foreign	ASA and adjacent AONB.	currently no access - though as part of planning permission for adjacent site this may be remedied	Site poorly related to existing development boundary and to existing services. No immediately apparent means of vehicular access. Landscape impact. Development here would set an undesirable precedent for development west of the ridge on exposed slopes of the High Weald AONB.
RY14	Land West of Kiln Drive	Rye Foreign	Rye Foreign	Abuts the AONB, Archaeological Sensitive Area.	ESCC Highways objections regarding access. Adverse impact on neighbouring amenities. Character of area.	No. It is less environmentally constrained than some other sites in Rye but accessibility to services is poor. Far from development boundary.
RY15	Land East of St Michael's Church, The Oakfield	Rye Playden	Playden	Archaeological sensitive area. Public rights of way.	ESCC Highways objections to access. Character of area.	This site is an area of both Rye and the wider District as a whole with relatively few environmental constraints, falling outside flood zones and AONB. However, the character of area and objections from ESCC Highways are both major constraining factors. ESCC Highways comments suggest that there are very limited options at present.
RY16	Land West of Fair Meadow - revise to only include the grassland land above the cemetery not the cemetery itself	Rural: Rye Foreign	Rye Foreign	Archaeological sensitive area. Public right of way.	Current use. Potential adverse impacts on neighbouring amenities. Adverse impacts on road network.	Site is not considered suitable for development as it appears to form part of the wider cemetery, it has several grave stones dotted over the site and open access to the main cemetery area, the only road access is via the narrow cemetery road, which is not considered appropriate.
RY17	Land West of Oast House Drive	Rye	Rye	part AONB	Landscape, character of area.	No, development would further extend ribbon development

ID	Site Name	Location	Parish	Summary of Environmental Policy	Summary of On-Site Constraints	Suitable Option for Development
RY21	Land r/o 13 Love lane	Rye	Rye	Public footpath. Adjacent AONB on west boundary. 30m from Archaeological Sensitive Area on east boundary.	Landscape, topography, access.	No, not practical, steep hillside with no vehicular access
RY22	Land east of Tilling Green Estate	Rye	Rye	Flood zone 2 and 3, AONB.	Landscape, darainage.	No
RY23	Land South of Rock Channel	Rye	Rye	Flood zone, strategic gap, BAP habitats	River flood plain, impact on historic setting	Not as part of SHLAA since it is not primarily a housing site, although housing may be an 'enabler'. Consideration of site for Marina purposes needs to be considered at a wider corporate level.
RY24	Land at Roldendene Farm, Love Lane	Rye	Rye Foreign	AONB, partial Archaeolical sensitive area.	Landscape, access, topography, character of area.	Site is not considered appropriate, it is not well related to existing development, is prominent in the AONB landscape, with no vehicular access and sloping topography.
RY25	Land north of Guldeford Road, Rye	Rye	East Guldeford	Flood zones, SSSI, UK bioversity action plan habitats (reedbeds; Coastal and floodplain grazing marsh)	Impact on road network. Character of area. Watercourses.	Not suitable for development due to SSSI status and greenfield site within Flood Zone 3
RY26	Land at Glencoe Farm, West Undercliff	Rye	Rye	Flood zones.	Difficult access off unmade road with narrow entrance. Character of area.	No, failed first sieve due to greenfield site in floodplain (PPS25).
RY27	Land adj. To 136 New Winchelsea Road	Rye	Rye	Flood zone, adjacent BAP habitats	Landscape. Extension of ribbon development in an essentially rural locale	No
RY28	Land adj. To Oast House Drive	Rye	Rye	None	Landscape issues, character of area.	No - small greenfield site, possibly not suitable for 6 dwellings given character of area. Far from services. Design and conservation concerns.
RY29	Land south of Guldeford Road, Rye	Rye	East Guldeford	adjacent SSSI	Character of area. Landscape issues.	No, not suitable for development.
RY35	Land between Saltcote and The Steps, New England Lane, Playden	Rye	Rye	Archaeological sensitive area.	Distance from town and main services. Access issues: ESCC Highways advise "It is considered that New England Lane is unsuitable to accommodate any further traffic."	Together with neighbouring site RY15, this site is an area of both Rye and the wider District as a whole with relatively few environmental constraints, falling outside flood zones and AONB. However, the distance from town centre, the character of area and objections from ESCC Highways are all major constraining factors. ESCC Highways comments suggest that there are very limited options at present.
RY36	Land east of Gateborough Farm, Winchelsea Road, Rye	Rye	Rye	Flood risk, part AONB, Coastal and floodplain grazing marsh.	Access. Flood risk and potential drainage issues, investigate contamination potential.	No, brownfield part of site is in employment use covered by existing policy. Design and concervation concerns.

