

1. Do you think the proposed spatial strategy will support the aim of creating a “network of low-carbon climate resilient connected settlements”?

Ringmer Parish Council does not consider that the proposed spatial strategy, as currently drafted, will achieve this aim.

The strategy places approximately 1,150 dwellings at Ringmer and Broyle Side under Strategic Policy RG1 – the single largest allocation in the district. This represents transformational growth in a rural village with limited employment opportunities, no rail connectivity, and reliance on road-based transport.

While Ringmer has a reasonable range of day-to-day services, it does not function as a self-contained settlement. A high proportion of residents commute to Lewes, Uckfield, Brighton and beyond for employment, secondary education and higher-order services. Increasing the population at this scale is therefore highly likely to increase outward commuting patterns rather than reduce them, particularly in the absence of new significant employment provision within the allocation.

The Settlement Hierarchy Review appears to overstate Ringmer’s sustainability credentials. Scoring mechanisms give equal weighting to facilities regardless of scale or capacity and apply transport multipliers that inflate overall scores. The absence of rail services and limited strategic public transport connectivity are not sufficiently reflected in the overall assessment.

In landscape terms, the allocation spans land that currently forms the perceived countryside gap between Ringmer and Broyle Side. Despite the proposed Strategic Green Gap designation, development of this scale risks physical and visual coalescence, fundamentally altering the rural character of both settlements. A landscape described in evidence as sensitive in relation to settlement separation and the setting of the South Downs National Park cannot reasonably be described as resilient to such extensive urbanisation.

Furthermore, the area is known to experience groundwater and surface water flooding. The hydrological sensitivity of the wider catchment raises questions about long-term climate resilience when development is proposed at this scale.

For these reasons, the Parish Council does not consider that concentrating such a large proportion of district growth in this rural location supports the objective of delivering a genuinely low-carbon, climate resilient and well-connected network of settlements.

2. Does the strategic policy on Achieving Sustainable Development provide a good framework to ensure that new development is well-connected by sustainable transport?

Ringmer Parish Council does not consider that the current evidence base – particularly the Transport (Forecasting) Report – provides a sufficiently robust or locally responsive framework to ensure that new development will be well-connected by sustainable transport.

Scope and Focus of the Forecasting Report

The Transport Forecasting Report was commissioned to inform the emerging Local Plan 2020–2042. Despite references to sustainable transport, its primary focus is on the road network and traffic modelling. It does not meaningfully assess how a realistic shift to sustainable travel modes could be achieved in rural settlements such as Ringmer and Broyle Side.

The report followed the earlier STEB Interim Assessment and Mitigation Strategy (June 2023), which had a wider scope and was prepared in advance of the delayed East Sussex Countywide Transport Model (CWTM). The current report appears narrower in focus and heavily road-based rather than providing an integrated transport strategy.

Modelling Methodology and Transparency

Although described as a “detailed transport modelling study,” the assessment is broad-brush in nature and lacks the granularity required to assess local impacts. It relies on:

- High-level modelling of “major road infrastructure upgrades”;
- Unsupported assumptions regarding district-wide modal shift;
- Generalised demographic and trip rate assumptions applied uniformly across urban and rural settlements;
- Limited explanation of the background data and modelling inputs used.

There is no differentiation between travel behaviour in rural communities – with low local employment, limited public transport, and dispersed services – versus urban/coastal settlements.

ONS 2021 Census data confirms that the majority of working residents in Ringmer commute outside the parish, with significant numbers travelling to Lewes, Brighton, and surrounding areas. The data also shows a high proportion of residents travel by car and a very low proportion commute by bus. Applying district-wide modal shift assumptions to such settlements is therefore unrealistic and risks underestimating car dependency.

The modelling concludes that, without mitigation, there are “likely to be severe impacts on the road network.” This is unsurprising given the scale of growth proposed. It suggests impacts could be managed through:

- Coordinated phasing of development;
- Ongoing investment in sustainable travel options;
- Regular monitoring.

However, these conclusions rely heavily on aspirational outcomes rather than secured, funded interventions.

Timing and Robustness

The timeline of the report raises further concerns:

- Draft produced 12 September 2025;
- Revision 1 dated 11 November 2025 (following unspecified comments);
- Revision 2 signed off 15 December 2025 – after key committee and Cabinet meetings.

The Parish Council is concerned the report was prepared under significant time pressure and cannot reasonably be regarded as a fully interrogated or finalised evidence base. While modelling is expected to continue through to Regulation 19 stage, site allocations are already being advanced on the basis of this preliminary work. At this stage, the modelling is insufficiently robust to justify the scale and distribution of strategic allocations.

Lack of Local Resolution

The appendices (A–F) are of insufficient graphical resolution to allow meaningful interrogation. Traffic flow figures and junction stress indicators cannot be clearly read, which limits transparency and public scrutiny.

Although the modelling indicates potential pressure on local roads, the report narrative does not adequately capture localised impacts, including anticipated vehicle movements on narrow routes such as the B2192 and through Broyle Side.

Sustainable Transport Framework

While the strategic policy sets appropriate ambitions regarding sustainable transport, in practice:

- Ringmer has no rail connection;
- Bus services are limited and partially dependent on time-limited funding arrangements;
- Strategic road corridors (A26, B2192, A22 connections) already experience congestion;
- There is no secured, funded programme of public transport enhancement proportional to the proposed scale of growth.

Without guaranteed infrastructure delivery, realistic modelling reflecting rural travel behaviour, and long-term funding commitments, the policy framework remains largely aspirational.

Conclusion

Ringmer Parish Council considers that:

- The Transport Forecasting Report is overly road-focused and lacks local granularity;
- It relies on unsupported district-wide modal shift assumptions, which do not reflect rural realities;
- Census data confirms a high proportion of residents commute by car, with low public transport use;
- The modelling lacks transparency and local resolution;
- The report was prepared under significant time pressure and remains incomplete;
- It does not provide a robust evidence base to justify the scale of development proposed in Ringmer and Broyle Side.

Accordingly, the Parish Council does not believe that the current strategic policy provides adequate assurance that new development will be well-connected by sustainable transport or that traffic impacts can be satisfactorily mitigated.

3. Do you have any comments or concerns about whether essential infrastructure (schools, doctors, transport, utilities) can keep pace with the proposed level of growth?

Ringmer Parish Council has significant concerns regarding infrastructure capacity and delivery.

Education

A new primary school is proposed as part of RG1. However, there is insufficient clarity regarding timing, funding and delivery mechanisms. It is essential that school provision is delivered in advance of, or in parallel with, housing occupation. Without firm phasing commitments, there is a real risk of pressure on existing school places.

