<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Surname</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Email address</th>
<th>Do you agree the Design Guide overall will help to provide clarity to those involved with the planning process?</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amy</td>
<td>Kitching</td>
<td>Natural England</td>
<td><a href="mailto:amy.kitching@naturalengland.org.uk">amy.kitching@naturalengland.org.uk</a></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The guide contains good references to green infrastructure provision and the importance of maintaining coherent ecological networks across the landscape. Specific comments on these aspects are provided in the sections below.</td>
<td>Consider where references to net biodiversity gain would be appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kate</td>
<td>Wiseman</td>
<td>Natural England</td>
<td><a href="mailto:katy.wiseman@nationaltrust.org.uk">katy.wiseman@nationaltrust.org.uk</a></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The Design Guide is useful as it set out clear parameters and expectations to those involved in the planning process seeking to achieve high quality development within the High Weald AONB. The guide provides a useful incite into the essential character of the High Weald that makes it such a special place.</td>
<td>Noted, no amendments required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natalie</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>Withyham Parish Council</td>
<td><a href="mailto:clerk@withyhamparishcouncil.org.uk">clerk@withyhamparishcouncil.org.uk</a></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>It's a starting point</td>
<td>Noted, no amendments required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hedley</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>-</td>
<td><a href="mailto:hedley.england@lineone.net">hedley.england@lineone.net</a></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>So long as the house builders agree to follow the Design guidelines, it may be viable for small developments only. But due to the money involved, compromises are always made, and in one case I know of in suburban housing, nefarious means were used to push through bad housing decisions. So the high ideals of the Design could take second place to profit. You show examples of the poor housing that has been built, so it will be built again. At the end of the day, house builders want to make a profit, at the expense of the Weald. They have a lot of power. Once the High Weald is gone under concrete, it's gone.</td>
<td>Noted, no amendments required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheena</td>
<td>Carmichael</td>
<td>-</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sheena.carmichael@gmail.com">sheena.carmichael@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Excellent design guide</td>
<td>Noted, no amendments required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:clerk@westhoathly.gov.uk">clerk@westhoathly.gov.uk</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Guide will only be valuable if developers, officers and members of Planning Committees read and take note of it. The relevant Highways Authorities also need to take the guide into account when commenting on development in the High Weald.</td>
<td>Noted, no amendments required.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I do not think there should be ANY DEVELOPMENTS in an AONB so there is no case for the DESIGN GUIDE to answer.

I am concerned not so much about the quality of development but of the scale. There are too many houses being built in this lovely area. There should be stronger protection for AONBs against development.

This area suffers from an inadequate infrastructure relative to the current level of population and requires upgrading of hospitals, roads, education to cope with a significant increase in housing development.

Dallington Parish Council are pleased that there will now be guidance and that it is sensitive to the historic and unique landscape of the HWAONB.

Recommendation

Ensure brown field sites and councils have a robust void policy.

Email address

I note its content and am generally supportive of the principles. What I am less clear on is its status and how it will be enforced.

Consider where more references could be made to climate change, energy efficiency. Make clear what photos are showing and whether good or bad.

The DG does not give sufficient guidance on major changes expected to occur during the next few years: climate change; air quality & emission restraint; transition to net carbon neutrality; development of widespread EV charging infrastructure etc.

The Design Guide is a positive contribution to an understanding of the characteristics of the High Weald that deserve protection and perpetuation. Moreover, it is an attractive document in its own right, and a pleasure to read and assimilate.

In addressing the issues arising from new housing developments (and, by association, roads), it does, however, overlook some opportunities for the consideration of other elements of the built environment (e.g. commercial, retail, agricultural, passenger and goods transportation, and the utility services). Although some of these sectors are subject to national and industry-specific design & planning policies and standards, this Design Guide does not suggest measures to persuade and encourage convergence by other sectors on the good practice being sought via housing developers.

Many of the recommendations (particularly DG7, local Details) seem to focus too much on ‘village’ type developments. In fact, the HWAONB incorporates many already large communities, facing future expansion, that have characteristics of urban town-scale environments (e.g. Wadhurst, Battle, Forest Row). There is insufficient focus on such places.

The Guide is specifically aimed at housing developments and does not purport to address other types of development. It is as relevant to large villages as to small areas. Consider where in the Guide to add references to climate change and sustainability.

Do you have any comments on the Design Guide overall?

Inclusion of renewable and sustainable energy sources. Most notably it also remains silent on the use of photovoltaic/solar thermal panels within the AONB area. Guidance on how these can be used to enhance new homes would be invaluable.

Environmental sustainability:

Hastoe has serious concerns that the guide does not pay any consideration to its own environmental impact. There is no mention of the use of sustainable building materials, thermally efficient building envelopes, or the inclusion of renewable and sustainable energy sources. Most notably it also remains silent on the use of photovoltaic/solar thermal panels within the AONB area. Guidance on how these can be used to enhance new homes would be invaluable.

Consider where more references could be made to climate change and sustainability.

Observation of recent and current new builds, especially in Heathfield, show exactly why this guide is needed. Unfortunately, it is swimming against the tide when it comes to developers’ proposals and WDC’s Planning approach to the subject.

The immediate reference to AONB is the root cause of my heavy distress at the fomeration of undermining my total vision in your plans. I fear the over development of Dad’s hill in Cross-in-hand where 25 houses were built but all within field far an AONB and against a flood of local objections. I have NO FAITH in any forthcoming plans that try and pretend to protect our local AONB.

Consider more reference could be made to innovative design, and energy efficiency. Make clear what photos are showing and whether good or bad.

While a clearly well thought through design guide for the here and now, it seems to take very little account of the climate emergency by including guidance on solar panels, ground heat sink equipment, electric vehicle charging points and other equipment designed to reduce the carbon footprint of settlements. Additionally, there will be an increased momentum towards active travel which has implications, even in the High Weald, for cycling and walking provisions that are addressed only lightly with respect to guidance for developers.

The DG does not give sufficient guidance on major changes expected to occur during the next few years: climate change; air quality & emission restraint; transition to net carbon neutrality; development of widespread EV charging infrastructure etc.
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Do you have any comments on the Design Guide overall?
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Excellent guidance in sufficient detail and with sufficient examples of good and bad practice to be extremely useful. Both interesting and useful - a rare combination!

Hawkhurst’s NDP does refer to the AONB and more specifically the Hawkhurst NDP specifies houses to be “Built for Life”.

Access Matters

Concern about giving an open door to developers whose sole goal is to make money to build anywhere as long as they keep within the design local authorities because of very weak planning has to accept whatever they are desperate for money. Addition of compliance with council’s local duty to UNCRDP and KCC Kent Design which I was involved with as chair of independence access. Group registered of the whole of Kent and founds for the Kent Design reference guide with KCC high ways and in the long term. Services for life is an important issue to take on board as it saves councils money in the long run.

Access Auditor

with amendments to meet needs of disabled people as per legal duties. Addition of compliance with council’s local duty to UNCRDP and KCC Kent design which I was involved with as chair of independence access. Homes for life is an important issue to take on board as it saves councils money in the long term.

Very thorough specification given on style, layout, materials to be used in any new construction design.

Development must ensure there is no deterioration to watercourses ecologically, chemically or physically. Gillwoodland streams are particularly vulnerable and therefore there should not be any significant discharges to these watercourses. Local Authorities and developers must understand from the outset of the risk of damaging these irreplaceable habitats through even small discharges of water from urban environments.

The guide could emphasise that development should ensure there is a significant buffer from watercourses to ensure the stream corridor is kept dark, and disturbance does not significantly increase.

Consider where reference could be made to accessibility requirements and flexibility for lifetime use.

The guide includes references to safeguarding of aerodromes in general but would not be feasible to refer to every parish with a NPD as this will get out of date too quickly.

The Design Guide could provide more details or links to useful information on integrating items such as bird and bat boxes into developments, particularly when factoring in all the other requirements facing a development in the High Weald.

Consider where the Guide could provide more information on watercourses, probably DG1 and include links to more information on bird and bat boxes in DG10.

First of all, I’d like to say how much I welcome this Design Guide and enjoyed reading it. I do think there are improvements to be made, but the project is massively important and I really hope it will have a very strong impact.

The questions in the survey so far, however, are difficult questions to answer. The securing of high quality development is dependent on planning authorities adopting / endorsing the Guide and requiring developers to adhere to the project. I have no idea whether this is something that can be achieved - I very much hope it can, but the question back to yourselves is - what can you and we as a community do to make sure that happens? On question two, with some amendments the guide should provide clarity, but there are some aspects of the guide as it stands that remain ambiguous. Some photos are clearly labelled to show what is and is not appropriate, others leave the reader slightly confused as to what is or is not wrong and also if wrong - what is a better suggestion. It needs to be idiot-proof otherwise it is open to misinterpretation, which, for a larger-scale developer could be costly in terms of

I hope a more detailed response can be submitted by Burwash Parish Council / Neighbourhood Plan - but this is a quick reply.

Armitage photographs.

I hope the guide will include information as to which Wards have their own Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP) in place and they should be compiled with.

The Guide includes references to safeguarding of aerodromes in general but would not be feasible to refer to every parish with a NPD as this will get out of date too quickly.

I have a quick look at this. It struck me that it was more to do with design than functionality, perhaps not surprisingly and I was not sure that it was really that relevant to us. One thing I did notice though - and I have been struck by it elsewhere is - the lack of any reference to horse riders. It does seem a singular omission in the context of a paper about such an essentially rural area as the High Weald.

I have had a quick look at this. It struck me that it was more to do with design than functionality, perhaps not surprisingly and I was not sure that it was really that relevant to us. One thing I did notice though - and I have been struck by it elsewhere is - the lack of any reference to horse riders. It does seem a singular omission in the context of a paper about such an essentially rural area as the High Weald.

Consider where reference could be made to accessibility requirements and flexibility for lifetime use.

Consider where the Guide could provide more information on watercourses, probably DG1 and include links to more information on bird and bat boxes in DG10.
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Consider where the Guide could provide more information on watercourses, probably DG1 and include links to more information on bird and bat boxes in DG10.
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Consider where the Guide could provide more information on watercourses, probably DG1 and include links to more information on bird and bat boxes in DG10.

I have had a quick look at this. It struck me that it was more to do with design than functionality, perhaps not surprisingly and I was not sure that it was really that relevant to us. One thing I did notice though - and I have been struck by it elsewhere is - the lack of any reference to horse riders. It does seem a singular omission in the context of a paper about such an essentially rural area as the High Weald.

Consider where the Guide could provide more information on watercourses, probably DG1 and include links to more information on bird and bat boxes in DG10.
Why aren’t solar panels and solar-heated water panels included in the planning to lessen the potential negatives?

No matter how well thought out this detailed guide may be the bottom line is no one should be building a new housing development in areas of outstanding natural beauty.

Noted, no amendments required.

SGN Network Planning

Knowles

Gallios

Watters

Briggs

Copsey

We recommend reference to the legal duty to co-operate with the Marine Management Organisation, as well as reference to Marine Planning, the Marine Policy Statement, and the South Marine Plans in the Appendix.

Salehurst Parish

Salehurst & Robertsbridge Parish Council Response to High Weald Consultation on 'Building for the High Weald - A Design Guide for new housing development'

Salehurst & Robertsbridge Parish Council is pleased to respond positively to this consultation and support its adoption.

We are very pleased to note the consultation’s focus on issues which we ourselves have identified as of critical importance within our own Neighbourhood Plan. In particular:

- The importance of new development to respect local history and topography.
- The importance of using appropriate building materials such as lime hanging and weather boarding.
- The importance of effective storm-water management – being sited on a flood plain and having experienced severe flooding both due to river flooding and rainwater run-off, makes our village particularly sensitive to this issue.
- The importance of permeability of developments, providing for connections to existing walk and cycle ways wherever possible to encourage people not to use their cars as a default.
- The importance of effective parking provision – our village already has a major parking issue and new developments should not be allowed to exacerbate the problem.
- The importance of incorporating green spaces in new developments and joining them up with existing green spaces where possible.
- The importance of road design, e.g. sufficient width, in new developments. Too many modern developments contain overly narrow roads resulting in congestion and difficulty of access for recycling vehicles and emergency services.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this document. Please confirm safe receipt.

Noted, no amendments required.

Colby/Houn

Rother District Council

Warrick

The Design Guidance is welcomed and supported. It aligns well with our Core Strategy Policy EN3, and will help support our various roles in the planning process, from plan-making including development site allocation, through to Neighbourhood Plan liaison, and the Development Management process, helping us to successfully deliver housing requirements and meet NPPF and Core Strategy policy objectives.