ID	Site Name	Location	Parish	Summary of Environmental Policy	Summary of On-Site Constraints	Suitable Option for Development
RY37	Land at Rolvedene Farm, Love Lane, Rye	Rye	Rye	AONB	Character of area, prominent hillside location, impact on views to and from the AONB. Topography.	No. Not suitable for development site is too prominent in the landscape, steep- sided and not well related to existing development
RY38	Land adj Thomas Peacock School, Rye	Rye	Rye	Flood zone	Access, drainage.	No potential for housing as greenfield site in FZ3
RY39	Land South West of Rye	Rye	Rye	AONB, Flood zones 2 and 3, SNCI, adjacent ancient monument, Coastal and floodplain grazing marsh.	Landscape, access, character of area.	No residential greenfield floodplain, not suitable for employment or retail - sequential tests PPS4 and PPS6 also access issues and traffic impacts.
RY42	Land Adj Rye Community Primary School	Rye	Rye	Flood zone	Character of area.	No. Greenfield FZ3
RY9	Land Adjoining Thomas Peacocke School, Rye	Rye	Rye	Flood zones 2 and 3	Character of area, access, traffic impact.	no residential development due to flood risk (greenfield site), not suitable for employment or retail development due to access and traffic impact issues.
SE1	Land to rear of The Green, Sedlescombe	Rural: Sedlescombe	Sedlescombe	AONB. Conservation Area. Rights of Way. Archaeological Sensitive Area.	Sloping, trees, hedges, pond.	Difficult site. Access issues with little prospect of being overcome. Impact upon conservation area issues. Loss of allotments. However it is still one of the less environmentally constrained sites in the village.
SE10	Land South of Eastview Terrace, Brede Lane, Sedlescombe	Rural: Sedlescombe	Sedlescombe	AONB. Flood zones 2 & 3. Ancient woodland. SNCI. Rights of way.	Sloping with woodland, flooding and poor access.	No. Unlikely potential for development given environmental and physical constraints.
SE2	Land North of Gorselands, Sedlescombe	Rural: Sedlescombe	Sedlescombe	AONB. Right of Way.	Possible views. Stream to W. Trees to boundaries.	No. Landscape constraints are significant in this AONB location.
SE3	Land r/o Harriet House, Sedlescombe	Rural: Sedlescombe	Sedlescombe	AONB. Conservation Area, Archaeological Sensitive Area. Grounds of listed buildings.	Changing levels. Lack of readily available access. Trees and hedges.	No. Reasonable site in terms of village location, but several constraints including access, change in levels, multiple ownerships. Moreover the land comprises historic burgage plots in a conservation area location, so the site is not suitable on heritage grounds.
SE4	Land at Balcombe Green, Sedlescombe	Rural: Sedlescombe	Sedlescombe	AONB.	Trees and prominence of high ground. Stream	No. Not considered suitable by reason of loss of trees (woodland habitat) and subsequent prominence of development.
SE7	Rear of Village Hall, Sedlescombe	Rural: Sedlescombe	Sedlescombe	AONB. TPO. Right of Way adjacent and contains recordings of protected species.	Access difficult, steeply sloping and pond.	No. Should be retained as a public and nature park.
SE9	Land east of The Street, Sedlescombe	Rural: Sedlescombe	Sedlescombe	AONB. SNCI. Archaeological Sensitive Area. Right of Way. Adjacent listed buildings.	Open area linking the village to the river with views into the valley.	No. Should not be developed but left as a public open space.
SP1	Land west of Forge Close, Staplecross	Rural: Staplecross	Ewhurst	AONB	Access	No, not well related to the village, poor access.

ID	Site Name	Location	Parish	Summary of Environmental Policy	Summary of On-Site Constraints	Suitable Option for Development
SP4	Land adj Brayburn Barn, Northiam Road, Staplecross	Rural: Staplecross	Ewhurst	AONB only	Constraints relate to landscape impact, loss of rural character and site unrelated to settlement pattern	No. Not considered appropriate as site reads as part of the wider landscape
ST1	Land West of Lymden Lane, Stonegate	Rural: Stonegate	Ticehurst	AONB. Sandstone Outcrops. TPOs adjacent. GPZ Zone 3 - north-west corner of site.	Landscape, character of area and relocation of overhead lines.	No, although this is the best site in Stonegate. There are several environmental constraints in addition to AONB status. North west corner of site is a groundwater source protection zone and part of the site is defined as sandstone outcrop (a special to sussex habitat). Site is visually exposed, of rural character and not within a 'service' village.
ST2	Land East of Lymden Lane, Stonegate	Rural: Stonegate	Ticehurst	AONB. Right of Way.	Highways, access, trees and hedges.	No. Landscape impact for residential, apart from on south west side. Highway difficulties would preclude residential.
TC1	Lower Platts	Rural: Ticehurst	Ticehurst	AONB.	Landscape, access	Only as exception site. Application now refusd.
TC10	Land at Orchard Farm, Ticehurst	Rural: Ticehurst	Ticehurst	AONB.	Access. Gradient and topography. Character of area. Impact on neighbouring amenities.	Consultation with HA and EA at Local Plan stage have effectively ruled out development for more than 4 dwellings, unless an alternative and viable access can be achieved. Whilst the submitted site boundary includes 8 High Street (which would enable a wider access point) the submitter has not confirmed that they have the consent of the land owner to promote this site for consideration. As such it cannot be considered developable or deliverable at this stage.
TC13	Land south of St Mary's Close, Ticehurst	Rural: Ticehurst	Ticehurst	AONB. Adjacent to Conservation Area.	Landscape. Impact on neighbouring amenities	No, only as exception site
TC14	Cherry Tree Field, Ticehurst	Rural: Ticehurst	Ticehurst	AONB. Adjacent to Listed Building.	Landscape, hedges, access	Other options in Ticehurst preferred for SHLAA. Suitable for a number of other uses but employment preferred. Being progressed as an exception site.
TC15	Land r/o Owl Cottage, Lower Platts, Ticehurst	Rural: Ticehurst	Ticehurst	AONB. Right of Way. Adjacent listed building.	Neighbouring amenities. Access. Development boundary extension and proximity to village core.	No ESCC Highways rule out based on gradient.
TC16	Land East of Ticehurst	Rural: Ticehurst	Ticehurst	AONB. Ancient Woodland. Wet Woodland & Ghyll Woodland. Right of Way. GPZ Zone 3. Listed Building.	Character of area and landscape	No
TC18	Land off Farthing Hill	Rural: Ticehurst	Ticehurst	AONB	Neighbouring amenities and size of site mean may only just get 6 dwellings at high density. Landscape views to east. Large earth mound is physical constraint.	No

