

Rother Local Plan 2025–2042 Development Strategy and Site Allocations Regulation 18 Consultation January 2026

Response Form

8 week public consultation period: 26th January – 23rd March 2026

Rother District Council is inviting residents, businesses, and stakeholders to take part in a vital consultation on its emerging Local Plan.

The consultation period runs for eight weeks from Monday 26th January to 5:00pm on Monday 23rd March 2026.

The Draft Local Plan and all of its supporting evidence base documents can be found and commented on via the Council's website at www.rother.gov.uk/draftlocalplan2026.

The Council prefers to receive your consultation responses via our website.

You may also respond by email or post by filling this form and then sending it by email to draftlocalplan@rother.gov.uk or by post to Planning Policy, Rother District Council, Town Hall, Bexhill-on-Sea, TN39 3JX. Please note that submissions made via post will not receive confirmation that they have been received.

If you are using this form, please state which consultation question(s) you would like to respond to. These questions are found in the draft Local Plan. They also have been attached to the end of this form for your reference.

Personal Details – You must provide these details for us to accept your consultation response

	Please enter your details
Title	Mr
First Name	Marcus
Surname	Gould
Job Title (where relevant)	
Organisation (where relevant)	
Address	██████████ ██████████ ██████████████ ████ ██████████
Post Code	██████████
Email address	██

Agents Details or Other Details (if making a representation on behalf of the above consultee)

	Please enter your details
Title	
First Name	
Surname	
Job Title (where relevant)	
Organisation (where relevant)	
Address	
Post Code	
Email address	

Privacy Policy Statement

Rother District Council is committed to ensuring that your privacy is protected and will only use and store your personal data in line with the General Data Protection Regulation 2016 and the Data Protection Act 1998. We collect and use your personal data in order to provide services you have requested from us or to carry out our legal obligations to you. We will not disclose your personal data to any third parties, unless we need to do so to provide a service to you or we are legally required to do so. We may share your personal data with other Council departments in order to provide the service you have requested and to ensure that the information we hold about you is accurate and up to date. Our Privacy Policy sets out how we collect, use and securely hold your data and can be viewed on our privacy policy page at <https://www.rother.gov.uk/data-protection-and-foi/privacy-policy/>. If you want more information on how a particular Council service uses your personal data, please view the Privacy Notices at the bottom of the above privacy policy page.

Please be aware that any comments you submit cannot be treated in confidence as the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012, as amended, requires copies of all representations to be made publicly available. The Council will publish names and representations on its website, but will not publish personal information, such as telephone numbers, emails or private addresses. By submitting a representation you are accordingly confirming that you agree to this and accept responsibility for your comments.

Please write your comments below. Please indicate in the left-hand column which question you are responding to. This will help ensure that your response is considered correctly. Please continue on a separate page or sheet of paper if necessary.

Question Number	Your Comments
1	The <i>Strategic Spatial Objectives</i> initially all appear very worthy but don't bear close scrutiny. For example, <i>Item 2</i> talks about <i>nature conservation and preserving the historic landscape character</i> which Rother's Plan then goes on to contradict by building four out of the five sites in Peasmarch on green fields (PE1, PE2, PE3, PE4) and allocating houses on rapidly sloping land that would loom over the village (PE3). <i>Item 4</i> refers to houses that <i>address the income levels of Rother's wider population</i>. A quick glance at the job ads in the area show that the majority of jobs hover around the minimum wage, which is around £25,000 per annum. A couple working full time would therefore be able to get a mortgage of around £225,000, a maximum of £300,000 if conditions were perfect (https://www.moneyhelpdesk.com/mortgages/mortgage-affordability/how-much-mortgage-can-you-get-with-a-50-000-salary). Given that the average house price in Peasmarch is £410,833 (https://www.rightmove.co.uk/house-prices/peasmarch.html) one can see that unless new builds are discounted by 27% and both halves of the couple are working full time and they get a maximum mortgage and they have a suitable deposit, so-called affordable houses are anything but. In reality, it's unlikely any person in their 20s (and therefore not much credit history) would get a maximum mortgage. Most young people will never be able to afford any of the 143 new houses being proposed in their village. <i>Item 8</i> admirably advocates public transport whilst simultaneously failing to recognise how infrequent, how unreliable, how poorly integrated and how expensive it is. <i>Item 10</i> mentions opportunities for <i>local</i> delivery through neighbourhood planning whilst ignoring almost everything in the local <i>Peasmarch Neighbourhood Development Plan (PNDP)</i>.