The labelling of the photographs and images used within the Guidance to indicate whether they are showing good or bad examples would be welcomed; as at present it is confusing.

The labelling of the photographs and images used within the Guidance to indicate whether they are showing good or bad examples would be welcomed; as at present it is confusing.

Noted, no amendments required.

Colby/Houn

Robertsbridge & Salehurst Parish Council

Gallios

SGN Network Planning

Knowles

Standard responses from the Marine Planning Team, Marine Management Organisation. Please ensure this response is read in its entirety.

After reading ‘Building for the High Weald’ - A Design Guide for new housing development in the AONB, the Marine Management Organisation would welcome the inclusion of marine planning. For the design guide to be sound there should be a clear inclusion of marine planning in line with the NPPF and Marine and Coastal Access Act (MCAA).

NPPF: 166. In coastal areas, local planning authorities should take account of the UK Marine Policy Statement and marine plans and apply Integrated Coastal Zone Management across local authority and land/sea boundaries, ensuring integration of the terrestrial and marine planning regimes.

MCAA: 58(1). A public authority must take any authorisation or enforcement decision in accordance with the appropriate marine policy documents.

MCAA: 58(3). A public authority must have regard to the marine policy documents in taking any decision which relates to the exercise of any function capable of affecting the whole or any part of the marine area.

The PAS soundness self-assessment checklist also states a recommended requirement to "take account of marine planning".

These requirements apply to Local Plans not guidance documents. Can include reference to Marine Policy Statement and Coastal Management Plans in the Appendix.

No amendments.

I am very worried about the ruination of our beautiful precious countryside. We have already had too much building in Hawkhurst, and they are threatening a huge amount more. I don't want anyone to be homeless but what we need is jobs in the North; where there is no shortage of housing. It's mad to keep building in the South East just because that's the only place people can get work.

Noted, no amendments required.

Noted, no amendments required.
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Noted, no amendments required.

The Design Guidance is welcomed and supported. It aligns well with our Core Strategy Policy EN3, and will help support our various roles in the planning process, from plan-making including development site allocation, through to Neighbourhood Plan liaison, and the Development Management process, helping us to successfully deliver housing requirements and meet NPPF and Core Strategy policy objectives.

The labelling of the photographs and images used within the Guidance to indicate whether they are showing good or bad examples would be welcomed; as at present it is confusing.

It would be useful to include reference to sustainable building technologies, with specific reference to the High Weald

Salehurst & Robertsbridge Parish Council is pleased to respond positively to this consultation and support its adoption.

We are very pleased to note the consultation’s focus on issues which we ourselves have identified as of critical importance within our own Neighbourhood Plan. In particular:

- The importance of new development to respect local history and topography.
- The importance of using appropriate building materials such as lime hanging and weather boarding.
- The importance of effective storm-water management – being sited on a flood plain and having experienced severe flooding both due to river flooding and rainwater run-off, makes our village particularly sensitive to this issue.
- The importance of permeability of developments, providing for connections to existing walk and cycle ways wherever possible to encourage people not to use their cars as a default.
- The importance of effective parking provision – our village already has a major parking issue and new developments should not be allowed to exacerbate the problem.
- The importance of incorporating green spaces in new developments and joining them up with existing green spaces where possible.
- The importance of road design, e.g. sufficient width, in new developments. Too many modern developments contain overly narrow roads resulting in congestion and difficulty of access for recycling vehicles and emergency services.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this document. Please confirm safe receipt.

Noted, no amendments required.
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Annotate photographs. May not be appropriate to identify locations of people’s private homes.

Annotate photographs. Consider where to add references to sustainable design.

Consider where to add references to sustainable building techniques.
The Parish Council want to know what weight the Design Guide has in the context of planning - is it a Guide or is it taken into account as part of the material considerations. The assumption is that the guide covers all development including infill/backland development but the Parish Council would like the Guide to explicitly state that it is relevant for all development in the High Weald however small.

Noble West Sussex Local Access Forum
At the Forum’s main remit is to ensure the existing network of PRoW and the wider access network is protected and where possible enhanced, it is encouraging to note, also in the introduction, the reference to the High Weald AONB Management Plan 2019-2024. This document clearly sets out (more so than in the Design Guide), the ‘top 5 issues relating to routeways’ (pages 38 & 39), their particular importance, current and historical value, and the value of the connectivity of woodland and ‘wooded routes’ (page 40). ‘We welcome the reference to PRoW and their reduction in accessibility’ (page 60), which is a matter of great concern to us, and welcome the reference to reducing speeds on all roads (page 63).

Moore Sarah Wealden from Overdevelopment Team
Yes, the guide does a fantastic job of highlighting the factors that we all appreciate as good local design, even though we wouldn’t be able to identify the factors ourselves unprompted.

Cotteringham Nown

Trainor CPRE Sussex
Pictures are extremely helpful, however it would be useful if each picture was annotated so that it is clear what the image intends to show. The Design Guide does not address the challenges of climate change, in that there is no reference to the possible use of PV panels/Heat pumps etc. Another missing issue is the involvement of local people in placemaking. In the CPRE Sussex ‘Making Places’ project (please see our website) we demonstrated how the involvement of local people in identifying key characteristics of a place are valuable. It should be made clear that this guidance is equally applicable to social/affordable homes as it is to market housing.

Hollidge Sustrans Volunteer / Cycle Group representative.
Guidance on how best to adopt and enforce the guide (as per Q1 and Q2) is critical to its success. The illustrations are welcome - however it would be helpful to add subtitles to all of them - in order to ensure it is completely clear whether they are good / bad examples. It could be helpful to add a glossary - to assist the lay person (e.g. definition of building grain, SUDs) the design guide is obviously for new development - is there any intention to produce guidance for conversion / extension of existing buildings or for other types of development - e.g. public/commercial/agricultural buildings?

Moore philipmmoore@yahoo.co.uk
Annotate photographs. Consider where to add references to climate change and sustainable design. Also refer to importance of community involvement in design. Clarify how the guide relates to this and whether any elements can be incorporated?

Fairlight Parish Council
The DG provides guidance, advice and recommendations to entities in housing development in clear and practical language without being prescriptive. SPC’s concern is that much of the DG is open to interpretation and consequently desired outcomes may not always be achieved. It is dependent on what weight local planning authorities will give to the DG when approving planning applications.

Rex

The DG provides guidance, advice and recommendations to entities in housing development in clear and practical language without being prescriptive. SPC’s concern is that much of the DG is open to interpretation and consequently desired outcomes may not always be achieved. It is dependent on what weight local planning authorities will give to the DG when approving planning applications.

Weston Fairlight Parish Council
The Neighbourhood Plan supports many of the design guide features advocated within the AONB Design Guidance. The checklist in the guide to assist developers would ensure that plans being put forward are broadly in line with NPPF.

Buscot

Caterham Sarah Wilmore Sarah.Cottingham@btconnect.com
The general vision of the document is written positively and it accepts that housing development in the High Weald is necessary and desirable to create a thriving and successful place. We admire that further consideration should be given to the way in which design can enhance the character and landscape of the AONB through contemporary and innovative developments such as high quality contemporary design. There are helpful resources such as the study cover however the document remains aspirational. Needs to reflect EEC highways regulations and the hierarchy of how this Design Guide sits within other statutory regulations such as NPPF and local planning policies should be addressed.

Weight will depend on whether LPAs adopt as SPD but will be a material planning consideration. Applies to all housing development, clarify in Chapter 1.

Consider adding more references to innovative designs. Already refer to Highway Authority guidance.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Surname</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Email address</th>
<th>Chapter 2 – Understanding the High Weald comments</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sharon</td>
<td>Maclen</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:sharonmaclen@btinternet.com">sharonmaclen@btinternet.com</a></td>
<td>There is no mention of the EXTRA STRAIN on natural resources such as water, which would be adversely affected by any building.</td>
<td>The Design Guide is intended to assist in making development more distinctive to the High Weald, it does not affect the quantity of development in the High Weald.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Captain Bryn</td>
<td>Wayt</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:bryn.wayt@icloud.com">bryn.wayt@icloud.com</a></td>
<td>I am not ignorant about what an AONB is, and why they came about - no lessons required.</td>
<td>Noted, no amendments required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Wear Davis</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:Montgomery20@ymail.com">Montgomery20@ymail.com</a></td>
<td>A brushed over approach with no discussion of the communities this will destroy due to increased traffic and lack of amenities etc</td>
<td>Noted, no amendments required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>Miller</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:jan.miller@education.gov.uk">jan.miller@education.gov.uk</a></td>
<td>I don’t need the guild to tell me how beautiful the countryside is and that we shouldn’t be putting more housing developments in these places particularly on green belt.</td>
<td>Noted, no amendments required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicholas</td>
<td>Watters</td>
<td>Rother District Council</td>
<td></td>
<td>The ‘Overview’ text on page 9 could helpfully include reference to the use of the Guide in producing Design &amp; Access Statements – I see that this is explored in more detail in the Appendices, but it would be useful to have an ‘upfront’ reference too.</td>
<td>Agreed, could be incorporated in the last sentence of the overview section.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenny</td>
<td>Knowles</td>
<td>Tonbridge &amp; Malling BC</td>
<td></td>
<td>Under defining components of the High Weald on page 3 there could also be an opportunity to highlight the man made features of beauty that are also defining characteristics, as well as the natural ones.</td>
<td>Clarify with T&amp;MBC what changes they are seeking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>Noble</td>
<td>West Sussex Local Access Forum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Most locally distinctive characteristics will be pre-1840 before railway transport enabled import of other materials and ideas about layouts became more standardised. Do not wish to dilute this character further.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alison</td>
<td>Stevenson</td>
<td>Balcombe Parish Council</td>
<td><a href="mailto:alison.stevenson@balcombeparishcouncil.co.uk">alison.stevenson@balcombeparishcouncil.co.uk</a></td>
<td>This section mainly covers the period prior to 1900. Where later additions to villages are substantial it may be that the village has already had much built that is not characteristic of the Weald and it is therefore hard to impose a ‘Wealden’ form of development.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ian</td>
<td>Hollidge</td>
<td>Sustrans Volunteer / Cycle Group representative</td>
<td><a href="mailto:iahollidge@icloud.com">iahollidge@icloud.com</a></td>
<td>Excellent document, only a few comments which you may wish to consider.</td>
<td>Noted, no amendments required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philip</td>
<td>Moore</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:philipmoore@yahoo.co.uk">philipmoore@yahoo.co.uk</a></td>
<td>Yes, The guide does a fantastic job of highlighting the factors that we all appreciate as good local design, even though we would not be able to identify the factors ourselves unprompted.</td>
<td>Noted, no amendments required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frankie</td>
<td>Nown</td>
<td>Ticehurst Parish Council</td>
<td><a href="mailto:frankienowne@btconnect.com">frankienowne@btconnect.com</a></td>
<td>Geographical areas have distinct architectural features that can be used to blend in new buildings. It would be interesting to Ticehurst Parish Council to contribute towards kit houses being designed with distinctive Wealden features to assist self-build partnerships and developers looking to build in the area.</td>
<td>Noted, no amendments required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Banks</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:robertgf@outlook.com">robertgf@outlook.com</a></td>
<td>If the overview on page 9 is not helpful as it does not differentiate between the policies to help the reader. I suggest that that section should be replaced with the following: The policies Connecting new developments with the High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and its setting.</td>
<td>The Guide is not allowed to include policies, it can only supplement existing Local Plan policies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surname</td>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Email address</td>
<td>DG2 comments: Responding to Site &amp; Context</td>
<td>Recommendations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wiseman</td>
<td>Natural England</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Katy.Wiseman@nationaltrust.org.uk">Katy.Wiseman@nationaltrust.org.uk</a></td>
<td>Welcome the positive approach to landscape-led design and the section using existing features in scheme design and the reinstatement of lost features as the National Trust strongly believe that places reflect the history that has shaped them, and gives them local identity.</td>
<td>Noted, no amendments required.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryt</td>
<td>Withyham Parish Council</td>
<td><a href="mailto:clerk@withyhamparishcouncil.org.uk">clerk@withyhamparishcouncil.org.uk</a></td>
<td>This section fails to consider the benefits of public transport to communities in the AONB and the effects of private vehicle use.</td>
<td>Noted, no amendments required.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richards</td>
<td><a href="mailto:alanjohnrichards@kicsali.co.uk">alanjohnrichards@kicsali.co.uk</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>This area suffers from an inadequate infrastructure relative to the current level of population and requires upgrading of hospitals, roads, education etc. with a significant increase in housing development.</td>
<td>Noted, no amendments required.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masiin</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sharonmaslen@btinternet.com">sharonmaslen@btinternet.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>There is NO CASE for building in an AREA OF OUTSTANDING NATURAL BEAUTY. We have SO FEW of these areas left that they should be left as they are WITHOUT building for everyone to enjoy - walking, riding etc.....</td>
<td>Noted, no amendments required.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeffries</td>
<td><a href="mailto:chrisjeffries5@gmail.com">chrisjeffries5@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>The whole approach, which is very positive, depends upon the space being available in areas that people want to live. That space is decided by the Local Plan which forces development into a few very high density locations. There is little to no provision for development within the actual AONB, only on its periphery.</td>
<td>Noted, no amendments required.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mortley</td>
<td><a href="mailto:chrismortley@btinternet.com">chrismortley@btinternet.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>The paragraph starting with &quot;A multidisciplinary approach (urban design,...&quot; includes highways engineering, but omits reference to other potentially intrusive services e.g. electricity substations, etc.</td>
<td>Add 'and other infrastructure provision' after 'highways engineering'.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bacon</td>
<td>Essenden Design Limited</td>
<td><a href="mailto:james@essendendesign.com">james@essendendesign.com</a></td>
<td>The location of original properties would have been greatly influenced by site topography and access, following the contours; layouts have often appeared to be based on a desk plan solution in isolation from the site.</td>
<td>Noted, no amendments required.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carmichael</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sheena.carmichael@gmail.com">sheena.carmichael@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>This section fails to consider the benefits of public transport to communities in the AONB and the effects of private vehicle use.</td>
<td>Noted, no amendments required.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treherne</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ktetreherne@btinternet.com">ktetreherne@btinternet.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>My suggestion is to be even more emphatic about where new building sites should go. I would spell out - ‘in grey/brown areas’. There are plenty of them around. You only have to look at Heathfield and Crowborough to observe sad, worn out 'no man's land' situated near the commercial districts.</td>
<td>Noted, no amendments required.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gonzalez</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sunnyekg@gmail.com">sunnyekg@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>It is worrying building on Weald anywhere. It's a beautiful view. I know Burwash and I think it has the space to build. So does Tunbridge Wells. Surely you can make the space without destroying High Weald.</td>
<td>Noted, no amendments required.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cartwright</td>
<td><a href="mailto:miltoncartwright@aol.com">miltoncartwright@aol.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>I welcome and support in particular the design principles that design should take account of and not harm views as well as the principle that new developments should not dominate the &quot;parent&quot; settlement. I also strongly support the need to use &quot;EXISTING SITE FEATURES IN SCHEME DESIGN AND REINSTATEMENT OF LOST FEATURES&quot;</td>
<td>Noted, no amendments required.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayt</td>
<td><a href="mailto:bryn.wayt@icloud.com">bryn.wayt@icloud.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>Haphazard building has and will take place, and I have no faith in your protection capabilities.</td>
<td>Noted, no amendments required.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holt</td>
<td>Kent County Council</td>
<td></td>
<td>Accessibility is covered in DG2.</td>
<td>Consider including the repair of an existing historic asset and the reinstatement of its missing features in order to enhance its character or setting.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hosford</td>
<td>CRANBROOK Conservation Area Advisory Committee (CCAAC)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:hilary.hosford@gmail.com">hilary.hosford@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>Although one understands the point about following the contours and this is generally to be supported there are of course many historic villages eg Hawkhurst where many streets definitely do NOT follow the contours. The General premiss of looking and understanding the site in the Guide is however well made.</td>
<td>Consider whether the 'Following the contours' advice should be caveated.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petford</td>
<td>Hastoe</td>
<td>Joanne Petford <a href="mailto:petford@hastoe.com">petford@hastoe.com</a></td>
<td>1. Development Challenge - Whilst it is widely understood that it is both a … responsibility and privilege to make long lasting interventions in a special and protected landscape … this needs to be considered in the wider context of the development scheme used for example, the quality of existing building provision. To redevelop an existing site is often more costly and risky. It's difficult to consider the wider AONB context and the next generation of the place.</td>
<td>Redevelopment of existing housing sites is rare in comparison to greenfield sites and LPAs will take exceptional viability cases to account as appropriate when applying this Guide.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Noted, no amendments required.