ID	Site Name	Location	Parish	Summary of Environmental Policy	Summary of On-Site Constraints	Suitable Option for Development
TC20	Land at Lower Platts, Ticehurst	Rural: Ticehurst	Ticehurst	AONB. Adjacent to listed buildings.	Ponds, topograhly.	Not suitable - Site comprises steep banks down to ponds. Remaining land not of sufficeint scale to warrant an allocation.
TC3	Land rear of Coronation Cottages, Tinker's Lane, Ticehurst	Rural: Ticehurst	Ticehurst	AONB, Ghyll woodland.	Character of area, relationship to development boundaries and village cores. Trees.	No
TC6	Land adj to Ferndale, Wallcrouch	Rural: Ticehurst	Ticehurst	AONB.	Rural location far removed from development boundary	No. Not suitable location for development allocation
TC7	Land west of Church Street, Ticehurst	Rural: Ticehurst	Ticehurst	AONB. Adjacent to listed building & Conservation Area.	Landscape. Access. Character of area and relationship to core of Ticehurst	No - Impact on AONB
TC8	Land at 40&41 of High Street, Ticehurst	Rural: Ticehurst	Ticehurst	AONB. Right of Way. Adjacent to listed building & Conservation Area. TPOs on adjacent land.	Landscape visual impact. Telegraph poles, access.	No. There are several obstacles to the development of this site and other sites are preferred in Ticehurst. Access is an issue, ESCC advise "In principle the loss of the two houses to provide site access is accepted. However, access would need to be staggered as far east as possible to avoid conflicts with uses on opposite side of the road. Noted that on-street parking is prevalent in High Street." Planning officer "The layout of extant permission RR/2008/648" for 25 extra care apartments and on-site care facility and A1 retail on the opposite side if the road is not condusive to the development of this site as it places site access directly opposite, which would give rise to ESCC Highways concerns. An access adjacent to listed buildings (Croft Cottage) is a potential conservation issue. Pylons are a physical constraint. Landscape is a constraint on northern sections of site.
TO3	Land adj. To Three Oaks Village Hall, Butchers Lane	Rural: Three Oaks	Guestling	AONB. Adjacent to Flood Zones 2 & 3.	Access, physical constraints.	Not for allocation, only as exception site
TO4	Land at Maxfield Lane, Three Oaks, Guestling	Rural: Three Oaks	Guestling	AONB. Adjacent to Ancient Woodland.	Unmade road. Existing properties	No
WB2	Land South of Harbour Farm	Rural: Wichelsea Beach	Icklesham	SSSI across southern section. SFRA issues. Flood Zones (Sea wall gives protection for 1:200 year event).	Access roads/multi ownership	No. Large scale redevelopment subject to sequential test and would require exception test subject to site specific assessment. SFRA states that any planning application for in-fill will be informed by level 2 SFRA, the breach analysis of which shows this area as a high flood hazard with possibility of flooding up to 2 metres. EA advise as follows; "we would object to:- the extension of the occupancy of the existing holiday caravans at this site; - the provision of further holiday caravans on the site; and - the provision of permanent residential caravan accommodation on the site." Site partially overlaps with SSSI (designated April 2007), so development boundary will need to be adjusted to reflect this and possibly re-drawn elsewhere as well.

ID	Site Name	Location	Parish	Summary of Environmental Policy	Summary of On-Site Constraints	Suitable Option for Development
WB4	Land at The Stables, Winchelsea Beach	Rural: Wichelsea Beach	Icklesham	Flood Zones 2 and 3 ROW BAP	Rural, fringe location with poor access	No. Consolidation/intensification of sporadic development along track resisted on character impact grounds.
WB5	Land at Victoria Way	Rural: Winchelsea Beach	Icklesham	Flooding zones 2 and 3, adj to SSSI and BAPs	Drainage/access roads/multi ownership	No. Large scale redevelopment subject to sequential test and would require exception test subject to site specific assessment. SFRA states that any planning application for in-fill will be informed by level 2 SFRA, the breach analysis of which shows this area as a high flood hazard with possibility of flooding up to 2 metres. EA advise as follows; "we would object to: - the extension of the occupancy of the existing holiday caravans at this site; - the provision of further holiday caravans on the site; and - the provision of permanent residential caravan accommodation on the site." Development boundary may need adjusting.
WC1	Land east of South Lane, Wood's Corner	Rural: Woods Corner	Dallington	AONB. Adjacent Right of Way.	Character of area. Hedges	No
WF1	Land at Cottage Lane, Westfield	Rural: Westfield	Westfield	AONB, Public Right of Way	Landscape, access.	No - Landscape constraints too great at this AONB location poorly related to existing development boundary.
WF10	Land at Ellenvale, Westfield	Rural: Westfield	Westfield	AONB, adjacent footpaths	Access, gradient, potential adverse affect on neighbouring amenities.	No. Negative issues include loss of rural business, unacceptable impact on AONB. South-west corner of site is on raised ground relative to dwellings west of the site boundary and development would have an adverse impact on their amenity.
WF11	Land at Yew Tree House, Wheel Lane, Westfield	Rural: Westfield	Westfield	AONB, public footpath	Site visit not necessary as distance from development boundary/services rules out proposed development.	No. Too far from existing development boundary and services. AONB location. Loss of rural business.
WF12	Hoads Farm, Moat Lane, Westfield	Rural: Westfield	Westfield	AONB	Site visit not necessary as distance from development boundary/services rules out proposed development.	No. Too far from existing development boundary and services. AONB location.
WF15	Land north of New Cut, Westfield	Rural: Westfield	Westfield	AONB.	Character of road network	Limited scope for development. Development boundary extension with access issues Possible allotment on west side, although access is still major contraint.
WF16	Land east of New Moorside, Westfield	Rural: Westfield	Westfield	AONB. Right of Way.	Access. Trees	No - poorly related to village services and preferable sites in Westfield.