Healthcare

Existing GP provision in Ringmer is already constrained. While policy references the potential for healthcare provision within new development, there is no confirmed commitment from NHS bodies to deliver additional capacity. Healthcare cannot be treated as optional or aspirational infrastructure; it must be secured and operational at the point it is required.

Transport Infrastructure

As noted above, road congestion and limited public transport options are already concerns. The cumulative traffic impact of 1,150 dwellings is likely to be significant. There is currently no clear, costed and funded package of highway or public transport improvements proportionate to the scale of development proposed.

Utilities and Drainage

Ringmer lies within a hydrologically sensitive area with known groundwater and surface water issues. Development of this scale will require substantial upgrades to drainage networks and potentially wastewater infrastructure. The Parish Council has not seen robust evidence demonstrating that existing utilities can accommodate this level of growth without major intervention.

Land Assembly and Delivery Risk

The strategic allocation spans multiple landholdings. Reliance on coordinated delivery across fragmented ownership increases the risk that infrastructure provision becomes delayed, piecemeal or incomplete.

Overall Conclusion

Ringmer Parish Council remains concerned that:

- The concentration of growth at Ringmer and Broyle Side is disproportionate in scale relative to the settlement's role and connectivity;
- The strategy risks undermining settlement separation and rural character;

- Sustainable transport improvements are not sufficiently secured to justify the level of development proposed;
- There is inadequate certainty that essential infrastructure will be delivered in step with housing growth.

Without stronger guarantees on infrastructure-first delivery, robust phasing, and a more proportionate distribution of development across the district, the Parish Council does not consider that the spatial strategy provides a sound or resilient framework for the future of Ringmer and Broyle Side.

4. Do you have any comments on the specific small sites identified in Newhaven, Seaford, Peacehaven and Ringmer?

SS11 – Lionville (Formerly 70RG)

Policy SDS5.10 – 7 units (net 6)

This site previously benefitted from outline permission (LW/20/0733), which has now expired.

The Parish Council recalls that the site presented a number of constraints, including:

- High density relative to its surroundings;
- Access constraints via Tile Kiln;
- Proximity to Diplock's Business Park;
- Relationship to the adjoining 10-unit development.

The adjacent site (10 units), which should arguably have been considered comprehensively with Lionville to secure affordable housing provision, has experienced delivery difficulties. Development has stalled on several occasions due to financial issues. Five properties remain incomplete and unoccupied as of February 2026, having been left exposed to weathering.

The slow build-out and apparent difficulty in selling properties in this location raises concerns regarding the deliverability of SS11 within the early years of the Plan period. It is therefore questionable whether this site can realistically contribute to the five-year housing land supply (5YHLS) or the three-year Housing Delivery Test (HDT) position.

However, the Parish Council acknowledges that:

- The site is centrally located;
- The units are relatively small in scale;
- There is local need for smaller and affordable homes.

If brought forward again, the Council considers that the site would be more appropriate for affordable or social rented housing, subject to compliance with normal development management policies and appropriate design, access and amenity safeguards.

The Parish Council does not object to its inclusion in principle but raises concerns about deliverability and viability.

2. SS10 – Land East of Norlington Lane (Formerly 55RG)

Policy SDS5.9 – 5 Custom/Self-Build Units

There is currently no outline permission or known pre-application engagement for this site.

Two nearby outline permissions (2 dwellings each) have recently been granted on Norlington Lane; however, construction has not yet commenced on either site. This may indicate slower delivery rates for small-scale schemes in this locality.

The Parish Council notes the following constraints:

- Presence of an unlisted heritage asset within the site;
- Proximity to Grade II listed buildings;
- A Public Right of Way crossing the site as part of a wider network.

Any future proposal must ensure:

- Proper assessment and mitigation of heritage impacts;
- Protection or sensitive diversion of the PROW;
- Appropriate scale and design reflecting the semi-rural context.

Notwithstanding these constraints, the Parish Council recognises that small custom or self-build plots in this location are more likely to attract interest than self-build units embedded within larger strategic sites. As such, this allocation may make a meaningful contribution toward meeting identified custom/self-build demand.

The Council suggests that this site be considered in the wider context of strategic allocations (including RG1 and the self-build provision within BR2) to ensure coordinated delivery of custom build plots across the parish.

If brought forward and approved in a timely manner, this site could potentially contribute toward the 2027 five-year housing land supply and Housing Delivery Test position.

5. Do you support the designation of these Strategic Green Gaps?

Ringmer Parish Council strongly objects to the proposed Strategic Green Gap (SGG) policy as it relates to Land to the North of Ringmer and West of Broyle Side.

While the Parish Council supports in principle the concept of maintaining separation between settlements and preventing coalescence, the proposed Strategic Green Gap designation in its current form is unclear, inconsistent, unsupported by robust evidence, and potentially ineffective. It risks weakening, rather than strengthening, the long-standing protection afforded by established settlement boundaries and countryside policies.

1. Lack of Clarity and Policy Certainty

There is no standalone, fully articulated policy document for SDS6. Limited references appear in the Spatial Strategy consultation document and draft Policy SGG2, with earlier references in the Environment Topic Paper (Policy NE5).

The absence of:

- A defined mapped figure at Regulation 18 stage;
- A glossary definition of “Strategic Green Gap”;
- Clear wording explaining its statutory basis;
- Clear explanation of how it interacts with settlement boundaries;
- creates significant uncertainty.

The Parish Council is concerned that the designation lacks precision and enforceability, which are fundamental requirements for effective plan-making.

2. Boundary Definition Appears Reactive to Development

Paragraph 3 of the earlier NE5 wording indicated that land identified within the SGG would be defined through the Site Allocations process.

This suggests that the extent of the gap would effectively be determined around developer-promoted sites, rather than being established first as a strategic constraint to shape development.

The Parish Council considers this approach fundamentally flawed. A strategic gap should define where development cannot occur in order to preserve separation — not be retrospectively shaped around development proposals.

If site allocations dictate the boundary of the SGG, the designation becomes reactive rather than strategic.

3. Conflict with Site Allocations

Draft Policy SDS7 confirms that:

- Strategic Green Gaps have not been treated as absolute constraints;

- They are not proposed to avoid meeting development needs;
- Land within them has been assessed through the Land Availability Assessment.

Natural England has already identified potential tension between the SGG designation and proposed site allocations.

This concern is well-founded.

In Ringmer, the proposed SGG sits alongside large and strategic site allocations (RG1, BR1, BR2) which materially reduce the physical gap between Ringmer and Broyle Side

When mapped against:

- Existing settlement boundaries;
- Committed developments;
- Proposed large site allocations;
- Surface water flood risk;
- Groundwater flood risk (BGS mapping);

it is evident that the residual separation would be significantly reduced.