Question Number	Your Comments
	The whole list continues in that vein, the above is a selection of standout points. Peppered throughout Rother's Plan is the word <i>sustainable</i>. Again and again in the text it appears whilst offering theoretically sustainable ideas which are only united by being practically unsustainable. In other words, the opening statement of the Rother Local Plan <i>talks the talk</i> but we see in almost every aspect of the rest of the document, absolutely fails to <i>walk the walk</i>.
2	The target housing numbers do not acknowledge the number of houses not in use such as second homes, holiday homes, speculative investments and so on, of which there were 1244 in 2025. Source: https://www.actiononemptyhomes.org/facts-and-figures (A-Z) There are no solutions offered as to how tax incentives/disincentives or any other mechanisms could be used to bring empty homes in to use. Although it makes no secret of it, it's clear that Rother's plan is less about providing homes and more about building for building's sake.
5	Item 4.3/Figure 6 lists the fundamental infrastructure needs of the community. The rest of the plan and its supporting documents and appendices then fail to show how any of these are sustainable. (a) Transport and Movement. Public Transport is dismal. Peasmarsh gets one bus (the 313) in to Rye every two hours which is often late and, even when it is on time, does not integrate with connections in Rye. Incoming buses to Rye arrive minutes after onward bus services to Hastings have already left. In the case of trains, there are only a couple of minutes in it meaning anyone who can't run for a train isn't going to make it. The last bus from Rye to Peasmarsh is at 21:00 making it challenging to socialise and support Rye's fragile hospitality industry. By way of illustration, a visit to the Conquest Hospital in Hastings is a four hour round trip and that is only if your appointment time is optimised to make the most of the bus connections.

Question Number	Your Comments
	Public Transport costs are prohibitive for anyone on low income, being about £5.50 for a return to Rye (https://www.stagecoachbus.com/plan-a-journey). Imagine the regular cost weekly and monthly in comparison to minimum wage, benefits payments and so on. The roads are littered with potholes so cycling is a matter of taking one's life in to one's own hands. It is certainly not an option for the young or inexperienced. At many times of year the roads flood, making transport hazardous. In cold weather the floods freeze, the bottom of Church Lane being an extremely dangerous area with sheets of ice covering the main road for example. Pedestrian pavements within the village are uneven and swap over the side of the road they're on. There are no crossings to help pedestrians get from one side to the other. Everything about the Public Transport network within the village encourages the use of cars. This is another example of how the <i>Strategic Spatial Objectives</i> in <i>Figure 1, Item 8</i> promise much but deliver little. (b) Community and Cultural Facilities. Credit where it is due, <i>Peasmarsh Memorial Hall</i>, the <i>Recreation Ground and its pavilion</i>, the <i>allotments</i> and <i>Coronation Garden</i> are all well-used and well respected facilities. However, these are run by the Parish Council, not Rother District Council, which illustrates the effectiveness of local knowledge and understanding of the community: The very local knowledge and understanding that Rother District ignored when it acknowledged almost nothing from the <i>Peasmarsh Neighbourhood Development Plan</i>. These examples of local self-determination are increasingly being undermined by a micromanaged centralised approach to local matters. (c) Education. The closest secondary school to Peasmarsh is Rye College. This has not had a Sixth Form for many years and has recently come out of special measures which left it with a stripped-down largely STEM-