ID	Site Name	Location	Parish	Summary of Environmental Policy	Summary of On-Site Constraints	Suitable Option for Development
WF2	Land at Barracks footpath, west of Cottage Lane, Westfield	Rural: Westfield	Westfield	AONB, TPO, Public Right of Way.	Trees, vegetation, access.	No - woodland open space. TPOs constrain development and site acts as informal open space for village.
WF8	South Terrace, Westfield	Rural: Westfield	Westfield	AONB	Neighbouring amenities, access.	Suitable in many ways, but not a reasonable prospect of coming forward given multiple ownerships
WF9	Land at Kent Street Nurseries	Rural: Westfield	Westfield	GPZ Zone 3, AONB, footpath.	Site visit not necessary as Environmental Policy factors rule out development.	No. Not well related to a development boundary, GPZ Zone 3, AONB - all factors that rule out development potential.
WL1	Land r/o 37 Baldslow Down	Rural: Westfield Lane	Westfield	Ghyll woodland (UK BAP habitat)	Physical constraints and topography. Landscape, trees, hedges. Access. Character of area - far from services.	Unsuitable for development. Difficult to justify site being located within development boundary.
WL2	Land r/o 66-78 Westfield Lane	Rural: Westfield	Westfield	Adjacent AONB, Ancient woodland. Ghyll woodland.	Access. Character of area - backland development would set an undesirable precedent. Distance to services.	No

Sites Appendix iv: Sites Rejected at Outset and Excluded from the Survey

ID	Site Name	Location	Parish	Size (Ha)	Reason for Exclusion
BA14	Land North West of Isherwood	Battle	Battle	1.46	Rejected at initial seive stage and not submitted by external party.
BA22	Lower Lake, Battle	Battle	Battle	5.1	Rejected at initial seive stage and not submitted by external party.
BA4	North Trade Road (East)	Battle	Battle	0.14	Operating telephone exchange. There is no indication that the current use is surplus to requirements.
BA48	Land at Netherfield Road, Battle	Battle	Battle	3.59	Already developed
BA51	Land north of Vale Road and Battle Gates, Battle	Battle	Battle	0.21	Falls below SHLAA size threshold. Too small developable area as site includes stream, steep banks and trees.
BB1	Winchelsea Road Garage, Bachelor's Bump	Rural: Bachelor's Bump	Guestling	0.21	Falls below SHLAA size threshold. Does not appear suitable for anything other then frontage scheme for perhaps 2 dwellings.
BE1	Beckley Garage, B2088	Rural: Beckley	Beckley	0.24	Rejected at initial seive stage and not submitted by external party.
BE2	Land r/o Prospect Cottage, Beckley	Rural: Beckley	Beckley	0.169	Rejected at initial seive stage and not submitted by external party.
BE3	Land adj. To Horsepen, Beckley	Rural: Beckley	Beckley	0.106	Rejected at initial seive stage and not submitted by external party.
BE4	Land adj. To The Poplars, Beckley	Rural: Beckley	Beckley	0.088	Rejected at initial seive stage and not submitted by external party.
BE5	Land adj. To Combe House, Beckley	Rural: Beckley	Beckley	0.173	Falls below SHLAA size threshold and prohibited by water course.
BE6	Aztec House, Main Street, Beckley	Rural: Beckley	Beckley	0.12	Falls below SHLAA size threshold.
BU1	High Street Garage, Burwash	Rural: Burwash	Burwash	0.23	Rejected at initial seive stage and not submitted by external party.
BU4	Land adj. Square Farm House, Burwash	Rural: Burwash	Burwash	0.281	Rejected at initial seive stage and not submitted by external party.
BU6	Laundry, Shrub Lane, Burwash	Rural: Burwash	Burwash	0.14	Falls below SHLAA size threshold.
BU9	Land at the Weeping Birch	Rural: Burwash	Burwash	0.135	Falls below SHLAA size threshold.
BX15	Former Public Conveniences, Down Road, Bexhill	Bexhill	N/a	0.008	Falls below SHLAA size threshold.
BX21	Belle Hill	Bexhill	N/a	0.47	Rejected at initial seive stage and not submitted by external party.
BX22	Chandlers Printers, Reginald Road	Bexhill	N/a	0.07	Development started
BX26	Land at Cooden Sea Road	Bexhill	N/a	0.68	Rejected at initial seive stage and not submitted by external party.