The Parish Council is concerned that the SGG designation may create a false impression of protection while simultaneously permitting substantial erosion of the existing gap.

4. Redundancy and Policy Duplication

The stated purposes of Strategic Green Gaps are to:

- Prevent coalescence;
- Retain separate identities of settlements;
- Protect rural settings.

These objectives are already embedded within:

- Settlement boundary policies;
- Countryside protection policies;
- Existing development management frameworks.

The Parish Council questions what additional protection an SGG provides beyond existing mechanisms.

If it does not supersede settlement boundaries, then its practical function is unclear. If it does supersede them, this must be explicitly stated and legally robust.

Without clarity, there is a risk that the SGG designation weakens the primacy of settlement boundaries by implying that development outside them may still be considered acceptable within a Strategic Green Gap subject to “minor” tests.

5. Inconsistency in Terminology

There is confusion between:

- Strategic Green Gap;
Green Gap;
Local Green Gap.

None are defined in the glossary.

This lack of definitional clarity undermines certainty and raises questions about implementation, weight and enforcement.

6. Groundwater Flooding and Functional Landscape Constraints

Mapping demonstrates that much of the land within the Ringmer–Broyle Side gap:

- Lies along watercourses including Norlington Stream and the Iron River;
- Falls within areas at risk of surface water flooding;
- Overlays aquifers;
- Is identified by BGS as being at risk of groundwater flooding affecting both land and existing property.

Groundwater flooding is more extensive than surface water flooding and is of critical importance to site suitability and long-term safety.

However, groundwater flood risk does not benefit from the same formal sequential testing as surface water flooding, creating potential vulnerability in decision-making.

The Parish Council considers that if the area performs a functional flood storage and hydrological role, this should be formally recognised and protected — potentially through designation as Local Green Space, part of a Local Nature Recovery Strategy (LNRS), or a wetland corridor — rather than a loosely defined Strategic Green Gap.

7. Risk of Coalescence

The settlement gap between Ringmer and Broyle Side is already relatively narrow and has been reduced by:

- Speculative developments allowed on appeal;
- Recent permissions to the South;
- Incremental encroachment.

Large concept areas RG1, BR1 and BR2, when viewed cumulatively, create real risk of visual and functional coalescence.

Unless significantly expanded, the proposed SGG would contract the remaining gap to an unacceptable level.

The Parish Council is concerned that the Plan appears ambivalent about whether the long-term intention is to maintain separation or facilitate eventual merger into a larger combined settlement.

If coalescence is intended, this should be transparently acknowledged and accompanied by a long-term infrastructure strategy — not introduced incrementally.

8. Implementation and Enforcement Questions

The Parish Council seeks clarity on:

- What additional protection does the SGG provide beyond settlement boundaries?
- Which policy takes precedence in case of conflict?
- How will exceptions be tested and determined?
- Will vehicular access be permitted across the SGG to serve adjacent allocations?
- Who will manage and fund long-term maintenance?
- How does the SGG integrate with Green and Blue Infrastructure, wildlife corridors and Bee Lines

At present, the policy provides insufficient answers.

9. Alternative Approach

If the Strategic Green Gap is to proceed, the Parish Council considers that:

- Its boundaries must be expanded northwards to Plashett Farm and Park to meet the A26;
- It should extend southwards along the South Downs National Park boundary and toward the district boundary along the B2124;
- Consideration should also be given to a further gap along the B2192 between Broyle Side and Halland/Wealden.

Such expansion would provide meaningful separation and clarity of purpose.

Conclusion

Ringmer Parish Council strongly objects to Strategic Green Gap Policy SDS6 in its current form because:

1. It lacks clarity, precision and defined statutory footing.
2. It appears reactive to site allocations rather than strategically defined.
3. It conflicts with proposed large-scale allocations in Ringmer.
4. It duplicates existing settlement boundary protections without adding certainty.
5. It risks creating an illusion of protection while permitting erosion of the gap.

6. It fails to adequately recognise groundwater flooding and functional landscape constraints.

Unless substantially revised, expanded and clearly integrated with settlement boundary policy and site allocations, the proposed Strategic Green Gap designation for Ringmer and Broyle Side is ineffective and unsound.

The Parish Council therefore requests that the policy be reconsidered and redrafted to provide clarity, robustness and genuine long-term protection against coalescence.

7. Do you support the Local Green Spaces policy?

Ringmer Parish Council does not support the proposed SDS7 Local Green Spaces policy as currently drafted. While the idea of protecting green spaces is understandable, the policy is vague and does not provide any clear guidance on how sites will be identified, designated, or managed.

There is no certainty that the policy would actually protect the land most valued by the community, and it risks being used to justify other planning decisions that may conflict with the intent of true local green space protection. Without clear criteria, enforcement, or evidence-based selection, it is unclear how the policy differs from existing protections such as settlement boundaries, countryside designations, or Green Gaps.

The Parish Council is also concerned that the policy could create confusion with other designations, like Strategic Green Gaps (SGGs), and may dilute the importance of settlement separation and the rural character of Ringmer. In practice, it appears to be more of a “paper exercise” than a tool that will deliver meaningful protection for valued open spaces.

In short, without clear definitions, site lists, or management plans, Ringmer Parish Council cannot support SDS7 as it currently stands.

8. Do you have any comments on any policies from the Phase 1 Consultation?

Ringmer Parish Council is very concerned about the employment strategy set out in the Plan. The Plan proposes a very significant level of growth – approximately 9,570 net new homes across the district. This will bring thousands of new residents, many of whom will need local jobs, services, and amenities.

However, the Plan only addresses employment in terms of 4,900 sqm of office space. This is far too limited to meet the likely demand generated by such a large increase in population. Retaining, promoting, and regenerating employment through office space alone will not provide enough jobs or opportunities for local residents, nor will it support the sustainability of the new communities that the Plan proposes

The Plan does not include any reference to other important employment uses, such as

- Retail – shops, convenience stores, supermarkets, and local services that people need day-to-day.
- Commercial – small businesses, professional services, or community-based enterprises.
- Industrial – light industry, warehousing, or manufacturing that can provide local jobs and reduce the need for commuting.

Without planning for a wider range of employment types, the new housing developments risk becoming commuter dormitories, with residents needing to travel outside the area for work. This would increase traffic, emissions, and pressure on the already constrained local road network, including the B2192 and Broyleside, and could undermine the sustainability of the growth.