I would like to see more pictures of examples, good and bad, of how developments sit into a long view. I am glad to see the highlighting of views through developments into the landscape but wonder if guidance can be provided on how this can be quantified as adequate for a development: particularly for a ridge top view. Can a more objective measure of exposure and prominence of developments from views be provided? On a similar point, with regard to hedgerow retention it would be good to have some objective measures of acceptable levels of disturbance. (Noting that while ancient woodland has some definitive protection, the removal of hedgerows (though protected under certain circumstances) is less clear.)

Although walking and cycling is mentioned within this section I think a more explicit explanation of how developers can support this is required. Recognising the challenges in a rural area to develop well connected routes for active travel between key community facilities, I still believe it is important to highlight the need for active travel and recreational travel within the development areas themselves and that routes should be safe, welcoming, well maintained, durable and clearly signposted. Further information about this is available in the Sport England Active Design Guide in chapter 2 (walkable communities) and chapter 3 (connected walking and cycling routes). Within the wayfinding section a connection could be made to walking and cycling e.g. if connectivity is clear it can encourage and support active travel.

We would strongly recommend that routes via estates must NOT go across dwelling driveways. In our experience this stores up issues for the future, both for the landowner and the user.

Please furnish me with a best example of a housing estate built in Wealden in the last 10 years.

New mass housing developments should never be built on Wealden ridge top positions. We completely agree if the issue is wider than the application site?

The reference to maintaining of the network of fields, woods and hedgerows is most important, space and retention/enhancement of features/hedgerows etc.

SITING DEVELOPMENT IN THE LANDSCAPE: what does the phrase 'as end-stops which block the view' mean? I think this could be better phrased/explained.

Consider whether we can include examples. The treatment of hedgerows is an advice note in itself and too detailed for inclusion in this one.

COP26: Responding to Site and Context (page 10) – The requirement for a robust Design & Access Statement is supported. This should incorporate all PRoW (and their status), within the proposed development and in the wider countryside, to enable an assessment of the opportunities to provide connectivity and improvement (possibly by upgrading of PRoW) both within the development and to the wider access network.

DG2: Responding to Site and Context (page 11) – Checklist – the requirements to analyse the site and wider landscape in relation to ‘routeways’, and study historic maps to identify opportunities for reinstatement of ‘routeways’ is supported, but clarification of the terminology is recommended, i.e. use wording PRoW.

Routeways is the appropriate term as it includes not just PRoWs but roads and other routes that currently have no public rights but have been historically used as such.

Consider whether we can include examples. The treatment of hedgerows is an advice note in itself and too detailed for inclusion in this one.

DG1: Responding to Site and Context (page 10) – The requirement for a robust Design & Access Statement is supported. This should incorporate all PRoW (and their status), within the proposed development and in the wider countryside, to enable an assessment of the opportunities to provide connectivity and improvement (possibly by upgrading of PRoW) both within the development and to the wider access network.

DG2: Responding to Site and Context (page 11) – Checklist – the requirements to analyse the site and wider landscape in relation to ‘routeways’, and study historic maps to identify opportunities for reinstatement of ‘routeways’ is supported, but clarification of the terminology is recommended, i.e. use wording PRoW.

Include reference in DG2 to routes being safe, welcoming, well maintained, durable and clearly signposted as per the Sport England Active Design Guide and to them being as accessible as possible, using gates instead of stiles to support disabled people, people with buggy’s, cyclists, and older people to use routes more easily. Include reference in DG2 to routes avoiding private spaces such as driveways.

DG1: Responding to Site and Context (page 10) – The requirement for a robust Design & Access Statement is supported. This should incorporate all PRoW (and their status), within the proposed development and in the wider countryside, to enable an assessment of the opportunities to provide connectivity and improvement (possibly by upgrading of PRoW) both within the development and to the wider access network.

DG2: Responding to Site and Context (page 11) – Checklist – the requirements to analyse the site and wider landscape in relation to ‘routeways’, and study historic maps to identify opportunities for reinstatement of ‘routeways’ is supported, but clarification of the terminology is recommended, i.e. use wording PRoW.

Noted, no amendments required.

Noted, no amendments required.

Consider whether we can include examples. The treatment of hedgerows is an advice note in itself and too detailed for inclusion in this one.

DG1: Responding to Site and Context (page 10) – The requirement for a robust Design & Access Statement is supported. This should incorporate all PRoW (and their status), within the proposed development and in the wider countryside, to enable an assessment of the opportunities to provide connectivity and improvement (possibly by upgrading of PRoW) both within the development and to the wider access network.

DG2: Responding to Site and Context (page 11) – Checklist – the requirements to analyse the site and wider landscape in relation to ‘routeways’, and study historic maps to identify opportunities for reinstatement of ‘routeways’ is supported, but clarification of the terminology is recommended, i.e. use wording PRoW.

DG1: Responding to Site and Context (page 10) – The requirement for a robust Design & Access Statement is supported. This should incorporate all PRoW (and their status), within the proposed development and in the wider countryside, to enable an assessment of the opportunities to provide connectivity and improvement (possibly by upgrading of PRoW) both within the development and to the wider access network.

DG2: Responding to Site and Context (page 11) – Checklist – the requirements to analyse the site and wider landscape in relation to ‘routeways’, and study historic maps to identify opportunities for reinstatement of ‘routeways’ is supported, but clarification of the terminology is recommended, i.e. use wording PRoW.

Include reference in DG2 to routes being safe, welcoming, well maintained, durable and clearly signposted as per the Sport England Active Design Guide and to them being as accessible as possible, using gates instead of stiles to support disabled people, people with buggy’s, cyclists, and older people to use routes more easily. Include reference in DG2 to routes avoiding private spaces such as driveways.

Noted, no amendments required.

Noted, no amendments required.

Consider whether we can include examples. The treatment of hedgerows is an advice note in itself and too detailed for inclusion in this one.

DG1: Responding to Site and Context (page 10) – The requirement for a robust Design & Access Statement is supported. This should incorporate all PRoW (and their status), within the proposed development and in the wider countryside, to enable an assessment of the opportunities to provide connectivity and improvement (possibly by upgrading of PRoW) both within the development and to the wider access network.

DG2: Responding to Site and Context (page 11) – Checklist – the requirements to analyse the site and wider landscape in relation to ‘routeways’, and study historic maps to identify opportunities for reinstatement of ‘routeways’ is supported, but clarification of the terminology is recommended, i.e. use wording PRoW.

Noted, no amendments required.

Noted, no amendments required.

Consider whether we can include examples. The treatment of hedgerows is an advice note in itself and too detailed for inclusion in this one.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Contact Information</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Harding | part of CPRE response | p.10 Whilst agreeing with the thrust of what is on this page, it has to be accepted that a planning application site can only be responsible for matters within its own confines, unless there is a S.106 agreement, and therefore some of the aspirations mentioned on this page cannot be achieved by a single planning application. ’Check List’.

The point made above has to be emphasised, that a single planning application cannot alter/improve the wider context.

p.11 The third paragraph on this page refers to LVIAs; these should be viewed with considerable caution, as an applicant will tend always to portray their proposal in the best possible way.

p.13 The reference to maintaining of the network of fields, woods and hedgerows is most important, because in Rother recently, this has been ignored when granting applications on greenfield sites. The same is true of field boundaries. |

| Town | Ticehurst Parish Council frankienowne@btconnect.com | Ticehurst Parish Council commends the Design guidance on advocating the use of the natural landscape, ditches, ponds, field boundaries and existing trees. Protection for tree and hedge root zones should be rigorously adhered to and it is suggested that this is included in the section on existing site features on page 13 document. |

| Cottingham | Barton Willmore Sarah.Cottingham@bartonwillmore.co.uk | We can see that there has been detailed analysis of the High Weald its history and character and how this can be used when considering how development should respond to the site and its context. However we would note that the Guide predominantly leans towards rural villages for its inspiration and the resultant guidance is more focused towards development in rural areas. We would advise that more consideration is given to development within and round towns within the AONB and how this may differ to development in rural areas. There is only one town within the AONB, Battle, and development here would need to follow the same principles. Similarly development on the edge of towns outside the AONB (Tunbridge Wells, Horsham etc or inset within it, like Heathfield and Crowborough, will still have important High Weald features that should inform the design. In Chapter 2, under settlements, clarify that Guide also applies to development on the fringes of these towns. |

| Nown | | Noted, no amendments required. |

| | Include protection of tree and hedgerow roots on p13. | |

| | | |
The detrimental effects of new development could do with more attention I feel; having lived in the village of Knockholt for 10 years it was apparent that travel provision does not keep pace with the population and the accumulative effect of new development along the ‘feeder’ routes. Increased traffic volumes are highly detrimental to villages; many original dwellings are located close to the through-road with street parking and limited footways, the traffic creates noise & pollution and the danger to pedestrians especially families attempting to walk to school encourages more car use which exacerbates the problem.