ID	Site Name	Location	Parish	Size (Ha)	Reason for Exclusion
BX27	Laundry, Chandler Road	Bexhill	N/a	0.08	Rejected at initial seive stage and not submitted by external party.
BX28	Land adj. To Broken Palm	Bexhill	N/a	0.11	Falls below SHLAA size threshold.
BX31	Ellerslie Lane Junction with Turkey Lane	Bexhill	N/a	0.15	Falls below SHLAA size threshold.
BX35	Ravenside Retail and Leisure Park	Bexhill	N/a	7.9	Proposal for designation as district centre. Not within remit of SHLAA. To be considered at Site Allocations DPD.
BX74	Land at the Byeway, Bexhill	Bexhill	N/a	0.11	Falls below SHLAA size threshold.
CA1	Skidders Lane, Catsfield	Rural: Catsfield	Catsfield	1.23	Rejected at initial seive stage and not submitted by external party.
CR5	Land at Sabon Gari, Battery Hill, Crowhurst	Rural: Crowhurst	Crowhurst	0.87	Rejected at initial seive stage and not submitted by external party.
CR6	Telephone Exchange, Crowhurst	Rural: Crowhurst	Crowhurst	0.13	Rejected at initial seive stage and not submitted by external party. Falls below SHLAA size threshold. Landscape issues.
CS4	Land at Cackle Street, Brede	Rural: Cackle Street	Brede	0.09	Falls below SHLAA size threshold.
EG5	The Old School House, Folkstone Road, East Gulderford	Rural: East Guldeford	East Guldeford	0.06	Falls below SHLAA size threshold.
ET12	Glebe Orchard Lands	Rural: Etchingham	Etchingham	0.079	Too small for 6 in isolation, unless developed with ET5. As ET12 owners say they are not willing to develop now, joint dev be guarenteed.
ET5	Land at Village Hall, High Street	Rural: Etchingham	Etchingham	0.11	Too small for 6 in isolation, unless developed with ET5. As ET12 owners say they are not willing to develop now, joint dev be guarenteed.
HG1	Land by Station Road	Rural: Hurst Green	Hurst Green	0.6	Rejected at initial seive stage and not submitted by external party.
HG12	Land at Hurst Green Garage	Rural: Hurst Green	Hurst Green	0.39	Development started
HG2	Land to the Rear of Ridgeway, Hurst Green	Rural: Hurst Green	Hurst Green	1.41	Rejected at initial seive stage and not submitted by external party.
IC1	Land adj. toFair View, Icklesham	Rural: Icklesham	Icklesham		Falls below SHLAA size threshold. Site too small to accommodate 6 or more dwellings
IC5	Car Park of The Robin Hood Pub, Icklesham	Rural: Icklesham	Icklesham	0.07	Falls below SHLAA size threshold. Site too small to accommodate 6 or more dwellings
IC6	Land adj to sunnyside, A259, Icklesham	Rural: Icklesham	Icklesham	0.2	Although site area is borderline to qualify for inclusion, the location would determine 1 or 2 dwellings only.
JC1	Redundant Farm Buildings, Johns Cross	Rural: John's Cross	Mountfield	0.14	Rejected at initial seive stage and not submitted by external party.
MO2	Darwell Reservoir (Indicative 125m buffer for Boundary Extension)	Rural: Mountfield	Mountfield	67.8	Not proposed for housing
NE8	Land at Darvel Down, Netherfield	Rural: Netherfield	Battle	0.248	Not proposed for housing

ID	Site Name	Location	Parish	Size (Ha)	Reason for Exclusion
NE9	Land at Darvel Down, Netherfield	Rural: Netherfield	Battle	4.48	Not proposed for housing
NO2	Land at The Farthings, Northiam	Rural: Northiam	Northiam		Falls below SHLAA size threshold. Too small to accommodate 6 dwellings given character of area.
NO21	Crown & Thistle Pub	Rural: Northiam	Northiam	0.15	Other uses preferred to housing. Unlikely to accommodate 6 dwellings in any event.
NO6	Land at Stoddards Depot, Whitebread Lane, Beckley	Rural: Northiam	Beckley	0.06	Falls below SHLAA size threshold.
PS1	Cornerways, School Lane, Peasmarsh	Rural: Peasmarsh	Peasmarsh	0.17	Falls below SHLAA size threshold.
PS17	Land west of Mendips, Peasmarsh	Rural: Peasmarsh	Peasmarsh	1.06	Rejected at initial seive stage and not submitted by external party.
PS19	Land at Oast Cottage, Main Street, Peasmarsh	Rural: Peasmarsh	Peasmarsh	0.13	Falls below SHLAA size threshold.
PS5	Land north east of Tanhouse, Tanhouse Lane, Peasmarsh	Rural: Peasmarsh	Peasmarsh	1	Rejected at initial seive stage and not submitted by external party.
PT2	Land adj. To Apple Tree Cottage, Pett	Rural: Pett	Pett	0.157	Falls below SHLAA size threshold.
PT5	Land at Home Cottage	Rural: Pett	Pett	0.073	Falls below SHLAA size threshold.
RB10	Land adj. To Cobblestones, Langham Road, Robertsbridge	Rural: Robertsbridge	Salehurst & Robertsbridge	0.1	Falls below SHLAA size threshold.
RB17	Land r/o Beech House	Rural: Robertsbridge	Salehurst and Robertsbridge	0.244	Falls below SHLAA size threshold.
RY1	Land adj. To The White House, A268	Rye	Rye	1.3	Rejected at initial seive stage and not submitted by external party.
RY10	Former Public Conveniences and 'Old Soup Kitchen', Rope Walk, Rye.	Rye	Rye	0.0078	Falls below SHLAA size threshold.
RY6	Land between Cyprus Place and Forge Mews	Rye	Rye	0.067	Falls below SHLAA size threshold. Too small to accommodate 6 dwellings
RY8	Cadborough Marsh, Rye	Rye	Rye	1.02	Rejected at initial seive stage and not submitted by external party.
SE6	Land at Queens Head, Brede Lane, Sedlescombe	Rural: Sedlescombe	Sedlescombe	0.18	Falls below SHLAA size threshold.
TC12	Bewl Reservoir (Indicative 60m buffer for Boundary Extension)	Rural: Ticehurst	Ticehurst	Approx 150-175	Not proposed for housing
TC2	Land off Pickforde Lane, Ticehurst	Rural: Ticehurst	Ticehurst	0.152	Now developed for business use.
TC4	Ticehurst Lane	Rural: Ticehurst	Ticehurst	18.19	Rejected at initial seive stage and not submitted by external party.
TC5	Land at Depot, High Street, Ticehurst	Rural: Ticehurst	Ticehurst	0.253	Permission not yet completed