Furthermore, the Plan does not identify or promote specific sites for employment development beyond office space. Ringmer Parish Council is unable to see where new jobs are expected to be created or how local employment needs will be met. There is no evidence of a coordinated strategy to provide mixed-use employment areas that could support the community alongside housing.

In summary, the proposed approach to employment is inadequate in the context of the scale of new housing. Ringmer Parish Council considers that:

1. Employment planning should include retail, commercial, and industrial uses not just offices.
2. Specific sites should be identified and allocated to provide a realistic opportunity for local jobs.
3. A strategy is needed to ensure that new residents can work locally and that communities are genuinely sustainable, rather than simply adding more pressure to commuting networks.

Without these measures, the Plan risks creating large new residential areas with insufficient local employment, undermining its aim of sustainable, connected, and thriving communities.

Response to Draft Policy SDS4 – Settlement Boundary Review

The use of the interactive map to review existing and proposed settlement boundaries is helpful. It is accepted that Ringmer and Broyleside are separate settlements within the hierarchy and that maintaining a clear settlement gap between them remains essential to prevent coalescence. This distinction must continue to be clearly defined and protected.

In principle, extending settlement boundaries to include committed and completed developments since 2020 is logical and pragmatic. However, consistency is required. Existing sports facilities such as The Kings Academy Ringmer playing fields and Ringmer FC grounds are rightly excluded from the settlement boundary as open space. The proposed new 3G pitch at Broyle Gate Farm should be treated similarly and excluded. Its removal would not prevent continuity between the Lewes Road boundary and the new development.

There are concerns regarding the “tidying up” of boundaries in certain locations. The inclusion of dwellings along Potato Lane, Rushey Green and Gote Lane would remove their current countryside designation. These established properties have large gardens that form a soft edge to the village, contribute to the setting of the South Downs National Park, and support Dark Skies objectives. Inclusion risks incremental infill and urbanisation, hardening the settlement edge. Similar concerns apply to properties south of Laughton Road.

Norlington Fields, being physically disconnected from the main built form, should be removed from the settlement boundary. Conversely, the small site approved under LW/23/0268 would logically “square off” the boundary and could be included.

With the return of an up-to-date Local Plan and five-year housing land supply, settlement boundaries again become a key tool in directing development. Recent speculative development outside boundaries has resulted from the presumption in favour of sustainable development during the policy vacuum since 2020. Re-establishing robust boundaries and maintaining settlement gaps is therefore essential.

The emerging NPPF (2025) reinforces the importance of clearly defined settlement boundaries and directs intensification within them, while restricting development outside settlements. This strengthens the need to define boundaries carefully, avoid unnecessary expansion in sensitive edge locations, and prevent de facto coalescence.

Settlement boundaries and gaps are fundamental planning tools in rural areas. Their extension should be limited to genuine built development and not include open land

that contributes to rural character, landscape setting, and the separation of distinct settlements.

Evidence Base – Settlement Hierarchy Review 2025

Ringmer Parish Council has serious concerns regarding the methodology, transparency and outcomes of the Settlement Hierarchy Review (SHR) 2025, particularly the reclassification of Ringmer to Tier 2 alongside significantly larger and more connected urban settlements.

1. Change in Hierarchy and Lack of Justification

Historically, Ringmer has been identified as a Tier 2 Rural Service Centre, with Broyle Side categorised separately as a lower-tier rural village. The recent redesignation of Tier 2 from “Rural Service Centre” to simply “Service Centre”, and the grouping of Ringmer alongside Peacehaven & Telscombe, represents a fundamental shift in approach without clear evidence-based justification.

Peacehaven & Telscombe is a substantial coastal urban settlement with direct access to an A-road corridor (A259) and strong bus connectivity to Brighton & Hove. By contrast, Ringmer is a rural village connected primarily via the B2192 (a B-class road) into Lewes. The two settlements are not comparable in scale, infrastructure capacity, or transport connectivity.

Equating a rural inland village accessed by a B road with a larger coastal town served by an A road and frequent bus links into Brighton is neither logical nor evidence-based.

2. Methodological Concerns

The Parish Council remains concerned that:

- The transport weighting multiplier disproportionately influences overall scoring without clear statistical justification.
- Amenities are scored in a binary manner (e.g. one primary school = 5, two or more = 10), with no graduated assessment of scale, capacity or quality.
- Employment provision is scored simply on the presence of any employment land, regardless of size or number of jobs.
- Population size is said not to be a determining factor, yet population data is included within Stage 4 assessments.
- Bus services are assessed on theoretical frequency rather than realistic coverage across the settlement, and without factoring in funding uncertainty (e.g. BSIP funding ending March 2026).

This approach disadvantages rural settlements by overstating sustainability where facilities are minimal and understating the functional advantages of larger urban centres.

3. Sustainability and Self-Containment

The SHR states that sustainability should reflect:

- Level of self-containment,
- Opportunities to live and work locally,
- Access to services and infrastructure capacity.

Ringmer does not demonstrate high levels of employment self-containment. Many residents commute to Lewes, Brighton and elsewhere. The village has no rail station and limited strategic connectivity. The B2192 is a busy road and does not provide the same level of sustainable connectivity as coastal A-road corridors.

Treating Ringmer as equivalent to a larger coastal town risks directing disproportionate growth to a rural settlement with limited infrastructure, limited public transport resilience, and constrained road capacity.

4. Disproportionate Growth Implications

Despite the SHR stating it does not determine growth levels, the practical outcome is that the largest allocation of new housing (1,605 dwellings) is directed to Ringmer & Broyle Side, significantly exceeding allocations in coastal towns.

The reclassification of Ringmer effectively opens the door to intensified greenfield development, higher density expectations, and cumulative infrastructure pressures inconsistent with its rural character and capacity.

5. Conflict with Sustainable Development Principle

Whilst the NPPF 2024 does not prescribe a specific settlement hierarchy methodology, Paragraphs 7–9 require plans to:

- Pursue balanced economic, social and environmental objectives;
- Reflect local circumstances;
- Direct development to sustainable locations appropriate to their character and capacity.

The Parish Council considers that the current hierarchy does not properly reflect the character, infrastructure limitations, or transport reality of Ringmer as a rural village accessed via a B road, and should therefore be revisited.

Conclusion

Ringmer Parish Council requests:

- A review of the transport weighting methodology;
- Clearer differentiation between rural villages and larger urban/coastal settlements;
- Recognition that connectivity via a B road into Lewes is not equivalent to A-road and high-frequency bus connectivity into Brighton;

- Reassessment of Ringmer's Tier 2 classification in light of genuine sustainability and infrastructure capacity.