Agree with the suggestion to make use of existing connecting routes, but this needs to be more bold - new development must be accompanied by improvements to transport with the objective of reducing through traffic and increasing safety for pedestrians, also through a wider improvement of connecting cycle routes across the county and area, the accumulative effect of development can then be mitigated.

I suggest this can be done by:
1. Creating new footpaths and cycleways by acquiring rights to fence up an average 2-3m strip of fields adjacent/alongside existing lanes leaving existing hedges in place, to serve existing and new dwellings and connecting to external links.
2. Improve existing roadside footways by increasing their width - especially school routes.
3. Where villages currently have high traffic volumes a sensitive proposal should be made to consider a new route to permit through traffic to avoid the villages. This may require robust conditions to restrict unnecessary harmful Highway Standards - many existing A class roads are little more than over-used slightly wider country lanes and the formation of similar new routes should not be detrimental to the existing countryside when balanced with the greater improvement to well being, safety and village life. I do not consider the reduction in through traffic would be detrimental to businesses in the villages as these are often a destination in themselves and would be improved as such. The High Weald area is beautiful and progressively creating connected cycle routes within this area would enhance the enjoyment of it, reduce the necessity of car travel and improve sustainable access to the countryside.

In my view there should be dedicated cycle routes connecting all towns as a basic requirement, they can be straightforward to construct but can transform the ability of many people to healthy and safe travel. A 2.0m wide path of consolidated base course is relatively inexpensive and adequate.

Feel that contributions to these travel improvements are much more important than contributions to play areas and libraries etc.

The detrimental effects of new development could do with more attention I feel; having lived in the village of Knockholt for 10 years it was apparent that travel provision does not keep pace with the population and the accumulative effect of new development along the ‘feeder’ routes. Increased traffic volumes are highly detrimental to villages; many original dwellings are located close to the through-road with street parking and limited footways, the traffic creates noise & pollution and the danger to pedestrians especially families attempting to walk to school encourages more car use which exacerbates the problem.

Agree with the suggestion to make use of existing connecting routes, but this needs to be more bold - new development must be accompanied by improvements to transport with the objective of reducing through traffic and increasing safety for pedestrians, also through a wider improvement of connecting cycle routes across the county and area, the accumulative effect of development can then be mitigated.

I suggest this can be done by:
1. Creating new footpaths and cycleways by acquiring rights to fence up an average 2-3m strip of fields adjacent/alongside existing lanes leaving existing hedges in place, to serve existing and new dwellings and connecting to external links.
2. Improve existing roadside footways by increasing their width - especially school routes.
3. Where villages currently have high traffic volumes a sensitive proposal should be made to consider a new route to permit through traffic to avoid the villages. This may require robust conditions to restrict unnecessary harmful Highway Standards - many existing A class roads are little more than over-used slightly wider country lanes and the formation of similar new routes should not be detrimental to the existing countryside when balanced with the greater improvement to well being, safety and village life. I do not consider the reduction in through traffic would be detrimental to businesses in the villages as these are often a destination in themselves and would be improved as such. The High Weald area is beautiful and progressively creating connected cycle routes within this area would enhance the enjoyment of it, reduce the necessity of car travel and improve sustainable access to the countryside.

In my view there should be dedicated cycle routes connecting all towns as a basic requirement, they can be straightforward to construct but can transform the ability of many people to healthy and safe travel. A 2.0m wide path of consolidated base course is relatively inexpensive and adequate.

Feel that contributions to these travel improvements are much more important than contributions to play areas and libraries etc.

The detrimental effects of new development could do with more attention I feel; having lived in the village of Knockholt for 10 years it was apparent that travel provision does not keep pace with the population and the accumulative effect of new development along the ‘feeder’ routes. Increased traffic volumes are highly detrimental to villages; many original dwellings are located close to the through-road with street parking and limited footways, the traffic creates noise & pollution and the danger to pedestrians especially families attempting to walk to school encourages more car use which exacerbates the problem.

Agree with the suggestion to make use of existing connecting routes, but this needs to be more bold - new development must be accompanied by improvements to transport with the objective of reducing through traffic and increasing safety for pedestrians, also through a wider improvement of connecting cycle routes across the county and area, the accumulative effect of development can then be mitigated.

I suggest this can be done by:
1. Creating new footpaths and cycleways by acquiring rights to fence up an average 2-3m strip of fields adjacent/alongside existing lanes leaving existing hedges in place, to serve existing and new dwellings and connecting to external links.
2. Improve existing roadside footways by increasing their width - especially school routes.
3. Where villages currently have high traffic volumes a sensitive proposal should be made to consider a new route to permit through traffic to avoid the villages. This may require robust conditions to restrict unnecessary harmful Highway Standards - many existing A class roads are little more than over-used slightly wider country lanes and the formation of similar new routes should not be detrimental to the existing countryside when balanced with the greater improvement to well being, safety and village life. I do not consider the reduction in through traffic would be detrimental to businesses in the villages as these are often a destination in themselves and would be improved as such. The High Weald area is beautiful and progressively creating connected cycle routes within this area would enhance the enjoyment of it, reduce the necessity of car travel and improve sustainable access to the countryside.

In my view there should be dedicated cycle routes connecting all towns as a basic requirement, they can be straightforward to construct but can transform the ability of many people to healthy and safe travel. A 2.0m wide path of consolidated base course is relatively inexpensive and adequate.

Feel that contributions to these travel improvements are much more important than contributions to play areas and libraries etc.

The detrimental effects of new development could do with more attention I feel; having lived in the village of Knockholt for 10 years it was apparent that travel provision does not keep pace with the population and the accumulative effect of new development along the ‘feeder’ routes. Increased traffic volumes are highly detrimental to villages; many original dwellings are located close to the through-road with street parking and limited footways, the traffic creates noise & pollution and the danger to pedestrians especially families attempting to walk to school encourages more car use which exacerbates the problem.

Agree with the suggestion to make use of existing connecting routes, but this needs to be more bold - new development must be accompanied by improvements to transport with the objective of reducing through traffic and increasing safety for pedestrians, also through a wider improvement of connecting cycle routes across the county and area, the accumulative effect of development can then be mitigated.

I suggest this can be done by:
1. Creating new footpaths and cycleways by acquiring rights to fence up an average 2-3m strip of fields adjacent/alongside existing lanes leaving existing hedges in place, to serve existing and new dwellings and connecting to external links.
2. Improve existing roadside footways by increasing their width - especially school routes.
3. Where villages currently have high traffic volumes a sensitive proposal should be made to consider a new route to permit through traffic to avoid the villages. This may require robust conditions to restrict unnecessary harmful Highway Standards - many existing A class roads are little more than over-used slightly wider country lanes and the formation of similar new routes should not be detrimental to the existing countryside when balanced with the greater improvement to well being, safety and village life. I do not consider the reduction in through traffic would be detrimental to businesses in the villages as these are often a destination in themselves and would be improved as such. The High Weald area is beautiful and progressively creating connected cycle routes within this area would enhance the enjoyment of it, reduce the necessity of car travel and improve sustainable access to the countryside.

In my view there should be dedicated cycle routes connecting all towns as a basic requirement, they can be straightforward to construct but can transform the ability of many people to healthy and safe travel. A 2.0m wide path of consolidated base course is relatively inexpensive and adequate.

Feel that contributions to these travel improvements are much more important than contributions to play areas and libraries etc.
The promotion of safe and connected access in new developments for all vulnerable road users (walkers, cyclists, equestrians) is a WSLAF priority, and although the Design Guide does address these issues, the Forum does not consider the terminology used, especially in relation to PRoW and their status (footpath, bridleway, byway), is set out clearly for the intended users of the Guide.

Chapter 2: Understanding the High Weald (page 15) – Routeways – It is appreciated that AONB documents have habitually used this terminology, but Members feel it does not meet the Aim of giving clear advice, and is considered confusing. The explanation of the term as ‘a dense network of historic routes (road, new roads and paths) is felt to be insufficient and not technically accurate. Instead, if all of the tracks and paths will be PRoW (footpaths, bridleways, byways), and if the intention of the document is to give clearer, succinct, practical and consistent advice to planning decision makers, then all these paths should be referred to by their correct status. The definition used in ‘Routeways’ also seems less clear than that in ‘Other qualities’ on the same page, which refers to the ability to get close to nature through the myriad of public rights of way.

In our view the present PRoW will ultimately reflect the ancient character of the High Weald. Development Plans should show an awareness of the existing PRoW network, and how new developments will interact and connect with it so as to provide improvement.

DG2: Connecting the Site (page 16) – Connecting streets, lanes and roadway – The aims of this section are supported but again the use of the term ‘roadway’ is considered unhelpful without clarification. The opportunities for all Non-Motorised Users (NMUS) to connect to historic routes should indeed be maximised, ideally by safe off-road routes.

DG2: Connecting beyond the Site – Designing for Walking, Cycling and Active Lifestyle – Whilst we would support the Site Designing for Walking and Cycling are extremely important within the High Weald, it is essentially a rural area (page 1, 2nd para), and because of this supports a large number of equestrians. These riders contribute to the local rural economy in many ways, and they are also recognised by the Department for Transport (DfT) as vulnerable road users. It is surprising (and disappointing) there is no mention of them in this document, even though bridleways are referred to which they can legally use. Designs should maximise opportunities for safe off-road routes for all NMUs (including equestrians).

DG2: Connecting beyond the Site – Forming Site Edges and Transitions – The use of green infrastructure on the fringes of development is supported, which ideally could include a multi-user PRoW as a green corridor. This will improve the network’s connectivity, and bring benefits for safety, leisure and recreation, health and wellbeing, wildlife and biodiversity.

DG2: Connecting beyond the Site – Permeability – Connectively both through and around proposed developments into the wider countryside is supported. The greatest public benefit can be derived through improving the off-road PRoW network.

The West Sussex Rights of Way Management Plan 2018-2030 states: ‘A starting point for new schemes will be to consider who can benefit from a new route, such as walkers, cyclists, horse riders and the disabled, and be inclusive as possible, often the aim will be to achieve at least bridleway status.’

Safe NMU use should be prioritised within developments to improve permeability. Paths should not be adjacent to roads unless no alternative is possible. More positive statements to separate paths and roads within formal streets is recommended, with paths being multi-user wherever practical and possible. The provision of ‘twistie’ style lanes can maintain and improve connectivity with PRoW.