Question Number	Your Comments
	only curriculum. In any case, its reputation has declined such that many parents prefer to send their children to Homewood in Kent! It will take a long time for Rye to recover the reputational damage of being in special measures even if it receives funding to bring back more arts, sports, vocational subjects and so on. Without a Sixth Form it may never be the school of choice, in spite of it being ten minutes up the road. Ironically, Rye College's location and opening hours mean it is very well served by accessible public transport, being close to the train and bus station. There should be a strategy to make Rye College an attractive place for parents to send their children. However, getting children from Peasmarsch to Homewood or to Sixth Forms in Hastings or Bexhill via public transport presents it own issues already discussed in part (a) of this response. (d) Health and Social Care. Peasmarsch does not have a village GP surgery. It is understood that nearby Northiam surgery is no longer taking new patients. The only choice for Primary Care is in Rye, reachable by expensive and unreliable public transport or car. As mentioned, an appointment at the hospital in Hastings will be an expensive all day affair if attempted by public transport. (e) Green and blue infrastructure, and flood defence. Peasmarsch floods and is a village with its own in-joke: "The clue is in the name - Peas<u>marsh</u>". Short of renaming the village <i>Floody McFloodface</i>, one struggles to think of ways to impress upon Rother District Council just how much water plays a part in day to day life. Because the village does not lie in a valley or flood plain and is not close to the sea, it appears that Rother District Council incorrectly assumes that Peasmarsch cannot flood. Indeed, the <i>Interim Sustainability Appraisal (January 2026) Page 120 Paragraph 5.137</i> makes the demonstrably nonsense assertion that, <i>[o]n Flooding, the parish scores both neutral and minor positives, indicating clearly that this is not a local issue.</i> The use of the word <i>clearly</i> in that sentence is direct evidence that

Question Number	Your Comments
	the <i>Peasmarsh Neighbourhood Development Plan</i> has been ignored. It also strongly suggests that the Council is using the wrong flood maps when assessing flood risk (fluvial vs pluvial) not to mention a very high water table. There are many homes around Peasmarsh that have fully functioning wells and active springs. If the council were to carry out an audit of wells and springs it would show that the village almost floats on water. The following map, based on Environment Agency data, clearly shows that Peasmarsh has a major surface water flooding problem: https://mapst.ac/foe/flood-risk#12.36/50.98345/0.68287  As the responses to these questions demonstrate, each part of the infrastructure affects many others. Without a thought-through, joined up, integrated, properly funded approach backed up by local knowledge built on a foundation of local understanding, Rother's plans have not got a chance of succeeding. Merely building houses to meet a quota will not help because it wilfully fails to take in to consideration these infrastructure failings. It will make life worse for both existing villagers and new residents by increasing competition for already limited resources. As if to add insult to injury, freshly-dug graves in Peasmarsh Church's cemetery often fill up with water and have to be pumped out before coffins can be interred. We can't even bury our dead with dignity! (f) Utility and Energy. The water supply has failed regularly in the past, sometimes being

Question Number	Your Comments
	out for days requiring South East Water to drop bottles of drinking water at the Memorial Hall. Personal records show water supplies were lost November 2024, December 2024, January 2025 and May 2025. Such frequent failures undermine any assertion that housing development can be sustainable. Waste water is equally poor with Southern Water regularly dumping raw sewage in to the River Rother. In 2026 so far (to mid March) Peasmarsh alone has dumped 27 dumps totalling 283 hours of Combined Effluent Overflow (CEO) and the onward Iden treatment works discharged 56 dumps totalling 1304 hours (Sanitary Sewer Overflow). Making Peasmarsh the tenth biggest polluter of the River Rother. This is not sustainable. Source: https://top-of-the-poops.org/constituency/hastings-and-rye/live The electricity supply is not sustainable, having failed sometimes for a few minutes and sometimes for hours at a time in December 2022, March 2023, June 2024, October 2024, November 2024 and January 2026. Even homes with solar panels and heat pumps will not be protected from these outages unless homes are built with solar batteries to see them through prolonged mains failure. Rother's plan does not mention building new homes with solar batteries which would have been an easy sustainability win. Similarly, in the move to a green infrastructure, Electric Vehicles cannot be charged when there is no power and petrol pumps don't work either. Non Fibre to the Premises (FTTP) broadband fails when the electricity supply fails as well as in its own right, most recently in January 2026 when it was unavailable for three days. It is not just residential households that are affected. Homeworkers, businesses large and small, hospitality and health services all suffer when the power, water and broadband fail. With the phasing out of the Public Switched Telephone Network