The current Settlement Hierarchy Review risks overstating Ringmer's sustainability and directing disproportionate development to a rural village without the infrastructure to support it.

Ringmer Parish Council Response to Strategic Policy RG1 – Land Between Ringmer and Broyle Side

Site: LAA 42RG, 81RG, 50RG, 67RG, 51RG incl. 56RG & 57G

Indicative Yield: 1,150 dwellings

The Parish Council strongly disagrees to Strategic Policy RG1 as unsound under paragraph 35 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). The allocation is not justified, not effective, and not consistent with national or local planning policy.

2: Are the requirements set out in the Site Allocation Policy sufficient to make the development appropriate in the context of the spatial strategy?

Ringmer Parish Council considers that RG1 requirements are insufficient for this scale of development.

Policy Conflicts & Key Issues:

1. Unsustainable Location / Transport Impacts

NPPF 105–106: Significant development should be focused in locations with sustainable travel options. RG1 will generate approximately 7,000 extra daily vehicle movements, primarily along the congested B2192, Ham Lane, and A26 junctions. Ringmer lacks rail infrastructure, and bus services are limited and reliant on time-limited funding. The allocation risks promoting a dormitory settlement reliant on private vehicles, contrary to national policy.

Local Plan Policy IC6 (Sustainable Transport): RG1 does not demonstrate that new development can be adequately served by sustainable transport modes.

2. Lack of Employment Provision

NPPF 104: Development should actively support sustainable travel and local employment. RG1 provides no minimum office, retail, industrial and limited commercial floorspace. Residents will be forced to commute long distances, undermining sustainable transport and self-containment objectives.

Local Plan Policies RG1, HW6 (Food Infrastructure), and IC1 (Infrastructure Delivery): No defined retail or employment quantum; no mechanisms for delivery.

3. Infrastructure Delivery

Local Plan Policies IC1, HW3, HW4: Schools, GP surgeries, dentists, water, and sewer systems are already near capacity. RG1 fails to demonstrate phasing, triggers, or capacity upgrades, contrary to Local Plan expectations and NPPF 92–94 on sustainable communities.

Conclusion: Current RG1 requirements are insufficient for the scale and spatial context of development.

3: Are there any requirements missing for this site that need to be included?

Missing Requirements & Policy Conflicts:

1. Employment and Retail Floorspace
NPPF 86, 104: Minimum employment floorspace (office, industrial, commercial) and retail (convenience retail ~4,000 sq ft) should be specified. Without this, the allocation fails to support sustainable travel patterns.
2. Flood Risk and Aquifer Protection
NPPF 167–169; Local Plan Policy W1: Parts of RG1 are within Flood Zone 3b, with overland and groundwater flood risk. The site sits on top of a principal aquifer, yet there is no requirement to avoid or protect it in the proposal.
3. Cumulative Transport Assessment and Mitigation
NPPF 111, 27; Local Plan Policy IC6: No evidence of cross-boundary modelling for cumulative traffic from RG1, surrounding commitments, or strategic allocations. Narrow lanes (Broyle Lane, Norlington Lane) cannot accommodate construction or additional commuter traffic.
4. Infrastructure Phasing & Delivery Triggers
NPPF 92–94, Local Plan IC1: Policy should tie infrastructure delivery (schools, healthcare, sewer upgrades, utilities) to phases of housing delivery.
5. Landscape and Settlement Gap Protection
NPPF 170–171, 182; Local Plan Policies D1, D3: Policy must explicitly maintain the countryside gap between Ringmer and Broyle Side, preserve views from the South Downs National Park, and prevent coalescence.
6. Biodiversity Net Gain
NPPF 174; Local Plan Policy NE3: Requirement for 20% net biodiversity gain, protection of bats, amphibians, reptiles, and incorporation of green/blue infrastructure.
7. Construction and Access Management
Local Plan Policy IC6, D1: Narrow lanes, including Broyle Lane, are unsuitable for construction traffic. Policy should include clear requirements to manage access, protect local roads, and ensure pedestrian safety.

Conclusion: The policy lacks multiple essential requirements necessary to make RG1 deliverable and sustainable.

4: Does the policy adequately address the potential impacts of developing this site?

Ringmer Parish Council considers that RG1 fails to adequately address potential impacts:

1. Landscape and Settlement Character
NPPF 170–171, 182; Local Plan D1, D3: RG1 threatens the countryside gap, risking coalescence between Ringmer and Broyle Side and harming views from the South Downs National Park.
2. Highways / Traffic
NPPF 111, 114; Local Plan IC6: B2192, Ham Lane, Earwig Corner, and Golden Cross junctions are already congested. Additional traffic would worsen safety, congestion, and air quality.
3. Schools and Healthcare
NPPF 92–94; Local Plan HW3, HW4: The policy does not ensure adequate delivery of schools, healthcare, or GP capacity to meet the needs of ~2,500–3,000 new residents.
4. Flood Risk and Water Resources
NPPF 167–169; Local Plan W1: Parts of RG1 lie in Flood Zone 3b. Building on a principal aquifer risks contamination. Reliance on mitigation alone is insufficient.
5. Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure
NPPF 174; Local Plan NE2, NE3: Policy does not guarantee 20% biodiversity net gain or integration of Green/Blue infrastructure.
6. Construction Impacts
Local Plan IC6: Narrow, single-track lanes cannot accommodate construction vehicles safely, and no policy safeguards are provided.
7. Cumulative Impacts
NPPF 27, 111; Local Plan IC6: RG1 does not adequately consider cumulative impacts with other Local Plan allocations, existing commitments, or cross-boundary traffic.

Conclusion: RG1 fails to demonstrate that development can be safely and sustainably accommodate. The policy is not justified, not effective, and inconsistent with national and local policy.

Policies Referenced in Objection

National: NPPF 2021/2024 – paragraphs 27, 92–94, 104–106, 111, 114, 167–169, 170–171, 174, 182.

Local: Lewes Local Plan Policies IC1, IC6, CC1, CC2, D1, D3, HW3, HW4, HW6, NE2, NE3, W1, RG1.

Ringmer Parish Council Response to Policy RG2 – Land at Harrisons Lane (LAA 46RG)

Indicative Yield: Up to 35 dwellings

Ringmer Parish Council strongly objects to Policy RG2. The allocation is unsound under NPPF paragraph 35 because it is:

1. not justified - the site is not the most appropriate option compared to alternatives (notably school expansion);
2. Not effective – safe access and cumulative highway mitigation cannot realistically be delivered;
3. Not consistent with national and local policy – relating to highway safety, sustainable transport, landscape protection, flood risk, and best and most versatile agricultural land.