ID	Site Name	Location	Parish	Size (Ha)	Reason for Exclusion
TC9	Land adj. 3 Pickforde Lane, Ticehurst	Rural: Ticehurst	Ticehurst	0.05	Too small and not suitable - back garden with listed building in close proximity.
TO1	Land adj. To Spring Bank, Butcher's Lane, Three Oaks	Rural: Three Oaks	Guestling	0.03	Rejected at initial seive stage and not submitted by external party.
TO2	Land adj. To 1 Willow Stream Close, Three Oaks	Rural: Three Oaks	Guestling	0.1	Rejected at initial seive stage and not submitted by external party.
WB1	Sea Road, Winchelsea Beach	Rural: Wichelsea Beach	Icklesham	0.56	Rejected at initial seive stage and not submitted by external party.
WB3	Land adjoining Seaspray Caravan Park, Winchelsea Beach	Rural: Wichelsea Beach	Icklesham	0.353	Rejected at initial seive stage and not submitted by external party.
WF7	Land adj. To Church View, Vicarage Lane	Rural: Westfield	Westfield	0.19	Rejected at initial seive stage and not submitted by external party.

Appendix v: Large Site Permissions not yet completed (as at SHLAA Base Date 01/10/09)

SHLAA ID	Ref	Large site Commitments	Parish	No. of units	.09/10	.10/11	.11/12	.12/13	.13/14	14		Available	Suitable	Achievable	Planning Notes
BX79	20002050	Hazareth House, Hastings Road	Bexhill	6 more than		6						Yes	Yes	Yes	Orbit housing have intructed Gemselect to complete the agreed affordable units - 13 units completed 09/10
BX7	20042907	Grand Hotel, Sea Road	Bexhill	28			28					Yes	Yes	Yes	2 Applications have been approved. Awaiting developer to purchase and from discussions it is expected to be completed within the 5yr period - Revenue funding has been secured, housing in the process of finding a developer
BX80	20073254	52 Collington Avenue	Bexhill	11			11					Yes	Yes	Yes	Work yet to commence - building regs approved - development on hold due to market conditions - Agent/Architect JOHN SHERIDAN 20/10/09
BX29	20050844	66-68 Sackville Road	Bexhill	66	66							Yes	Yes	Yes	U/C - works continuing site visit 11/5/09 - expected completion 09/10
BX5	20062226	Bowling Green, Knole Road	Bexhill	41			41					Yes	Yes	Yes	Back with Planning Inspectorate awaiting new Inquiry date 20/10/2009
BX13	20070264	47-51 Cooden Sea Road	Bexhill	10			10					Yes	Yes	Yes	Advised by Development Control Officer 19/10/2009 that developers hope to make a start on the early 2010
BX81	20070609	Land South of Terminus Road	Bexhill	6			6					Yes	Yes	Yes	Still only outline 19/10/2009
BX82	20070694	Chintings, Upper Sea Road	Bexhill	7			7					Yes	Yes	Yes	Still only outline 20/10/2009 - No further contact since approval - Orbit did offer on this site check status as HMO
BX83	20072234	30-34 Dorset Road	Bexhill	10			10					Yes	Yes	Yes	Still only outline 20/10/2009 - No further contact since approval - Orbit did offer on this site check status as HMO
BX84	20080769	Sackville Apartments, De La Warr Parade	Bexhill	7	7							Yes	Yes	Yes	Spoke with agent (challinor hall) 15/10/2009 development should be complete within the next 3 months
BX85	20081497	12-14 Sutherland Avenue	Bexhill	9			9					Yes	Yes	Yes	Still only outline permission on hold due to downturn in market - R D P ARCHITECTS and case officer 15/10/2009
BX62	20082759	Hillborough House, Little Common Road	Bexhill	13			13					Yes	Yes	Yes	Challinor Hall [david@challinorhall.co.uk] 15/10/2009 Site being marked for sale however if the markets continue to improve their client is minded to develop the Hillborough house site on his own or in partnership mid next year.
BX86	20032683	Hollenden house, Buckhurst Road	Bexhill	70		45	25					Yes	Yes	Yes	U/C (Plots 1-10) Estimated date of completion 2011
BA3	20040822	36 North Trade Road	Battle	4	4							Yes	Yes	Yes	U/C plots 12-15 due to complete Autumn 09
FO11	20033300	Royal Oak - Former Site, Main Street	Beckley	6			6					Yes	Yes	Yes	Spoke with Central & Provincial Properties Limited 15/10/2009 Bridle-way issue now resolved. Have started the development as far as they can, any further development requires the implementation of the recently granted stopping up order. The County Council are preparing the Supplemental Deed which they are currently drafting. Once this is agreed and executed we can go out to tender these works and once certified as being complete stop up the BOAT and resume the development.
BU7	20072451	The Old Orchard, High Street	Burwash	3	3							Yes	Yes	Yes	U/C - Flats now complete remaining houses under construction to be completed 09/10