Question Number	Your Comments
	(PSTN), digital phone lines now rely on electricity. When the power fails severely enough (e.g. December 2022) the mobile phone masts also lose power meaning that it is impossible to make a phone call by landline or mobile. This is not only unsustainable but being unable to contact the police, fire service, doctor, ambulance or even a friend is literally life-threatening. All of these things were explained in the Peasmarsh Neighbourhood Development Plan which has clearly been ignored as a matter of policy: <i>The parish – sometimes just parts of it – experiences frequent supply disruption ranging from less than a second to hours or even days. This is because the supplies are, in general, spurs from high voltage lines and not rings [which would provide secure supplies]. There is little likelihood of the network being upgraded.</i> (PNDP, Page 12) (g) Emergency and Security Services As explained in the previous section on Infrastructure, when the power fails, it may be impossible to actually call the emergency services. The fire service are mercifully not needed for fires very often. They are, however, on hand to pump water out of people's homes due to flooding. There is not a visible police presence in the village. The days of a reassuring beat copper on patrol are long gone. Rural crime is particularly distressing as primarily targets work tools and equipment and impacts trades people's livelihoods. Source: https://www.sussexexpress.co.uk/news/crime/this-is-how-many-tool-thefts-have-been-reported-in-sussex-since-2021-5863868 In summary, there is very little of Peasmarsh's infrastructure that is fundamentally sustainable. All aspects require considerable investments of money and time, none of which have been considered as part of this plan.

Question Number	Your Comments
6	<i>Item 5.12 Strategic Gap is an example of how Rother District's Plan is trying to have its cake and eat it.</i> <i>5.13 says both of these contradictory statements in consecutive sentences</i> <i>Overall, it is considered that this option would undermine the principal intent of the strategic gaps, which is to: maintain the separate identity and distinctiveness between settlements; to maintain the strategic settlement pattern; and to prevent the coalescence of settlements.</i> <i>And then...</i> <i>[...] Development Strategy will not necessarily preclude future site allocations within one or more of the strategic gaps or Neighbourhood Plan green gaps (and a subsequent re-drawing of the strategic/ green gap boundary), if a site is assessed as suitable, available and achievable for development</i> <i>In spite of this doublethink ("we won't build in strategic gaps unless we want to") it is easy to infer Rother District's intent in Peasmarch by the fact that proposed Site PE3, Tanyard Field, is a strategic gap that stops Peasmarch blurring in to Rye Foreign, a tiny parish with it's own quirky history (https://rye-foreign-parish-council.org/rye-foreign-history.html). A case of closing gaps and redrawing maps.</i>
8	<i>Item 6.3 says talks about "small scale" developments in the High Weald National Landscape and then proposes 143 new houses in a village of 592 houses. That isn't small scale. That is an increase of almost 25%. An expansion of that size is irreconcilable with the Plan's strategy of [s]ensitive development in other rural settlements of the district. (Item 6.1, Page 53).</i> <i>The same table says, Rye and Battle will continue to be key transport and community hubs, with improved active and public transport, better connecting the cluster of settlements to the towns. There are opportunities for sensitive growth in these clusters alongside new facilities and services for both new and existing residents to benefit from. Which uses the word sensitive again and couples it with a belief that Rye is a viable transport hub.</i>