Landscape Institute guidance on Routeways. Include reference to Routeways. Include in glossary definition of Routeway. Include reference to Landscape Institute guidance on Routeways. Suggest he refers to Landscape Institute guidance on Routeways.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Surname</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Email address</th>
<th>Layout &amp; Structuring the Site DGS comments</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amy</td>
<td>Kitching</td>
<td>Natural England</td>
<td><a href="mailto:amy.kitching@naturalengland.org.uk">amy.kitching@naturalengland.org.uk</a></td>
<td>Natural England welcomes early consideration of green infrastructure (GI) provision, and recognition of GI as an integral feature of development which is also linked to wider ecological networks. It is recommended that from the outset, design of green infrastructure features and multifunctional green spaces incorporates future maintenance requirements to ensure the multifunctional benefits of such features are effective for the lifetime of the development.</td>
<td>Add reference to management of open spaces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kate</td>
<td>Wiseman</td>
<td>National Trust</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Katy.Wiseman@nationaltrust.org.uk">Katy.Wiseman@nationaltrust.org.uk</a></td>
<td>Welcome guidance on ‘principles of site structure’ and emphasises the importance of green infrastructure throughout development. May be useful to include incorporation of multifunctional green infrastructure into site structure within checklist.</td>
<td>Amend checklist number 4 to include reference to multi-functional greenspace.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natalie</td>
<td>Brett</td>
<td>Withyham Parish Council</td>
<td><a href="mailto:clerk@withyhamparishcouncil.org.uk">clerk@withyhamparishcouncil.org.uk</a></td>
<td>We agree with and support the statement following “street character” on page 18. However comments from the Conservation Guide should be integrated into this section “DGS” in respect of the landscape and views.</td>
<td>Not clear what Conservation Guide is being referred to but not all sites will be within a Conservation Area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharon</td>
<td>Mealen</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sharammealen@btinternet.com">sharammealen@btinternet.com</a></td>
<td>There is no case to answer because we SHOULD NOT be building on any of these sites</td>
<td>I am largely in agreement with the advice here, but it should also have reference to the lifestyle of current day living and not just be based on design concept. What about the many vehicle owners who use quite large vans for their business - how is provision for these incorporated so that they do not need to be parked in the road or at the front of properties?</td>
<td>Noted, no amendments required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>Bacon</td>
<td>Essenden Design Limited</td>
<td><a href="mailto:james@essenden_design.com">james@essenden_design.com</a></td>
<td>I strongly support the requirement to ensure developments have sufficient green. I think the guide could be strengthened further by giving some indicative proportion of green space to density of development.</td>
<td>Not appropriate for a design guide, should be set in Local Plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheena</td>
<td>Carmichael</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:sheena.carmichael1@gmail.com">sheena.carmichael1@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>I will be interested to see if the Highway authorities accept the principles of tight radii and fewer road signs.</td>
<td>Noted, no amendments required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milton</td>
<td>Cartwright</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:miltoncartwright@aol.com">miltoncartwright@aol.com</a></td>
<td>KCC recommends that the Design Guide considers Sport England Guidance. This guidance is focussed on tackling inactivity and supporting underrepresented groups to be active. Through the national Active Lives Survey, approximately 25% of people nationally (24% now in Kent, compared to 26% two years ago) are inactive; and this is having an effect on physical and mental health, as well as individual and community development. New developments should consider this and incorporate a mix of formal and informal areas (spaces and outdoor) where people can be active, including walking and cycling routes and open spaces.</td>
<td>Noted and this point is covered in recommended changes to DG2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie</td>
<td>Holt</td>
<td>Kent County Council</td>
<td><a href="mailto:s.hufton@nationaltrust.org.uk">s.hufton@nationaltrust.org.uk</a></td>
<td>I agree with points about using buildings to define site rather than just scattering them like many new housing estates.</td>
<td>Noted, no amendments required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillary</td>
<td>Hodsdon</td>
<td>CRANBROOK Conservation Area Advisory Committee (CCAAC)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:hilaire.hodsdon@gmail.com">hilaire.hodsdon@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>No building on green belt land</td>
<td>Noted, no amendments required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin</td>
<td>Longbon</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:klongbon13@gmail.com">klongbon13@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>layout and structuring of sites seems to take very little account of the climate emergency by including guidance on solar panels, ground heat sink equipment, electric vehicle charging points and other equipment designed to reduce the carbon footprint of settlements.</td>
<td>Noted and covered by recommended changes to DG1 and 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew</td>
<td>Hickey</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:andrew.t.hickey@gmail.com">andrew.t.hickey@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>Multifunctional green spaces - I agree with the concept however, in reality, if a piece of land has a sole use e.g. planting, or play, it should remain so. Planting areas, which are sole planting areas, provide a visual relief to the surrounding buildings, and is a place anyone can access and enjoy to aid their mental wellbeing. They also aid in air pollution - something that can aid the performance targets for emissions. Play areas, that are solely used as play areas, should remain as such; when considering building work, crenel footfall data shows the areas are unpopular. However, the reasoning for their unpopularity should be explored, e.g. disruptive, youths, and measures should be taken to mitigate this (contacting the Police) so children can learn with outside play - something the council should encourage.</td>
<td>Noted, no amendments required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucy</td>
<td>O’Neill</td>
<td>Strawberry Hill Knoll Hill Aldington Kent TN25 7BQ</td>
<td><a href="mailto:lucyco125@gmail.com">lucyco125@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>Importance of footways as well as carriage ways.</td>
<td>Noted, no amendments required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Françoise</td>
<td>Montford</td>
<td>Access Matters</td>
<td>Strawberry Hill Knoll Hill Aldington Kent TN25 7BQ</td>
<td>Importance of footways as well as carriage ways.</td>
<td>Noted, no amendments required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Françoise</td>
<td>Montford</td>
<td>Access Auditor</td>
<td>Hand written</td>
<td>Importance of footways as well as carriage ways.</td>
<td>Noted, no amendments required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phil</td>
<td>Moore</td>
<td>none</td>
<td><a href="mailto:philmoo1234@yahoo.co.uk">philmoo1234@yahoo.co.uk</a></td>
<td>I would like to see guidance on objective measures of how much space should be left as green space within a new development. The description of street hierarchy and particularly the development of the lesser streets without pathways is very helpful, especially when set against the homogeneous approach of most recent developments in the Parish.&lt;br /&gt; I particularly liked the highlighting of the use of materials to minimise the distinction of pavements and road markings.</td>
<td>Noted. Standards for Greenspace are set in Local Plans.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Lee Hatcher

**Cranbrook and Sissinghurst Neighborhood Development Plan Steering Committee**

leehatcher@madasafish.com

Regarding ‘left over space’. Potential for left over space, rather than being designed out of a development could be utilised as wild flower areas?

Noted, but such spaces still need to be maintained. With leftover spaces there is often confusion about who is responsible for them.

### Frankie Nown

**Ticehurst Parish Council**

frankienowne@btconnect.com

Ticehurst Parish Council agrees that sufficient space must be allow for soft landscaping, hedgerows, verges and tree canopies to break up the form of development. The creation of public realm areas (p20) within or adjacent to new developments creates a sense of place and belonging.

Noted, no amendments required.

### Sarah Cottingham

**Barton Willmore**

Sarah.Cottingham@bartonwillmore.co.uk

We would suggest that the Guide acknowledges that while a development can be successfully landscape led, designers do need to give due consideration to their factors such as accessibility and requirements relating to road and pavement widths. The example of page 18 does provide a wide pavement however these are sometimes a requirement of the highway authority and have to be designed for the scheme. Therefore while we acknowledge that this may be not represent desirable design with the AONB the guide should be mindful of other requirements during the planning process and that the NPPF is clear that where the design of a development accords with expectations within plan policies design should not be used for a reason to object a development.

Noted, no amendments required.

### Robert Banks

15) Developers must understand the topography of the area of their site. They should create settlements that are in harmony with the topography. This is particularly so with the arrangement of the streets. Streets should generally run with the contours and not across them. Cut and fill should be minimised. Distance and close-up views must be considered. Sites which are at or near exposed ridges are not able to accommodate any development because the area would be too steeply sloping to have buildings without harming the character of the area. Such development would be too prominent. For more detail, see Policy DG1 at page 12 and Policy DG3 at page 16.

16) It is important that access to and from development sites should connect with the villages and not create separate estates bolted onto a settlement. Dead ends should not be built unless there is no other solution. Where street connections cannot be made, walkways should be used to connect the nearby settlements and the countryside. For more detail, see Policy DG2 at page 14 and Policy DG3 at page 18.

17) Streets should create convenient and pleasant walking experiences rather than proving routes for vehicles. Roundabouts should not be incorporated into schemes. For more detail, see Policy DG3 at pages 16 and 17. Streets within a settlement should have their own hierarchy in terms of size so they fit well together. In most new settlements there should be three tiers in the hierarchy. For more detail, see Policy DG3 at page 17.

18) The design of public open spaces should reinforce local landscape character and create a valuable amenity for the residents. They should be prominent and accessible. There are advantages to triangular open spaces. Green spaces should be linked with lanes. Where possible they should be placed at the heart of a scheme. Their furniture should reflect the character of the area. For more detail, see Policy DG3 at page 20.

19) Green spaces should integrate amenity land, play area and water management. For more detail, see Policy DG3 at page 21.

Suggested ‘list of policies’ duplicates function of the checklist. Check whether any important requirements have been missed from the checklist or whether points can be highlighted more in text.
All effort should be made to protect verges and footpaths being used as car parking areas with suitable physical barriers, bollards or trees.

Noted, no amendments required.

Support soft edges, small front gardens, using buildings to define corners and other features typical of Wealden villages.

Noted, no amendments required.

It would be helpful if good examples of successful street layouts were given to flesh out the comment re ‘placement of buildings, tree planting and street surfacing’.

Positive relationship with the street is better than buffering with landscaping. Noted, no amendments required.

Open front gardens (no front border of hedge or picket fence) are seen as modern - you will have to persuade builders and planners to be different in the High Weald.

Better to avoid leftover space in the first place. Picket fences are wooden, but we can add this clarification.

Avoidance of close boarded fencing to define boundary treatments is also an extremely valid point. A point on this could be added as the placement of new developments next to roads can often result in such barriers being needed, but with careful placement of landscaping areas to provide a buffer this could be avoided entirely.

Building design, typology and parking sections are prescriptive but well considered and a necessary response to designs in the past.

Depends what you mean by ‘using buildings’ would have helped to have a brief narrative here instead of keep reading back. But basically, I think the answer is No as the streets and spaces particularly open spaces should define the building works i.e. busy streets already, don’t put more housing in.

The Design Guide is intended to assist better design of new housing not to prevent it.

There is only one estate road exit onto major roads for both the Rydon and Newcourt estates. The Newcourt estate exit road has a significant hill to climb which will affect the streetscape and design of new housing not to prevent it.

The word ‘pavement’ is used to describe a footway adjacent to the road, not sure why this is considered incorrect. Add ‘footways’ to title of section on footpaths and cycleways through the development on P18.

It would be helpful if good examples of successful street layouts were given to flesh out the comment re ‘placement of buildings, tree planting and street surfacing’.

Examples are provided in the photographs on P17. Annotations to these will help.

Aviation of close boarded fencing to define boundary treatments is also an extremely valid point. A point on this could be added as the placement of new developments next to roads can often result in such barriers being needed, but with careful placement of landscaping areas to provide a buffer this could be avoided entirely.

Building design, typology and parking sections are prescriptive but well considered and a necessary response to designs in the past.

Depends what you mean by ‘using buildings’ would have helped to have a brief narrative here instead of keep reading back. But basically, I think the answer is No as the streets and spaces particularly open spaces should define the building works i.e. busy streets already, don’t put more housing in.

The Design Guide is intended to assist better design of new housing not to prevent it.

There is only one estate road exit onto major roads for both the Rydon and Newcourt estates. The Newcourt estate exit road has a significant hill to climb which will affect the streetscape and design of new housing not to prevent it.

The word ‘pavement’ is used to describe a footway adjacent to the road, not sure why this is considered incorrect. Add ‘footways’ to title of section on footpaths and cycleways through the development on P18.

It would be helpful if good examples of successful street layouts were given to flesh out the comment re ‘placement of buildings, tree planting and street surfacing’.

Examples are provided in the photographs on P17. Annotations to these will help.

Aviation of close boarded fencing to define boundary treatments is also an extremely valid point. A point on this could be added as the placement of new developments next to roads can often result in such barriers being needed, but with careful placement of landscaping areas to provide a buffer this could be avoided entirely.

Building design, typology and parking sections are prescriptive but well considered and a necessary response to designs in the past.

Depends what you mean by ‘using buildings’ would have helped to have a brief narrative here instead of keep reading back. But basically, I think the answer is No as the streets and spaces particularly open spaces should define the building works i.e. busy streets already, don’t put more housing in.

The Design Guide is intended to assist better design of new housing not to prevent it.

There is only one estate road exit onto major roads for both the Rydon and Newcourt estates. The Newcourt estate exit road has a significant hill to climb which will affect the streetscape and design of new housing not to prevent it.

The word ‘pavement’ is used to describe a footway adjacent to the road, not sure why this is considered incorrect. Add ‘footways’ to title of section on footpaths and cycleways through the development on P18.

It would be helpful if good examples of successful street layouts were given to flesh out the comment re ‘placement of buildings, tree planting and street surfacing’.

Examples are provided in the photographs on P17. Annotations to these will help.

Aviation of close boarded fencing to define boundary treatments is also an extremely valid point. A point on this could be added as the placement of new developments next to roads can often result in such barriers being needed, but with careful placement of landscaping areas to provide a buffer this could be avoided entirely.

Building design, typology and parking sections are prescriptive but well considered and a necessary response to designs in the past.

Depends what you mean by ‘using buildings’ would have helped to have a brief narrative here instead of keep reading back. But basically, I think the answer is No as the streets and spaces particularly open spaces should define the building works i.e. busy streets already, don’t put more housing in.

The Design Guide is intended to assist better design of new housing not to prevent it.