2: Are the requirements set out in the Site Allocation Policy sufficient to make the development appropriate in the context of the spatial strategy?

Policy RG2 requirements are insufficient given the scale and context of the site.

Key Conflicts and Issues:

1. Landscape Sensitivity / SDNP Setting
NPPF 180, 182; Local Plan D1, D3: RG2 extends built form toward the South Downs National Park (SDNP) boundary, eroding the rural approach to Ringmer. Proposed mitigation (LVIA, “landscape-led” approach) cannot fully offset urbanisation of the site or cumulative visual impact.
2. Highways and Access Constraints
NPPF 110–115, 111, 114; Local Plan IC6, IC8: Harrisons Lane and adjacent routes are already congested at peak school times, with narrow footways and limited passing width. The policy’s requirement for a 5.5m carriageway and 2m footways is unrealistic without land acquisition or harm to local character. Safe access for all users cannot be guaranteed.
3. Sustainable Transport / Travel Choice
NPPF 104–109, 105; Local Plan IC6: RG2 assumes modal shift that is unrealistic in a rural setting. Parents and schoolchildren will continue to rely on private vehicles, further increasing congestion
4. Infrastructure Delivery
NPPF 92–94; Local Plan IC1, HW3, HW4: No phasing or triggers are specified for schools, healthcare, or utility capacity. Existing local schools are already at capacity.

Conclusion: The policy does not provide sufficient requirements to ensure development is appropriate in context, nor does it support the spatial strategy for sustainable growth.

3 : Are there any requirements missing for this site that need to be included?

Missing Requirements / Policy Conflicts:

1. Alternative Use – Primary School Expansion
NPPF 95; Local Plan IC1: The site is directly adjacent to Ringmer Primary School. Allocation for educational expansion would:
 - Improve long-term educational capacity;
 - Reduce car trips for school travel;
 - Support sustainable growth.
 - Residential allocation ignores a more justified and sustainable alternative.

2. Construction Traffic Management
Local Plan IC6, D1: Harrisons Lane, Potato Lane, and surrounding roads and country lanes are narrow. The policy does not require a construction traffic management plan, putting children and residents at risk.

3. Flood Risk and Drainage
NPPF 167–169; Local Plan W1: Parts of the site are within Flood Zone 3b. A robust flood risk assessment and avoidance strategy are missing.

4. Best and Most Versatile Agricultural Land
NPPF 180: Site contains Grade 2 BMV land. No mitigation or policy to minimise loss is proposed.

5. Landscape Protection
NPPF 180–182; Local Plan D1, D3: Policy does not provide sufficient protection for the transition between built form and the SDNP, or for visual and ecological connectivity.

6. Education / Community Infrastructure Triggers
NPPF 92–94; Local Plan IC1: Policy should include requirements to expand school capacity or delay development until additional provision is secured.

Conclusion: RG2 omits critical requirements for school expansion, flood and aquifer protection, construction management, and landscape safeguards.

4: Does the policy adequately address the potential impacts of developing this site?

Ringmer Parish Council considers that RG2 does not adequately address impacts:

1. Landscape and SDNP Setting
NPPF 180, 182; Local Plan D1, D3: The site contributes to the rural transition into the SDNP. Development would urbanise open land and incrementally encroach toward the Park, contrary to statutory weight requirements.
2. Highways / Traffic Safety
NPPF 111, 114; Local Plan IC6, IC8: Harrisons Lane, Gote Lane, Shephards Way, and Mill Road are constrained. Additional residential traffic and construction vehicles will worsen congestion and pedestrian safety, particularly near the school.
3. Education / Community Capacity
NPPF 95; Local Plan IC1: Adjacent schools are already full. RG2 does not provide triggers or mitigation to ensure educational capacity. Families will be forced to drive children to alternative schools, compounding congestion.
4. Flood Risk and Water Resources
NPPF 167–169; Local Plan W1: Flood Zone 3b affects parts of the site. Policy assumes mitigation is sufficient, but avoidance would be preferable.
5. Agricultural Land Loss
NPPF 180: Grade 2 BMV farmland would be lost for a modest yield of 35 homes.
6. Cumulative Development Impacts
NPPF 111, 27; Local Plan IC6: RG2 does not address cumulative traffic with committed developments (Clayhill, Macar, Charles Church).
7. Construction and Access Risks
Local Plan IC6, D1: Narrow rural lanes are unsuitable for HGV access. Policy does not include safeguards to protect children and residents.

Conclusion: RG2 fails to demonstrate that development can be safely, sustainably, and appropriately accommodated. It is not justified, not effective, and inconsistent with national and local planning policy.

Policies Referenced in Objection

- National: NPPF 2021/2024 – paragraphs 27, 92–95, 104–109, 110–115, 167–169, 180–182.
- Local: Lewes Local Plan Policies IC1, IC6, IC8, D1, D3, HW3, HW4, W1, RG2.

Ringmer Parish Council Response – Policy BR1 – Land North of the Broyle (LAA 30RG & 64RG)

Indicative Yield: Approximately 340 dwellings

Ringmer Parish Council strongly objects to Policy BR1. The allocation is unsound under NPPF paragraph 35 because it is:

- Not justified – represents ribbon development extending into open countryside without spatial evidence;
- Not effective – safe access from the B2192 and mitigation for cumulative traffic are not demonstrably deliverable;
- Not consistent with national and local policy – conflicts with NPPF 104–109, 110–115, 167–169, 180–183 and Local Plan Policies D1, D3, IC1, IC6, IC8, HW6, W1.

2: Are the requirements set out in the Site Allocation Policy sufficient to make the development appropriate in the context of the spatial strategy?

Policy BR1 requirements are insufficient for the scale, location, and context of the site.

Key Issues:

1. Ribbon Development / Settlement Pattern
NPPF 180, 182; Local Plan D1, D3: Extends built form north along B2192, creating ribbon development that alters rural character and erodes the approach to Broyle Side. The proposed landscaping buffer cannot mitigate the fundamental spatial intrusion.
2. Highways and Access
NPPF 110–115, 111, 114; Local Plan IC6, IC8: Two new priority junctions on a 60mph section of the B2192 pose serious safety risks. Cumulative traffic from consented and proposed developments has not been modelled adequately.
3. Retail / Community Provision
NPPF 86, 104; Local Plan HW6, IC1: Proposed retail floorspace (approx. 200m²) is under-sized and unlikely to be commercially viable. It fails to reduce travel to Ringmer village and does not provide a meaningful local centre.
4. Sustainable Transport / Connectivity
NPPF 104–109; Local Plan IC6: No safe walking or cycling routes exist to Ringmer village, school, or shops. The development would be highly car-dependent, undermining sustainable transport objectives.