Question Number	Your Comments
	It is true that Rye has a train station and a bus station but as has been pointed out in the answer to Q5 these services fail to run when they're needed (either by frequency or early/late in the day), are not integrated with each other, are unreliable and expensive. At the time of writing it has been announced that <i>the council will cease funding for Sunday services on the 312 between Rye and Tenterden, the 313 between Northiam and Rye Harbour and the 329 between Tenterden and Hastings. Evening services are also expected to see reductions on the 313 between Northiam and Rye Harbour, and the 329 between Northiam and Hastings.</i> https://www.ryenews.org.uk/news/news-in-brief-13-march
13	<i>Item 6.77 says of Peasmarch, [f]our sites have been allocated in the parish; the existing services indicate that it is a sustainable location for development.</i> No it isn't a sustainable location for development. <i>The Settlement Study – Part 1 Figure 4, Page 23, allocates Peasmarch 13 points towards its Service Level Component Score because the village has a Supermarket, Post Office, Cafe, Pharmacy and Petrol Station.</i> However, all of these facilities are part of one shop, Jempson's, which is a family business run by one man in his sixties, Mr Jempson. Rother District Council has piled all of its sustainability goals in an inverted pyramid on the shoulders of one human being: a local shopkeeper close to retirement age! This eggs-in-one-basket approach is precarious and fragile. The parlous state of bricks and mortar retail in general along with the building of a new Aldi in Rye means that we cannot count on this small local business being here in 20 years' time. Maybe not even ten. We cannot just assume (as the Rother Plan does) a local family-run shop is somehow immune to the forces that have seen the loss of so many much bigger established High Street names. For the avoidance of doubt: This is not about the rights and wrongs of competition, this is not about whether we love or loathe Jempson's, this is not about Mr Jempson as an individual or as a businessman.

Question Number	Your Comments
	This is about Rother District Council gambling an entire 17-year development plan on one single privately-owned family business. That is not a solid foundation for a sustainable plan. If this one shop, the service hub of Peasmarsch, disappears, then what? Without Jempson's, Peasmarsch becomes a service wasteland like its neighbour, Beckley.
15	The plan says, on Page 100, <i>[n]ew development will be strictly limited to that which supports local agricultural, economic, tourism, community or housing needs (especially for affordable housing) and maintains or improves the rural character.</i> Firstly, 143 houses, mostly on green fields does not <i>maintain or improve the rural character.</i> Secondly, as already demonstrated by the PE2 development, <i>affordable housing</i> is the first thing to be dropped by developers when it impacts their profits. Finally, natural landscapes and the communities within them evolve. One can see that evolution within Peasmarsch, old thatched cottages and listed buildings mingling with little clumps of newer weatherboarded houses, homes being added here and there, filling in gaps over the years. The proposal in Rother's Plan is to trample over that natural evolutionary ebb and flow, opting for revolution: Blocks of 15 and 40 and 70 houses in one strike is not a <i>vision</i> for the countryside, it is a <i>catastrophe</i> for the countryside.
47	General comments covering all sites: The first significant thing to note is that if the PE1, PE2 and PE3 developments in Peasmarsch were all to happen, it would add three new road junctions with the main road all within just $\frac{2}{3}$ of a mile. Having PE1 and PE2 so close together, over 120 houses with porch lights, garage lights and ambient light from windows will have a

Question Number	Your Comments
	significant impact on <i>dark skies</i>. Any development in Peasmarsh will require attenuation ponds/ Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS). Who will pay for the ongoing maintenance of these? There is no mention of any safeguards to ensure that new homes go to those who need them. For example, there are no proposed measures to prevent houses being bought speculatively to rent out privately (as homes or holiday lets) or being bought as a second home whilst the first is being Airbnb'd. The proliferation of Airbnb and other kinds of holiday let disrupts and undermines other local, more established local businesses. There are zero proposals to ensure that the <i>houses</i> within Peasmarsh's boundaries remain <i>homes</i> for people with Peasmarsh's boundaries. PE1 aka Kitewood Planning permission (RR/2025/1499/P) is already being sought for this significant development of 70 houses. The site, like everywhere else in Peasmarsh is subject to the flooding and fundamental infrastructure issues covered by Question 5. It is also worth noting that the so-called affordable housing is unlikely to be genuinely affordable to local young people who need it the most. There are very few employment opportunities in the surrounding area that pay significantly above minimum wage, their being in agriculture, hospitality and retail. Any Social Housing is likely to be managed by a housing association that, based on experience, does not necessarily focus on local needs as council houses used to do. This means that housing associations can uproot people away from a home within walking distance of a Tube Station, night buses, 24x7 services, street lights, friends, family and support network to a village in the middle of nowhere that has literally none of these things. <i>The Health and Wellbeing Background Paper</i> makes no mention of the <i>mental</i> health of such potentially vulnerable people. However, these arguments are largely academic, because as demonstrated by site PE2, it is very likely that affordable starter homes and social housing will be the first to be abandoned by the developer as unprofitable, in favour of more lucrative three/four/five