There is only one estate road exit onto major roads for both the Rydon and Newcourt estates. The Newcourt estate exit road has a significant hill to climb which will affect the streetscape and design of new housing not to prevent it.

The word ‘pavement’ is used to describe a footway adjacent to the road, not sure why this is considered incorrect. Add ‘footways’ to title of section on footpaths and cycleways through the development on P18.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title/Position</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Philip Moore</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:philipmmoore@yahoo.co.uk">philipmmoore@yahoo.co.uk</a></td>
<td>This is very useful in defining how house should be laid out to define the streets. I particularly liked the block plan mapping. It is something along with the positioning of parking provision that has been totally ignored on recent local developments and again highlights a factor that people notice but cannot define themselves. Noted, no amendments required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frankie Nown</td>
<td>Ticehurst Parish Council</td>
<td><a href="mailto:frankienowne@btconnect.com">frankienowne@btconnect.com</a></td>
<td>Relating to buildings to the street - the suggestion use of Twittens linking houses with parking areas and footpaths is supported by the Parish Council replicating what has worked well in the past and current landscape. The use of hedging to define gardens close to the street scene adds soft landscaping as opposed to harsh fence lines. Noted, no amendments required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Cottingham</td>
<td>Barton Willmore</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Sarah.Cottingham@bartonwillmore.co.uk">Sarah.Cottingham@bartonwillmore.co.uk</a></td>
<td>We understand the intention behind the desire to ensure development and the placement of buildings within a plot should respond to traditional High Weald settlement layouts, however in practice this can be difficult to achieve as this can lead to a higher density of development than intended. which can be resisted by local people due to the dwelling per hectare resulting figure being tighter than 30dph. The density of a site is often driven by the site constraints and policy considerations. In cases where site specific allocations within Local Plans area seeking lower densities it is not always possible to effectively respond to the close knit layout of development as seen in rural villages. Therefore while desirable to reflect the close street pattern of an existing rural settlement, this is not always policy compliant in practice. We consider that it would be advisable within the wording of DG4 to recognise this. Noted, densities can be lowered where necessary by inclusion of more open space whilst retaining the characteristic settlement layouts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Banks</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:robertrgf@outlook.com">robertrgf@outlook.com</a></td>
<td>17) Discernible building lines should be established. Front curtilages should be enclosed. For more detail, see Policy DG4 at page 24. 18) New buildings should be positioned to define and reinforce street layout. Solid brick frontage is required. For more detail, see Policy DG4 at page 22. Walkways, streets, access and frontage 19) The Manual for Streets principles should be applied both to streets and their junctions. For more detail, see Policy DG3 at pages 16 and 19. 20) Buildings should be placed in relation to the street, so they have a clear and purposeful relationship with the street to create an active and attractive edge. There should be a clear boundary between the public and the private areas. For more detail, see Policy DG4 at pages 23 and 24. 21) Access to back gardens should be through cut-throughs and ‘twitten’-style lanes. Long narrow lanes or pathways with high-sided walls or fences should be avoided. For more detail, see Policy DG3 at page 18. Twittens and pathways should lead from the street to parking courts, other development and the countryside. For more detail, see Policy DG4 at page 22. 24) Close-board fences are not appropriate. For more detail, see Policy DG4 at page 24. 25) Green spaces should be managed functionally through traditional productive means such as coppicing. 35) Small left-over spaces should be avoided. Well-designed open spaces and good layout design should avoid left-over spaces. For more detail, see Policy DG4 at page 25. 36) Front doors and windows to the building frontage must feel connected, safe and welcoming. Blank building edges or sides of buildings facing public spaces should be avoided. Corner buildings should have their entrances on the more significant street in the hierarchy of streets. Blank spaces should be avoided. For more detail, see Policy DG4 at page 25. Suggested 'list of policies' duplicates function of the checklist. Check whether any important requirements have been missed from the checklist or whether points can be highlighted more in text.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There is no right build form as there should be no building.

Demolition & re-purposing existing buildings. New & infill development is often adjacent to other structures. We do include reference to re-use, retrofit, modification, conversion, etc.

I think this is important but the example of the rather bland timber clad terraced dwellings in unfortunate; they offer little interest either in detail or design and as the timber weatherings will become rather drab; they also appear to have timber enclosures which will need regular maintenance.

Agreed that domestic buildings should not be more than 2 storeys; but there are plenty of current examples of builders designing houses of two and a half storeys so as to squeeze in some 5-bed properties (more profit). To please emphasise that this is not acceptable.

I see that the Cascothea in Ticehurst is given as a bad example (for too big for apartments; with something which most people in the village agree). This design was initially refused planning permission by the LPA for exactly this reason, but given permission on appeal - how do you educate Inspectors who do not know the High Weald?

I support the requirement for mix use developments and lower densities towards the edge of settlements. The guidance could give further detail here of what might be appropriate in terms of density in different areas, accepting other considerations such as infrastructure which will also affect this decision.

Agree about height and form.

I think that the guidance suggests that the scale of the new scheme should not dominate that of the ‘parent’ settlement... this directly conflicts with the exception site policies for delivery of affordable housing; often requiring higher densities and smaller house types to meet local need. If applied rigorously this could prevent delivery of such schemes coming forward that are often already constrained.

Certainly these are best avoided but in some cases may be necessary. If these are written off then the number of sites which could be used for housing will become limited. This guidance should be seen in conjunction with other planning policy considerations.

This needs to be considered in the broader context of deliverability; i.e. in overcoming landownership issues that may cause significant delays/costs to the scheme coming forward.

I support the requirement for mixed size developments and lower densities towards the edge of settlements. The guidance could give further detail here of what might be appropriate in scale of new developments – the document suggests that the scale of the new scheme should not dominate that of the ‘parent’ settlement... this directly conflicts with the exception site policies for delivery of affordable housing, often requiring higher densities and smaller house types to meet local need. If applied rigorously this could prevent delivery of such schemes coming forward that are often already constrained.

Good parking strategies - recognises the reliance in the rural area on the car and the need to position parking areas to ensure it does not look like a car park and see the character of the planning permission by the LPA for exactly this reason, but given permission on appeal - how do you educate Inspectors who do not know the High Weald?

I agree. All effort should be made to promote walks and footpaths being used as car parking areas with suitable physical barriers, bollards or trees.

Lack of chimney pots in the last two.

This is a Local Plan function not appropriate for the Design Guide.

Included in annotation to second photograph on pages 23-24. This is a Local Plan function not appropriate for the Design Guide.

11 bed properties (more profit). Agreed that domestic buildings should not be more than 2 storeys, but there are plenty of current examples of builders designing houses of two and half storeys so as to squeeze in some 5-bed properties (more profit). To please emphasise that this is not acceptable.

In the current and future context outlined above. Redrow consider that three storey buildings can be appropriate, particular for use as feature, or wayfinding, buildings within a development.

Current and future context outlined above. Redrow consider that three storey buildings can be appropriate, particular for use as feature, or wayfinding, buildings within a development.

We are being told the SANG is for private use of Rydon etc.

We are being told the SANG is for private use of Rydon.

The guidance will be considered in conjunction with local Plan and national policies and practical issues such as landownership.

The Design Guide is only aimed at new housing development.
5) New development should reflect the historic density and grain of the area. Grain and density should closely relate to street pattern. There should be denser development around junctions and the centre of the development and lower density around the edge of the development. Clusters of large, detached buildings of a similar size and footprint are to be avoided. For more detail, see Policy DG5 at page 26.

Note: A word other than ‘grain’ should be used, as it is unclear to so many people and is an imprecise word.

6) Very tall buildings are not appropriate. Typical heights should be two storeys with, on occasions, an attic floor. Hipped or half-hipped roofs and catslides are appropriate. Too much variation within a design and distribution of the buildings should be avoided. Repetitious designs should also be avoided. For more detail, see Policy DG5 at page 27 and 29.

7) Terraces should reflect local designs. Traditional proportions, detailing materials and front curtilages should be incorporated into schemes. For more detail, see Policy DG5 at page 28.

8) Deep-plan buildings are to be avoided. Blocks of flats should not sit unanchored in their own grounds. For more detail, see Policy DG5 at page 29.

Note: A word other than ‘deep-plan’ should be used, as it is unclear to so many people and is an imprecise word.
We agree and support this Organisation.

Many developments are now being designed with no garages, so the guidance for parking needs to be very clear.

Accepting that rural communities are much more reliant on private cars is a key consideration and therefore ensuring there is sufficient parking for the development is critical. I would prefer this to be off the road to avoid access issues.

We thought this section was particularly strong. Accepting the car and making sensible provision eg in areas behind houses, accessed under a 1st floor bridge or along the street and NOT just dumping cars on a hard standing which breaks up the building line.

Simply don’t put housing in where the streets and parking are already having problems. I live on a busy road into Tonbridge and Tonbridge has and is seeing more and more attractiveness of shops cars parked in front of gardens destroy the look of a village.

Parking and driveways

Could more specific guidance be provided on what would be considered an adequate number of parking spaces. It would be good if a definitive guide to the required number of car spaces could be included (e.g. spaces per bedroom for example) as parking spaces in plans seem to always be traded away for the overly optimistic provision of bicycle parking which is often never used.

Parking standards are generally set by County Councils or sometimes in Neighbourhood Plans. It would not be appropriate to include them within a Design Guide.

Can overcome this issue with vegetation between parking spaces, include reference or photograph.

Suggested list of policies duplicates function of the checklist. Check whether any important requirements have been missed from the checklist or whether points can be highlighted more in work.

DG6 comments

DG6: Parking Strategies – Parking Solutions – On-street parking can cause obstructions and potential safety concerns for all NMUs and needs to be carefully considered before use.

Parking standards are generally set by County Councils or sometimes in Neighbourhood Plans. It would not be appropriate to include them within a Design Guide.

Include reference to EV charging points in first paragraph

Noted, no amendments required.

Noted, no amendments required.

Noted, no amendments required.

Noted, no amendments required.

Noted, no amendments required.

Noted, no amendments required.

Noted, no amendments required.

Noted, no amendments required.

Noted, no amendments required.

Noted, no amendments required.

Noted, no amendments required.

Noted, no amendments required.

Noted, no amendments required.

Noted, no amendments required.

Noted, no amendments required.
Alison Stevenson
Balcombe Parish Council
alison.stevenson@balcombeparishcouncil.co.uk

David Connolley
Save Wealden from Oversevelopment Team

Joanne Petford
Hastoe
joanne.petford@petford@hastoe.com

First Name | Surname | Organisation | Email address | DG7 comments | Local Details | Recommendations
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | ---
Natalie | Brett | Withyham Parish Council | natalie@withyhamparishcouncil.org.uk | Fully support this as described in the Conservation area documents, but this needs to be mandatory. | Noted, no amendments required. | 
Alan | Richards | alanjohnrichards@tiscali.co.uk | This area suffers from an inadequate infrastructure relative to the current level of population and requires upgrading of hospitals, roads, education to cope with a significant increase in housing development. | Noted, no amendments required. | 
Sharon | Maslen | sharonmaslen@btinternet.com | It is very important to PROTECT the AONB areas. We should not even be contemplating building when we NEED countryside, fields, woods and streams for the good health of people and to try and sustain wildlife. | Noted, no amendments required. | 
Chris | Jeffries | chrisjeffries5@gmail.com | The small development in Rotherfield of 12 houses appears in keeping with the guide’s objectives. I believe this took 12 years to bring about. We need to find a way to encourage and speed up small projects of this scale which can more easily conform to the objectives. | Noted, no amendments required. | 
James | Bacon | Essenden Design Limited | james@essendenlimited.com | I like chimney stacks but to be realistic and not cause unnecessary costs I don’t think this provision should be artificially continued; brick chimneys are very expensive to build, will eventually require scaffolding for maintenance and insulated flues are quite adequate. To insist on a chimney and end up with a grp bolt-on to me is false.<br />
Traditional detailing would include the practical affect of weathering on this is important in creating shadow lines, interest and 3 dimensional shape and can be missing in some modern designs, even when timber is used which requires careful weathering, modern metal cladding and roofing often omits overhangs and can produce long term unsightly staining of the facade. | P31 amend ‘Tall chimney stacks’ to include possibility that modern architecture may include more modern replacements such as metal pipes. | 
Elizabeth | Osmanaz | sunnyeg@gmail.com | Will all of this affect the environment? Surely, at some time, you will build on fields? | Noted, no amendments required. | 
Milton | Cartwright | miltoncartwright@aol.com | I strongly support enforcing requirements that built forms should be in the character of the surrounding settlement, including details and materials. I consider this to be one of the key issues that designs stand or fall by in terms of blending into the existing settlement. | Noted, no amendments required. | 
Hilary | Hosford | CRANBROOK Conservation Area Advisory Committee (CCAC) | hilary.hosford@gmail.com | good section going far beyond usual nod to the vernacular | Noted, no amendments required. | 
Joanne | Petford | Hastoe | joanne.petford@petford@hastoe.com | 12. The section on ‘local details’ to include build details and materials is of most concern to Hastoe, primarily due to the prescriptive language used and the significance of the document as a material planning consideration. This sections states for example that ‘…use of the right local materials as a key factor in creating High Weald housing developments, …’ Whilst the principle of using local skills and materials is worthy, this is simply not realistic in commercial terms, to enable value engineering required to drive down scheme costs and to ensure deliverability of affordable homes. | Section to be added on sustainable construction. | 
Francoise | Montford | Access Matters | strawhill@kroll ltd Aldington Kent TN25 7BZ | time for environment friendly material is used to protect damaging it further | Section to be added on sustainable construction. | 
Patrick | Thompson | Hawkhurst NDP | The DG should also include reference to parking strategies in the broader context of shopping centres, railway stations, etc. | The Design Guide only relates to housing developments. | 
Graham | Eley | CBC | Climate change might lead to growth in sun blocking parking space shelters. Guidance on HWAONB design parameters could include wooden, rather than metal, structures, featuring vegetation screens rather than opaque plastic. Car barns are referred to on P31. | Car barns are referred to on P31. | 
Francoise | Montford | Access Auditor | Hand written | time for environment friendly material is used to protect damaging it further | Section to be added on sustainable construction. | 

Recommendations

- **Access Matters**: The DG should also include reference to parking strategies in the broader context of shopping centres, railway stations, etc.