Conclusion: The policy does not include sufficient requirements to make development compatible with the spatial strategy or sustainable growth principles.

3: Are there any requirements missing for this site that need to be included?

Missing Requirements / Policy Gaps:

1. Education, Community, and Health Infrastructure
NPPF 92–95; Local Plan IC1, HW4: No triggers for school expansion, GP provision, or community facilities. Distances to primary school (1.8km), village centre (2.1km), and GP surgery (2.1km) make walking impractical.
2. Construction and Access Management
Local Plan IC6, D1: No plan for construction traffic on the busy B2192. Safety of children and residents cannot be guaranteed.
3. Flood Risk and Water Resources
NPPF 167–169, 180, 183; Local Plan W1: Site partially in Flood Zone 3b and above a principal aquifer. Policy lacks clear mechanisms to avoid flooding and prevent contamination.
4. Landscape / Countryside Protection
NPPF 180–182; Local Plan D1, D3: Insufficient protection of open countryside; buffers cannot fully mitigate visual intrusion or SDNP setting impacts.
5. Cumulative Traffic Assessment
NPPF 111, 27; Local Plan IC6: No robust modelling of traffic impacts with consented development and cross-boundary growth.

Conclusion: RG1 omits critical requirements for education, infrastructure, flood risk, water protection, landscape, and cumulative transport.

4: Does the policy adequately address the potential impacts of developing this site?

Ringmer Parish Council considers that BR1 does not adequately address impacts:

1. Landscape / Settlement Character
NPPF 180, 182; Local Plan D1, D3: The site forms a rural approach to Broyle Side. Development would urbanise this open corridor and result in fragmented settlement edge.
2. Highways / Traffic Safety
NPPF 111, 114; Local Plan IC6, IC8: Two new accesses on a 60mph road are unsafe. B2192 is already congested; additional 500+ cars would worsen traffic, air pollution, and accident risk.
3. Education / Community Capacity

NPPF 92–95; Local Plan IC1: No provision for schools; children would need to travel further, increasing car dependency.

4. Flood Risk and Aquifer

NPPF 167–169, 180(e), 183; Local Plan W1: Development partially in Flood Zone 3b and above a principal aquifer. Risk of flooding and groundwater contamination is high; mitigation not demonstrated.

5. Retail / Local Centre Viability

NPPF 86, 104; Local Plan HW6, IC1: Proposed 200m² retail is inadequate for scale of development. Fails to reduce travel to village centre, undermining sustainable objectives

6. Cumulative Development Impacts

NPPF 111, 27; Local Plan IC6: Policy does not assess cumulative traffic from existing and proposed developments.

7. Sustainable Transport / Accessibility

NPPF 104–109; Local Plan IC6: Walking and cycling connections to Ringmer village and amenities are unsafe and impractical. Development is car-dependent.

8. Infrastructure / Utilities

Southern Water's sewage works and local water supply already near capacity; no upgrade plan linked to the development.

Conclusion: BR1 fails to demonstrate that development can be safely, sustainably, and appropriately accommodated. It is not justified, not effective, and inconsistent with national and local policy.

Policies Referenced:

- National: NPPF 2021/2024 – 27, 86, 92–95, 104–109, 110–115, 167–169, 180–183.
- Local: Lewes Local Plan – D1, D3, IC1, IC6, IC8, HW6, W1.

Ringmer Parish Council Response – Policy BR2 – Land South of the Broyle

Indicative Yield: Up to 80 dwellings

Ringmer Parish Council strongly objects to Policy BR2 in its current form. The allocation is unsound under NPPF paragraph 35 because it is:

- Not justified – site selection ignores physical, environmental and transport constraints;
- Not effective – safe and suitable access cannot be delivered without materially altering the rural character;
- Not consistent with national and local policy – conflicts with NPPF 104–109, 110–115, 167–169, 180–183, and Local Plan Policies D1, D3, NE2, NE3, NE4, W1, IC1, IC8, HW5.

2: Are the requirements set out in the Site Allocation Policy sufficient to make the development appropriate in the context of the spatial strategy?

Policy BR2 requirements are insufficient to make the development compatible with the spatial strategy or sustainable growth principles:

1. Access and Highway Safety
NPPF 111, 114; Local Plan IC6, IC8: Half Mile Drove is a narrow rural lane, constrained in width, visibility, and lacking continuous footways. The allocation assumes intensified vehicular, pedestrian, and service movements that the lane cannot safely accommodate.
2. Sustainable Transport / Car Dependency
NPPF 104–109; Local Plan IC6: Site is physically remote from Broyle Side and Ringmer village. Walking/cycling routes are unsafe or impractical. Occupants would be highly car-dependent, contradicting modal shift objectives.
3. Surface Water and Flood Risk
NPPF 167–169; Local Plan W1: Site partially affected by surface water flooding. The policy does not guarantee safe, long-term drainage or management, relying instead on mitigation measures that may be insufficient.
4. Landscape and Rural Character
NPPF 180, 182; Local Plan D1, D3: Urbanising Half Mile Drove with carriageway widening, visibility splays, and footpaths would materially alter the rural setting and erode the approach to Broyle Side.

Conclusion: The policy lacks requirements that would make development appropriate to the spatial strategy, rural character, and sustainability objectives.

3: Are there any requirements missing for this site that need to be included?

Key missing requirements / gaps:

1. Access and Infrastructure
Local Plan IC8, D1: No plan to remove or reduce vehicular reliance on Half Mile Drove; construction traffic management is absent; pedestrian safety not secured.
2. Education and Community Facilities
NPPF 92–95; Local Plan IC1: No provision for schools, nursery, or community infrastructure. Distances to Ringmer Primary School (2.3 km), village centre (2.6 km), and GP surgery (2.6 km) make walking impractical.
3. Flood Risk and Drainage Evidence
NPPF 167–169; Local Plan W1: No robust catchment-wide surface water management plan provided.
4. Ecological and Green Infrastructure Mitigation
NPPF 180, 174–180; Local Plan NE2, NE3, NE4: While biodiversity net gain is mentioned, integration with recreational uses, allotments, and playing pitches may intensify pressure on sensitive landscape edges.
5. Sustainable Transport and Connectivity
NPPF 104–109; Local Plan IC6: No safe walking/cycling routes to village amenities or Ringmer Primary School.
6. Utilities and Service Capacity
No provision for expansion of water, sewage, healthcare, or retail infrastructure.

Conclusion: Policy BR2 omits critical requirements for safe access, education, flood risk, sustainable transport, utilities, and landscape protection.