Question Number	Your Comments
	bedroom properties. This is not fear mongering: See PE2, below, for an example of exactly this process literally happening. PE2 aka Pippins This has already been granted planning permission (RR/2023/1707/P) but remains in limbo because the developers cannot meet the housing mix required. Per a Regulation 106 planning committee report dated 18th July 2024, <i>the Applicant has demonstrated that the requirement to provide any affordable housing would render otherwise suitable development unviable.</i> It is entirely predictable that development of PE1 (and probably PE3) will play out in the same way. PE3 aka Tanyard Field Planning permission has already been turned down for this site many times over the last 40 years at least. One of the first (RR/90/0021/P) was rejected on appeal by the Department For Environment. <i>Per HELAA Site assessments April 2024, [d]evelopment [of Tanyard Field] would be prominent in views from the village, especially in the southern part of the site (on the highest ground), and would extend the footprint of the village significantly, contrary to the historic linear settlement pattern. Development of this site at the scale considered through the HELAA would be harmful to the rural character and setting of the village within the High Weald National Landscape.</i> The field is steeply sloping (AECOM Site Options and Assessment Report prepared for PNDP, June 2022) so anything built on the land would loom up from behind the houses already there and be visible from many vantage points, including Main Street. Development on this site would be a blight on the eastern end of Peasmersh. The supporting policy text for PE3 says, on page 433, <i>[p]rotect the residential amenity of the occupiers of adjoining dwellings.</i> Given they layout of the field, this is impossible as all the houses bordering the field currently look out on to grass and there is no way to avoid this being obliterated when houses are built. There are many elderly people along this stretch who will end their days staring out of the

Question Number	Your Comments
	window at a building site from a house they cannot leave because it is so blighted it cannot be sold. <i>The Health and Wellbeing Background Paper</i> fails to confront the inevitable mental health issues and anxiety caused by destroying the environment so close to people's homes. Tanyard Field floods and it cannot drain without a network of French drains and culverts. There are natural springs in the field, so mitigating against incoming surface water running down from the hill above will not be sufficient. Tanyard Field is pretty much a swamp all year round. Potential developers of Tanyard Field have repeatedly adopted a cynical approach to currying favour with villagers and planners by putting forward plans for every imaginable "worthy" building from old people's homes, GP surgeries, supported housing, sheltered housing, homes for key workers and now a "small" number of affordable houses. One assumes that if this fails then an offer to build an orphanage will be next. In light of previous attempts to exploit the entire site, it is clear that the latest offer of a modest 15 affordable dwellings in one corner is a Trojan horse. It is a means to scorch the land and turn a greenfield site in to a brownfield site whereupon it will be more straightforward to gain planning permission for dozens of new properties on the remaining land, which has been the objective all along. The proposal in the Plan is simply too good to be true. After installing new roads, water, sewage, drainage, electrical and flood mitigation infrastructure there is absolutely no way that it would be economically viable for any developer to build just 15 affordable homes. The precedent for this has already been set 900 yards up the road by the developers of PE2 who protest they cannot afford to build a similar number of affordable houses and that is <i>with</i> 30 or so full price houses to offset the cost. To reiterate, the developers of PE2 said, <i>the requirement to provide any affordable housing would render otherwise suitable development unviable</i>. The maths has already been done: The developer's offer of 15 affordable houses on Tanyard Field is a transparent attempt to game the planning system.