- **CBC**: Climate change might lead to growth in sun blocking parking space shelters. Guidance on HWAONB design parameters could include wooden, rather than metal, structures, featuring vegetation screens rather than opaque plastic.

- **Access Auditor**: Time for environment friendly material is used to protect damaging it further.
Car parking and the problems it creates is a very serious issue for many High Weald Villages. The first section does appear to be rather bland and aspirational. Words like 'adequate' and 'conveniently located' cannot exert control. There is also the interlace between motorists, cyclists, and pedestrians that are all affected. For more detail, see Policy DG7 at page 32.

11) Roof pitches of clay-tiled roofs should never be lower than 42.5°. The usual range should be 47.5°-50°. Open eaves are suitable. Note: The phrase ‘upvc soffits’ should perhaps be explained.

10) Designers should find imaginative ways of reinforcing the local designs, building on local crafts and skills. Poor and muddled copies of traditional designs are unacceptable. For more detail, see Policy DG7 at page 32.

1) Roof pitches of clay-tiled roofs should never be lower than 42.5°. The usual range should be 47.5°-50°. Open eaves are suitable. Bulky boxed upvc soffits should not be used. Porches should normally be simple canopies. Window heads in brick elevations should normally be arched. Soldier brick lintels are inappropriate. Tall chimney stacks are characteristic of the High Weald and have other advantages. For more detail, see Policy DG7 at page 33.

9) Lintel to window heads should normally be arched. Soldier brick lintels are inappropriate. Tall chimney stacks are characteristic of the High Weald and have other advantages. For more detail, see Policy DG7 at page 33.

8) Roof pitches of clay-tiled roofs should never be lower than 42.5°. The usual range should be 47.5°-50°. Open eaves are suitable. Note: The phrase ‘upvc soffits’ should perhaps be explained.

7) Full-height brick buildings are not appropriate. Typically, the ground floor of new buildings should be made of brick and the first floor should have tile-hung walls or timber corner filet. Bricks should have the hue of the local area. Clay tiles for roofs and tile-hung walls should be locally sourced. Concrete substitutes should not be used. Small module tiles with a natural camber should be used. Local rather than imported stone should be also used. For more detail, see Policy DG7 at page 34.

6) Unusual lintels should not be used. Soldier brick lintels are inappropriate. Tall chimney stacks are characteristic of the High Weald and have other advantages. For more detail, see Policy DG7 at page 33.

5) Roof pitches of clay-tiled roofs should never be lower than 42.5°. The usual range should be 47.5°-50°. Open eaves are suitable. Bulky boxed upvc soffits should not be used. Porches should normally be simple canopies. Window heads in brick elevations should normally be arched. Soldier brick lintels are inappropriate. Tall chimney stacks are characteristic of the High Weald and have other advantages. For more detail, see Policy DG7 at page 33.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Surname</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Email address</th>
<th>DG8 comments</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Natalie</td>
<td>Brett</td>
<td>Withyham Parish Council</td>
<td><a href="mailto:clerk@withyhamparishcouncil.org.uk">clerk@withyhamparishcouncil.org.uk</a></td>
<td>We agree with the checklist. We would encourage bin sharing.</td>
<td>Noted, no amendments required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christoph</td>
<td>Mortley</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:chrismortley@btinternet.com">chrismortley@btinternet.com</a></td>
<td>Better management of domestic &amp; light commercial waste sorting, storage, and disposal is critically important, and the mention of waste bin siting is insufficient in detail and forthrightness. Greater provision is needed to discourage fly tipping and long-term holding of time-expired white goods, furniture etc. Consideration should be given to the availability of local community holding sites for refuse pending LA collection.</td>
<td>Beyond the remit of this Design Guide. Waste collection methods will be different for each local authority.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheena</td>
<td>Carmichael</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:sheena.carmichael1@gmail.com">sheena.carmichael1@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>There is no way to make wheelie bins unobtrusive. We are all bin-men now.</td>
<td>Noted, no amendments required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hilary</td>
<td>Hosford</td>
<td>CRANBROOK Conservation Area Advisory Committee (CCAC)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:hilary.hosford@gmail.com">hilary.hosford@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>Another strong section with sensible advice about how to house bins etc. Also strongly support point about appropriate street lighting - keep rural areas as dark as possible with discrete low level lighting</td>
<td>Noted, no amendments required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francoise</td>
<td>Montford</td>
<td>Access Matters</td>
<td>Strawberry Hill Knoll Hill Aldington Kent TQ25 7E</td>
<td>Many FFRV filling stations will become redundant and suited for change-of-use during the next 20 years. With existing strong hard standing areas, for delivery/collection vehicle, and scope for underground tank replacement by storage receptacles, should old filling stations be re-purposed as local short-term waste disposal sites?</td>
<td>Beyond the remit of this Design Guide.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francoise</td>
<td>Montford</td>
<td>Access Auditor</td>
<td>Hand written</td>
<td>Hidden storage space required</td>
<td>Noted, no amendments required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen</td>
<td>Hardy</td>
<td>part of CPRE response</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hidden storage space required</td>
<td>Noted, no amendments required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philip</td>
<td>Moore</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:philipmmoore@yahoo.co.uk">philipmmoore@yahoo.co.uk</a></td>
<td>Could guidance also be provided on how best to incorporate items such as electric car charging points/ bicycle racks or stores - which are often a feature of new developments. Consider adding bicycle storage , EV points will be covered in DG6.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frankie</td>
<td>Nown</td>
<td>Ticehurst Parish Council</td>
<td><a href="mailto:frankienowne@btconnect.com">frankienowne@btconnect.com</a></td>
<td>Could storage for bins and cycles be incorporated in car ports or barns? The positive examples shown at the bottom of this page still seem quite obtrusive.We feel that guidance/images about the size, type and location of street signs, as well as way markers for footpaths or bridle paths would be useful.</td>
<td>Noted, no amendments required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Banks</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:robertrgf@outlook.com">robertrgf@outlook.com</a></td>
<td>Suggested list of policies duplicates function of the checklist. Check whether any important requirements have been missed from the checklist or whether points can be highlighted more in text.</td>
<td>Core barns are usually communal which would only work for communal bin stores, i.e. for flats.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kia</td>
<td>Trainer</td>
<td>CPRE Sussex</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kia.trainer@cpresussex.org.uk">kia.trainer@cpresussex.org.uk</a></td>
<td>Suggested list of policies duplicates function of the checklist. Check whether any important requirements have been missed from the checklist or whether points can be highlighted more in text.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommendations**

- Beyond the remit of this Design Guide. Waste collection methods will be different for each local authority.
- Noted, no amendments required.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Surname</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Email address</th>
<th>DGG comments</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Natalie</td>
<td>Brett</td>
<td>Withyham Parish Council</td>
<td><a href="mailto:clerk@withyhamparishcouncil.org.uk">clerk@withyhamparishcouncil.org.uk</a></td>
<td>fully support</td>
<td>Noted, no amendments required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher</td>
<td>Mortley</td>
<td>Withyham Parish Council</td>
<td><a href="mailto:chrismortley@btinternet.com">chrismortley@btinternet.com</a></td>
<td>Street clutter &amp; signage: RV charging infrastructure is likely to make existing clutter worse, and design principles deserve sharper focus now. References to signage should be expanded to include other private roadside signage and advertising.</td>
<td>The Design Guide seeks to influence the initial design of housing development, subsequent private signs/adverts will be a matter for enforcement action by local authorities if appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>Gonzalez</td>
<td>Withyham Parish Council</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sunnykg@gmail.com">sunnykg@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>always believe a house should be similar to the rest of the houses in the village/town or road</td>
<td>Noted, no amendments required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milton</td>
<td>Cartwright</td>
<td>Withyham Parish Council</td>
<td><a href="mailto:miltoncartwright@aol.com">miltoncartwright@aol.com</a></td>
<td>The Design Guide seeks to influence the initial design of housing development, subsequent private signs/adverts will be a matter for enforcement action by local authorities if appropriate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie</td>
<td>Holt</td>
<td>Kent County Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Noted, no amendments required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillary</td>
<td>Hosford</td>
<td>CRANBROOK Conservation Area Advisory Committee (CCAC)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:hilary.hosford@gmail.com">hilary.hosford@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>Good section. Avoid anything goes turning Circles and the like.</td>
<td>P37 first paragraph amend to 'depending on the hierarchy and role of the street and the requirements of the local highway authority ...'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francoise</td>
<td>Montford</td>
<td>Access Matters</td>
<td>Strawberry Hill Knoll Hill Aldington Kent TN25 7BZ</td>
<td>mention to meet disability legislation etc required in the guide</td>
<td>P37 add sentence under Surfaces and Materials highlighting the need for surfaces to be accessible to those of limited mobility and assist those with disabilities to sense when moving from a safe space to one where they might encounter bicycles or vehicular traffic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francoise</td>
<td>Montford</td>
<td>Access Auditor</td>
<td>Hand written</td>
<td>mention of meet disability legislation etc required in guide</td>
<td>P37 add sentence under Surfaces and Materials highlighting the need for surfaces to be accessible to those of limited mobility and assist those with disabilities to sense when moving from a safe space to one where they might encounter bicycles or vehicular traffic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phil</td>
<td>Moore</td>
<td>none</td>
<td><a href="mailto:philipmmoore@yahoo.co.uk">philipmmoore@yahoo.co.uk</a></td>
<td>Could guidance also be provided on other street furniture items such as benches, planters and rubbish bins? Perhaps also including the wooden 'fingerpost' signs that are such a feature of our local area.</td>
<td>Too detailed for this Guide.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alison</td>
<td>Stevenson</td>
<td>Balcombe Parish Council</td>
<td><a href="mailto:alison.stevenson@balcombeparishcouncil.co.uk">alison.stevenson@balcombeparishcouncil.co.uk</a></td>
<td>Good section. Perhaps some better examples and a plan/sketch of how to orientate a suitable storage area in any of the given typologies?</td>
<td>Not currently aware of better examples but could include in future case studies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philip</td>
<td>Moore</td>
<td>none</td>
<td><a href="mailto:philipmmoore@yahoo.co.uk">philipmmoore@yahoo.co.uk</a></td>
<td>Could guidance also be provided on other street furniture items such as benches, planters and rubbish bins? Perhaps also including the wooden 'fingerpost' signs that are such a feature of our local area.</td>
<td>Too detailed for this Guide.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frankie</td>
<td>Nown</td>
<td>Ticehurst Parish Council</td>
<td><a href="mailto:frankienowne@btconnect.com">frankienowne@btconnect.com</a></td>
<td>Street character and details - Ticehurst supports the principle of minimising the light pollution and promotes dark skies. It also advocates the use of materials for road surfacing that is less harsh than black asphalt and supports the use of good design rather than the use of painted lines.</td>
<td>Noted, no amendments required.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Materials for streets, paths, pavements and parking areas

27) The materials for streets etc. should be visually pleasing and must not create an urban look. Lines on streets should be avoided wherever possible. Where blocks of brick are used it should not be in a herringbone pattern. Pavements should generally match the street surface. Footpaths through green areas should be of a softer material. Kerbs should be avoided. Soft roadside verges should be used to reduce the hard surfaces of developments. Parking areas should be of a permeable material to help prevent flooding and excess water nearby. For more detail, see Policy DG9 at page 37.