4: Does the policy adequately address the potential impacts of developing this site?

Ringmer Parish Council considers that BR2 does not adequately address the key impacts of development:

1. Landscape / Rural Character
NPPF 180, 182; Local Plan D1, D3: Urbanising Half Mile Drove with engineering works, lighting, signage, and increased traffic would harm the rural approach to Broyle Side and erode the settlement edge.
2. Highways / Traffic Safety
NPPF 111, 114; Local Plan IC6, IC8: Additional vehicular and service trips along Half Mile Drove pose severe safety risks. The Broyle (B2192) is already a busy

road; additional car movements from up to 80 dwellings exacerbate congestion and collision risk.

3. Flood Risk / Drainage Constraints

NPPF 167–169; Local Plan W1: Surface water flooding already occurs along the lane. Additional development increases runoff and risk to highway safety and downstream areas.

4. Sustainable Transport / Accessibility

NPPF 104–109; Local Plan IC6: Lack of safe pedestrian or cycling connections makes residents heavily car-dependent, conflicting with sustainable development principles.

5. Community / Education Infrastructure

NPPF 92–95; Local Plan IC1: No capacity exists at Ringmer Primary School; children may need to travel further, increasing car usage.

6. Utilities / Services

Southern Water's sewage treatment and local water supply are already at capacity; the policy provides no mechanism to ensure upgrades are delivered in tandem with development.

7. Ecology and Green Infrastructure

NPPF 174–180; Local Plan NE2, NE3, NE4: While net gain is required, recreational uses combined with access and vehicle movements intensify pressures on sensitive landscape and habitat edges.

Conclusion: BR2 fails to demonstrate that development can be safely, sustainably, or appropriately accommodated. The allocation is not justified, not effective, and inconsistent with national and local policy.

Lewes Local Plan: A Spatial Strategy for Development in Our Plan Area (incorporating Site Allocations)

Regulation 2018 – Phase 2

Consultation period from 17 December 2025 to 28 February 2026

How to respond

The Council **prefers to receive your consultation responses online** via the consultation platform at https://planningpolicyconsult.lewes-eastbourne.gov.uk/LP_SpatialStrategyandSites/

You may also respond by email or post by filling this questionnaire and then sending it by email to localplan@lewes-eastbourne.gov.uk with the subject line “Lewes Local Plan Consultation,” or by post to Lewes District Council, 6 High Street, Lewes, BN7 2AD.

Your Details

Please note that responses to this consultation will be publicly available. This will include your name, who you represent and the company/organisation, but not personal contact details such as address or email.

Data Protection and Privacy Notice

For further information about how the council uses your information and your rights, please read our privacy notice [here](#).

Name: Cllr John-R Whitlock

Organisation (if relevant): Ringmer Parish Council

Agent providing comments on behalf of (if relevant): Click or tap here to enter text.

Postal address: Old School Close, Ringmer, BN8 5RA

Email address: admin@ringmerparishcouncil.gov.uk

Type of stakeholder / who are you representing: (place “x” in the corresponding box)

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Member of the Public (Resident of Lewes District) | <input type="checkbox"/> Member of the Public (Resident elsewhere) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Local Business / Employer | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Neighbouring District / Parish Council |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Local Group / Organisation | <input type="checkbox"/> Resident Association |
| <input type="checkbox"/> National Group / Organisation | <input type="checkbox"/> Landowner / Developer |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Planning Consultant | <input type="checkbox"/> Infrastructure / Service Provider |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other - please describe: Click or tap here to enter text. | |

Your comments on the Strategic Policies

Overall Spatial Strategy

1. Do you think the proposed spatial strategy will support the aim of creating a "network of low-carbon climate resilient connected settlements"?

Yes

No

Not sure

If not, how should the growth distribution be delivered?
Refer to attached document.

2. Does the strategic policy on Achieving Sustainable Development provide a good framework to ensure that new development is well-connected by sustainable transport?

Strongly Agree

Somewhat Agree

Not sure / Neutral

Somewhat Disagree

Strongly Disagree

Please provide additional details on your answer.
Refer to attached document.

3. Do you have any comments or concerns about whether essential infrastructure (schools, doctors, transport, utilities) can keep pace with the proposed level of growth?

Please provide your answer below.
Refer to attached document.

New Strategic Policies

Small Sites

4. Do you have any comments on the specific small sites identified in Newhaven, Seaford, Peacehaven, and Ringmer?

*These are separate from the sites, which are set out with their own site allocation policies.

Please provide your answer below.
Refer to attached document.

Strategic Green Gaps

5. Do you support the designation of these Strategic Green Gaps?

Land between Newhaven and Peacehaven

Yes No Not sure

Land to the north of Ringmer and west of Broyle Side

Yes No Not sure

Land between Newick and North Chailey

Yes No Not sure

Land between Haywards Heath and Burgess Hill

Yes No Not sure

Please provide additional details on your answer.
Refer to attached document.

6. Are there any other areas you believe should be designated as a Strategic Green Gap that are not currently included?

Please provide additional details on your answer.
N/A

Local Green Spaces

7. Do you support the Local Green Spaces policy?

*Please note that there is a concurrent Call for Sites and Evidence regarding Local Green Space Designation. To learn more about it, please visit:
https://planningpolicyconsult.lewes-eastbourne.gov.uk/LDC_LGS

Yes No Not sure

Please provide additional details on your answer.
Refer to attached document.

8. Do you have any comments on any policies from the Phase 1 consultation?

Yes No Not sure

Please provide the reference number to the policy you wish to comment on.

Refer to attached document.

General Comments

9. Taking everything into account, do you generally agree or disagree with the proposals in this consultation document?

Strongly
Agree

Somewhat
Agree

Not sure /
Neutral

Somewhat
Disagree

Strongly
Disagree

Your comments on the Site Allocation Policies

Note: Please use a separate copy of this section for each site you wish to comment on.

1. Which Site Allocation Policy do you wish to comment on?

Please state the relevant site reference number
(e.g. NB1)

RG1/RG2/BR1/BR2

2. Do you think the requirements set out in the Site Allocation Policy are sufficient to make the development appropriate in the context of the spatial strategy?

Strongly Agree Somewhat Agree Not sure / Neutral Somewhat Disagree Strongly Disagree

Please provide additional details on your answer.
Refer to attached document.

3. Are there any requirements missing for this site that need to be included?

Yes No Not sure

Please provide additional details on your answer below.
Refer to attached document.

4. Does the policy adequately address the potential impacts of developing this site? (e.g. landscape, roads, schools, healthcare, biodiversity)

Yes No Not sure

Please provide additional details on your answer below.
Refer to attached document.