Question Number	Your Comments
	PE4 aka Orchard Way This is the only site that was allocated in the Peasmarsh Neighbourhood Development Plan so it would be churlish to object having voted for it in the village referendum. Having said that, the PNDP allocated five houses whereas Rother allocates seven. Note that access to the site is via a narrow private road with overhead cables which prove challenging for the plant machinery required to build here. Development of the site will also make the junction busier; a junction coincidentally opposite where PE3 would meet Main Street. PE5 aka Malthouse Business Park Adjacent to the proposed site are a number of parking spaces which would be consumed by residents of any new developments. These are already well used by visitors to the recreation ground and play area including local football teams. Any development here will increase contention for parking spaces with existing residents of the Old Hop Garden, for example (which would be less of an issue if public transport was a viable option). The business units are the only real support for small industry in the village. What effect will building homes here have?
67	The removal of Policy SDO9 means that villages like Peasmarsh can see an increase of over 25-30% the number of buildings in a very short space of time. Rother's plan for Peasmarsh could see it balloon and sprawl from about 592 houses to almost 700 in a few years. The physical infrastructure (power, water, sewage, public transport, etc) cannot cope as it is.

Question Number	Your Comments
68	The Interim Sustainability Appraisal, Item 5.137, Page 120 says, <i>[o]n flooding, the parish scores both neutral and minor positives, indicating clearly that this is not a local issue.</i> This one sentence, more than any other, sums up how little real research has been done by Rother District Council. It betrays the planning department's fundamental lack of understanding of the communities within its remit. It demonstrates that the assessments and assertions made in the plan were conjured up entirely from behind a desk. It is obvious that the wrong resources were being used (e.g. fluvial flooding maps) and there was a lack of training, experience or curiosity to seek out and acquire the correct resources (e.g. pluvial flooding maps). If the council can't get something as simple as flooding right, what confidence is there that they got anything else right? To support Rother District Council's vision, one needs to have confidence that it knows what it is doing. By any objective measure, whether it is public transport, flooding, sewage, power, education or just mundane human sensibilities, almost everything in this plan shows the council to be woefully out of touch with the people of Peasmarsch.
69	This consultation has not been conducted in a fair and inclusive way that encourages universal participation. There was no physical mail drop from Rother District Council that explained to residents what the plan was about and how to respond. It appears to have been relying on social media and word of mouth. I also understand that consultations of this kind are usually 12 weeks but this one was only eight. All access to the materials is online via a sprawling website. This approach excludes the elderly (of which there are many in Rother District!) as they are less likely to be online and tech-savvy. It discourages the young, "Generation Z", who generally default to using their phones. The consultation process is not phone-friendly. Even this form was only provided in Microsoft Word format and needed access to email or a printer. It fell to volunteers in

Question Number	Your Comments
	Peasmarsh to print, distribute and collect paper copies of the Response Form and run workshops to help people fill them, or the website, in. The whole process is discriminatory and excludes a variety of groups whose opinions and lived experiences would help and inform the Local Plan immeasurably. As a result, so many of their voices are unlikely to be heard. Finally, I recognise that this plan is being forced on the council by government policy and that the planners at Rother District Council are having to do things (one hopes) against their better judgement. A major concern is that the government's <i>build baby build</i> mantra (https://www.gov.uk/government/news/housing-secretary-issues-call-to-arms-to-build-baby-build) will backfire by taking power from local authorities and handing it over to commercial developers, ultimately undermining the government itself. Right now, councils have some power to refuse planning permission to developers whose proposals fail to meet their social obligations. The feeling is that, <i>up until now</i>, councils had the upper hand in this negotiation: <i>If you don't build a meaningful number of affordable homes you don't build at all.</i> However, in an effort to meet quotas the balance of power tips significantly in favour of commercial developers who can hold out and play a game of chicken until the council capitulates and says, <i>just build something</i> in order to get the numbers up. This whole plan, in the case of Peasmarsh at least, could very easily fall foul of <i>The Law of Unintended Consequences</i>: Dozens of large expensive houses lying empty because nobody in the area wants them or can afford them.

Question Number	Your Comments

Should you require further space to respond to make comments please continue on a separate page or sheet of paper as necessary.