CM12	19930736	Brookside Farm	Camber	67	15	52						Yes	Yes	Yes	Plots 145 - 151 recently complete Phase 4 to start shortly completion expected 10/11
NO17	20062311	The Paddock, Goddens Gill	Northiam	51				51				Yes	Yes	Yes	Currently on hold - Original applicants have gone bust (English Courtyard Association); owners considering options - DC case officer 20/10/2009
RB12	20053312	Country Crafts Site - Adj. The George	Robertsbridge	9			9					Yes	Yes	Yes	Development Still on hold due to market conditions. 20/10/2009 ROGER HOWELLS ARCHITECT
RY20	20061991	53 Cinque Ports Street	Rye	10					10			Yes	Yes	Yes	Unlikely to occur soon as the ESCC library element of this scheme is now going to occur on another site and without this owner unlikely to build - Gary Pillbeam & DC case officer 20/10/2009
RY43	20062000	43 Winchelsea Road	Rye	6			6					Yes	Yes	Yes	Details approved recently development could start shortly 20/10/2009
RY44	20052399	Tower House, Hilders Cliff	Rye	6			6					Yes	Yes	Yes	Works yet to commence - Left message with applicant. Spoke with case officer still outstanding conditions unlikely to start in near future 20/10/2009
RY5, RY41	20072365	Udimore Road	Rye	135			40	40	40	7		Yes	Yes	Yes	Case officer advises (20/10/09) Details about to be approved but no indication of start date as affordable housing funding bid under 'kickstart' scheme recently failed.
SE11	20070378	Pestalozzi International Village	Sedlescombe	6			6					Yes	Yes	Yes	Development has not yet commenced due to lack of funds from owner & current conditions are being discussed also still only outline PP 4/2/2009 no affordable housing. Land & planning permission currently being advertised - Oct 09
SE8	20073306	Cartref, The Street	Sedlescombe	6			6					Yes	Yes	Yes	Oakley New Homes developers has gone bust so progress on this site has stopped. Possible purchase from a different developer.No new developer only ground works started 4/2/2009
HF1	20071911	Land at Woodlands Way	Westfield	43				43				Yes	Yes	Yes	Millwood homes have development on hold will not be developed in the near future. 20/10/2009 Not viable at present
WF6n and w		Land off Moor Lane, north of Moor Farm	Westfield	26								Yes	Yes	Yes	
WF17	20041092	Westways and Westfield Garage, Main Road	Westfield	7		4	3					Yes	Yes	Yes	Development of 4 dwellings commenced but not completed because of the recession. Developer (owner of garage) is believed to have run out of money. RR/2008/1159/P - Mixed development including 3 dwellings. Not yet commenced. Do not know when this might be implemented but may depend upon developer being able to complete and sell 4 already started. DC Case officer 19/10/2009. Contacted Agent/Owner Awaiting Reply 19/10/2009
	Totals			669	95	107	242	134	50	7					
	Subject to S106														
BX30	20030006	276 Turkey Road	Bexhill	38				38				Yes	Yes	Yes	No Revised Application works yet to commence - Orbit involved but no replies from landowner
BX87	20071798	51-55 Hinfild Road	Bexhill	13				13				Yes	Yes	Yes	No further progress has been made and nothing has been heard from agent or any possible developers. Orbit refused no RSL interested
BA11, BA49 AND BA50	20071896	Blackfriars	Battle	245				25	55	55		Yes	Yes	Yes	On Hold - DoR investigating options with HCA - issues regarding S/O and rented regarding P council wishes (valuations and viability) - issues with school location and plans for early years away from prim/joun schools
RH8	20083027	Rye Harbour Garage	Icklesham	7		7						Yes	Yes	Yes	In partnership with local developers. Orbit Housing is due to deliver 7 affordable flats.
	Totals			303	0	7	0	76	55	55					
	Totals Inc. S106			972	95	114	242	210	105	62		5 years Total		828	

Sites Appendix vi: Form A 'Initial Assessment of Suitability including On-Site Appraisal'

Id:		Name:	
How Was the Site Identified			
Location			
Settlement:	Parish:		
Address:	Ward:		
	South Coast Sub Region:		
Site Details		Brownfield or Greenfield?	Size (Ha)
Current Land Use			

Policy Context and Identified Need

Wholly within development boundary ☐ Partially within development boundary ☐
 Abut development boundary ☐ Wholly outside development boundary ☐

**Local Plan, SE Plan
Waste and Minerals
LDF, Core Strategy
(incl Rural
Settlements Study
and Urban Options
Background paper)**

Housekeeping Checklist (replace with photo later)

Surveyed By (1):

Survey Date (1):

Environmental Factors

Criteria	Yes/No	+ any other relevant information, i.e impact upon adjacent, etc.
Flood Zone 2:		
Flood Zone 3:		
AONB:		
SPA:		
SAC:		
Ramsar:		
SSSI:		
S.Ancient Monument:		
Registered Battlefield:		
Strategic Gap		
Ancient Woodland:		
SNCI:		
NNR:		
Listed Buildings:		
Conservation Area:		
TPO		
Archaeological Sensitive Area:		
Groundwater Source Protection Zones		GPZ Zone 1 (Inner Protection Zone) ☐ GPZ Zone 2 (Outer Protection Zone) ☐ GPZ Zone 3 (Outer Protection Zone) ☐
Groundwater Source Point		
Other (e.g. rights of way, bridleways)		
UK Biodiversity Action Plan Habitats:		
Summary of Environmental Constraints:		

On-Site Appraisal

Not necessary if Environmental Factors and Policy Factors weigh against development

Character of Area (including relationship to key services)	
Density of Neighbouring Homes:	
Potential adverse affects on neighbouring amenities:	
Physical Constraints and Topography:	
Landscape Issues / Visual Linkages (+ into site from public vantage points if has potential)	
Access Issues (including movements across site and need for 3rd party access)	
Impact of traffic on character and road network:	
Trees:	
Hedgerows:	
Watercourses:	
Drainage:	
Contamination or Pollution Issues:	
Following two questions only necessary if site has a potential development opportunity (see right hand column)	
Layout/design parameters	
Potential Mitigation Measures:	
Summary of On-Site Constraints:	

Future Development Opportunities

Based on context of (i) Position in Relation to Development Boundary (ii) Env. issues, (iii) On-site constraints, (iv) Policy and Identified needs

Summary of Development Opportunities		constraints, (iv) Policy and identified needs
SHLAA Conclusions: First Seive:		
SHLAA Conclusions: Second Seive:		
Potentially Suitable for Exception Site		
Total Residential Units		
Affordable Units		
Indicative Density (units per ha)		
Potentially Suitable for Employment:		
Employment: Indicative floorspace by use class		
Potentially Suitable for Retail:		
Retail: Indicative floorspace by use class		
Potentially Suitable for Open Space / Leisure:		
Open Space, Leisure: Indicative sqm by use class		
Potentially Suitable for Another Use (e.g Gypsies and Travellers)		
Other Site Opportunities		

Conclusions - Suitable Option for Further Investigation

Sites Appendix vii: Form B 'Detailed Assessments'

Key Details

Id: Name:

How Was the Site Identified?

Size (Ha):

Location

Settlement:

Address:

Current Land Use:

Planning History

Detailed Environmental Information

Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA):includes Highway and Sewerage Flooding (and Southern Water advice where appropriate)

Environment Agency Advice:

Agricultural Land Classification:

Contamination Issues:

Habitats and Biodiversit From Sussex Biodiversity Record Centre and Site Forms

Species Information:
Protected Species Register (PSR):
Rare Species Inventory (RSI):
Biodiversity Action Plan Species (BAP):

Biodiversity Opportunity Areas

Landscape Character Area Assessment by County Landscape Officer

Capacity to Accept Change - Housing:

Capacity to Accept Change - Business

Conservation and Design Issues

Comments from Conservation and Design Office

Summary of Environmental Constraints

Summary of Environmental Policy, and Habitats Constraints:

Summary of On-Site Constraints:

Additional Studies and Researc

Utilities and Infrastructure (from utilities agencies)

Gas Cables:

Highways and Accessibility Issues

Access to nearest	Distance from
Convenience Food Shop:	
Primary School	
Bus Route:	
Railway Station	
Main Doctor's Surgery	

On-Site Access Issues (as further advised by ESCC Highways)

Further Access advice sought from ESCC?:

Assessment of Suitability

SHLAA Conclusions: Second Seive:

SHLAA Conclusions: Third Seive:

Notes: SHLAA Third Seive is a cross-check of suitability in the light of new info; i.e; Landscape Study, Planning History, SFRA, Access to Services (set of rules based on guidance such as 'Places, Streets and Movements' + other docs but not ownership and not generally on site access (since these are factors affecting developability/deliverability, not suitability). If access can never be achieved safely then suitability is 'No', if it is not developable because of a factor like ransom strip, it can be suitabale but not yet developable.

Potentially Suitable for Residential Exception Site:

Development Opportunitie Based on env. issues, on-site constraints, policy context

Summary of Development Opportunities

Total Residential Units

Affordable Units

Indicative Density (units per ha)

Note on Densities from RDC SHLAA Methodology: It will include comparison with a selection of sample schemes in accordance with the DCLG guidance. For example, design and densities could be informed by PPS3 companion guide which has series of case-studies and sample schemes.
<http://www.communities.gov.uk/publications/planningandbuilding/betterplaces>

Conclusions - Suitable Option

Ownership:

Notes: only need to confirm ownership if site considered developable

If submitted by a external party using site submission form.....

Submitted By:

Received by post Received by email

Site Interest of Submitter

A Planning Consultant The Land Owner
A Developer/prospective developer An Agent
A Registered Social Landlord Other

If Other, please specify:

If agent or consultant, who are they acting on behalf of?:

Does Submitter of Site have consent to promote this site in LDF?:

Other Factors / Constraints

Ownership and / or Applicant Constraints:

Awaiting Relocation of Current Use:

Level of Developer Interest: (High, Medium or Low)

Recommendations for How Constraints Could Be Overcome

Developable?

Developable?

How long to fully develop the site?

Timescale: Before 2011

Timescale: 2012-2016:

Timescale: 2017-2021:

Timescale: 2022-2026:

Timescale: After 2026:

Deliverable?

Available Now?

Available within 5 Years of Adoption?