Signage and lighting

28) To ensure that developments are uncluttered, signage should be minimal. Where possible it should be located with another sign or on a building. The High Weald area and many villages have a dark sky policy to prevent interference with wildlife (particularly bird life) and waste of energy through street lighting. This policy enhances the beauty of such areas. Consequently, lighting should only exist where it is absolutely necessary for public safety. In the rare event where it is necessary, street lights should not clutter the highways or damage the visual appearance of the development. Steps must be taken to minimise its impact. For more detail, see Policy DG9 at page 37.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Banks</td>
<td><a href="mailto:robertrgf@outlook.com">robertrgf@outlook.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kate</td>
<td>Wiseman</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Katy.Wisman@nationaltrust.org.uk">Katy.Wisman@nationaltrust.org.uk</a></td>
<td>It states that herringbone patterns are not typical of the HW and should not be used, it would be useful to have an example here of typical HW permeable paving.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Tunbridge Wells access group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Walking cycling and active lifestyles: segregated from footpaths within the street scene they must be delineated by a trapazoidal delineator strip have the necessary tactile indicators - see letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alison</td>
<td>Stevenson</td>
<td>alison.stevenson@balcombe parishcouncil.co.uk</td>
<td>Not sure why this very short section is here. Street hierarchy is discussed in DG3, why not combine the sections?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Suggested 'list of policies' duplicates function of the checklist. Check whether any important requirements have been missed from the checklist or whether points can be highlighted more in text.

P37 add sentence under Surfaces and Materials highlighting the need for surfaces to be accessible to those of limited mobility and assist those with disabilities to sense when moving from a safe space to one where they might encounter bicycles or vehicular traffic.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Surname</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Email address</th>
<th>DG10 comments</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amy</td>
<td>Kitching</td>
<td>Natural England</td>
<td><a href="mailto:amy.kitching@naturalengland.org.uk">amy.kitching@naturalengland.org.uk</a></td>
<td>This section presents a valuable opportunity to ensure new development within the High Weald provides net gains for biodiversity in accordance with paragraphs 8 and 170 of the NPPF. Whilst the current wording within DG10 seems some suggestions as to how development may provide biodiversity net gains, it is recommended that explicit reference to the requirement for net gain is included within this section so that developers are aware at the earliest planning stages, and that opportunities for net gain can be maximised.</td>
<td>Add a heading at beginning of DG10 ‘Net Biodiversity Gain’ and refer to Government’s intention to make this a legal requirement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kate</td>
<td>Wiseman</td>
<td>Natural England</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Katy.Wiseman@nationaltrust.org.uk">Katy.Wiseman@nationaltrust.org.uk</a></td>
<td>Reinforcing local planting character and habitat could make reference to building resilience to climate change.</td>
<td>Noted, no amendments required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natasha</td>
<td>Brett</td>
<td>Withyham Parish Council</td>
<td><a href="mailto:clerk@withyhamparishcouncil.org.uk">clerk@withyhamparishcouncil.org.uk</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>Noted, no amendments required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris</td>
<td>Jeffries</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:chrisjeffries5@gmail.com">chrisjeffries5@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>Climate change is already bringing change to the characteristics of the AONB. Disease is quickly forcing visual change. Native species may no longer be the right choice for the longer term and future and deep consideration should be given to this. Plantings are governed at present by cost, speed of establishment and a quick SANS type solution without enough regard for what will result in 50 years time. Wrong choices now will undo centuries of natural progress and decline.</td>
<td>Most native species of trees / hedgerows are also found in hotter and drier parts of Europe and therefore should be reasonably resistant to climate change. Management of grassland as meadows is more drought resistant than frequently cut grass.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christoph</td>
<td>Mortley</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:christiormortley@btinternet.com">christiormortley@btinternet.com</a></td>
<td>Management plans to use traditional land management skills: No guidance is given on how to use traditional skills – their use costs money. For example, woodland coppicing – a previously widespread skill that has left a strong visual identity across the HW – is dying out. In this context, the words ‘management plan’ are empty and meaningless.</td>
<td>Noted, no amendments required. Local agricultural colleges and organisations like the Trust Conservation Volunteers and Wildlife Trusts do provide courses in traditional land management skills.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>Bacon</td>
<td>Essenden Design Limited</td>
<td><a href="mailto:james@essendendesign.com">james@essendendesign.com</a></td>
<td>Support this but would add that it could benefit by encouraging connecting green links and not just isolated sites</td>
<td>PS3 add reference to the need to create and reinforce habitat corridors, connecting into the surrounding landscape.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheena</td>
<td>Carmichael</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:sheena.carmichael13@gmail.com">sheena.carmichael13@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>Agree with all your advice on planting, but again developers will take the cheapest approach, which is non-native estate planting.</td>
<td>Noted, no amendments required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milton</td>
<td>Cartwright</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:miltoncartwright@ntlbi.com">miltoncartwright@ntlbi.com</a></td>
<td>All developments should be required to adhere to this part of the guidance. Indeed I would go further and suggest that any development that results in the removal of trees/hedgerows should be required to replace the lost green habitat 3 times over as an incentive to develop sympathetically.</td>
<td>Noted, reference to net biodiversity gain will be added.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie</td>
<td>Holt</td>
<td>Kent County Council</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Design Guide states that “within existing and proposed green spaces and landscape features opportunities for wildlife should be maximised” (page 39). KCC is supportive of this approach and would like to highlight that the mitigation hierarchy must be implemented in developments to retain habitats of interest. The mitigation hierarchy is avoid, mitigate, compensate and enhance. Therefore, where green spaces are proposed, they ideally should be located within the areas where there are existing habitats, rather than involve creating new habitat.</td>
<td>Add reference to mitigation hierarchy at beginning of DG10.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hilary</td>
<td>Hasford</td>
<td>CRANBROOK Conservation Area Aviary Committee (CCAC)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:hilary.hasford@gmail.com">hilary.hasford@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>The green quality of many Wealden towns such as Cranbrook is a vital component, adding so much to the quality of life and the setting of the historic buildings. Understanding and using planting, hedges, appropriate trees is key to new developments blending in, as well as supporting local biodiversity.</td>
<td>Noted, no amendments required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joanne</td>
<td>Petford</td>
<td>Hastoe</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jpetford@hastoe.com">jpetford@hastoe.com</a></td>
<td>14. Planting - we would advise against being overly prescriptive on the planting guide. They need to be appropriate to the site and end users - i.e. maintenance of certain trees including fruit trees can add significant maintenance costs to affordable development. This also raised the question whether or not such information should be passed to the occupiers and not just developers? Once residents move in they will plant according to their own personal preferences/budget available and may not have an understanding of the wider implications on the AONB and ecological benefits of native planting.</td>
<td>Native trees are no more expensive than non-native and will usually need less maintenance because they are suited to the soil and local conditions. Design Guide can only cover initial planting as future planting by residents is not generally controlled by the planning system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catriona</td>
<td>Chaffield</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Cat.chaffield@gmail.com">Cat.chaffield@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>I was particularly interested in this section. Given what we know about the importance of carbon sequestration in high weald woodland and wildflowers to support wildlife I would like to see these emphasised even further in the guide.</td>
<td>Refer to natural capital / carbon sequestration benefits from habitat protection and creation at the beginning of this section.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucy</td>
<td>O’Neill</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:lucyoc125@gmail.com">lucyoc125@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>Local Planting Character &amp; Habitats should be at the forefront of building guides and there should be a minimum quota of plants on a site to ensure the street looks and feels green for mental wellbeing, encourages wildlife and aids emission levels. The increased housing encourages more cars in the area, which is more pollution, therefore shrubs/trees are vital to new developments.</td>
<td>Note but minimum quota would not work as some sites will have more existing habitat than others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathleen</td>
<td>Foster</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Kathe.thefosteric@gmail.com">Kathe.thefosteric@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>Habitats are more than just planting flowers and trees. If possible there should also be a move to create more ponds and wildlife meadows. Spaced should not always be kept tidy, - rough areas are also important.</td>
<td>PS3 Change heading to ‘Habitats and New Planting’ and include reference to ponds. PS3 include management of grassland as wildflower meadows under Management of Green Spaces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>Miller</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jen.miller@education.gov.uk">jen.miller@education.gov.uk</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>Very important if you must pull up green belt and disturb nature and trees but would like it to be preserved rather than building more new houses in the first place. Are these homes for local people?</td>
<td>Noted, no amendments required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philip</td>
<td>Moore</td>
<td>philipm@<a href="mailto:moore@yahoo.co.uk">moore@yahoo.co.uk</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>The section focuses on planting - it may be implicit but it would be helpful to reinforce the concept of retaining, and incorporating into the scheme, as many existing locally native species as possible (alongside objective guidance re hedges as noted in the comments to GS) Could the section on opportunities for wildlife incorporate guidance for aquatic features (e.g. ponds /wetlands etc) as well</td>
<td>PS3 Change heading to ‘Habitats and New Planting’ and include reference to ponds. Retention of existing features is covered under DG1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frankie</td>
<td>Ticehurst</td>
<td>Ticehurst Parish Council</td>
<td><a href="mailto:frankienowne@btconnect.com">frankienowne@btconnect.com</a></td>
<td>Local planting character and habitats - supports the use of native hedging plants which can be coppiced. The use of hedges rather than fencing to define house boundaries is preferable and agrees that oak, hornbeam, field maple, hawthorn, hazel, and birch can be used. Non native species should not be introduced - in recent years the importation of species or plants from overseas has introduced diseases that have been devastating the landscape. Leylands and laurel should not be used as hedging plants.</td>
<td>Noted, no amendments required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Banks</td>
<td><a href="mailto:robertrgf@outlook.com">robertrgf@outlook.com</a></td>
<td>Wildlife, trees and other planting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31) Green spaces and wildlife spaces should have the maximum opportunities for wildlife. Nest boxes and roost boxes should be installed. Barriers to connectivity such as roads and paths should be improved through aerial connections. For more detail, see Policy DG10 at page 39. Planting should have a range of vegetation heights. For more detail, see Policy DG5 at page 38. Native plants should be used. For more detail, see Policy DG2 at page 15. Native wildflowers should be included in schemes. The ubiquitous use of ground-cover plants like berberis, pyracantha, photinia, mahonia etc. is not appropriate. Non-native invasive species should be avoided. For more detail, see Policy DG10 at page 38. 'Soft landscaping', grass verges and full tree canopies should be built into developments. For more detail, see Policy DG3 at page 16. Note: The ‘ground cover’ sentence needs to be reworded since the four plants listed are not normally ground-cover plants. 32) During the construction phase, mature trees and hedges should be protected from damage. For more detail, see Policy D31 at page 21. Suggested 'list of policies' duplicates function of the checklist. Check whether any important requirements have been missed from the checklist or whether points can be highlighted more in text.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justin Norman</td>
<td><a href="mailto:eastfootpath@sussexramblers.org.uk">eastfootpath@sussexramblers.org.uk</a></td>
<td>Ensure planting planning is subject to ongoing constraints of maintainance that ensures PRoW are not obstructed by overgrowth. Covered by existing legislation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kia Trainor</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kia.trainor@cpresussex.org.uk">kia.trainor@cpresussex.org.uk</a></td>
<td>CPRE Sussex is currently developing guidance on incorporating biodiversity measures into new development which we have attached as this may be useful. We would suggest that this section is reviewed in light of new planning guidance around 'net gain.' We would be happy to discuss this with you and the Wildlife Trust at a future High Weald Network meeting. Noted, for future discussion.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Surname</td>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Email address</td>
<td>Appendices comments</td>
<td>Recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natalie</td>
<td>Brett</td>
<td>Withyham Parish Council</td>
<td><a href="mailto:clerk@withyhamparishcouncil.org.uk">clerk@withyhamparishcouncil.org.uk</a></td>
<td>It would be very useful to use as a checklist to draw up a meaningful Design Access Statement but is it enforceable?</td>
<td>It is guidance only not policy or legislation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francoise</td>
<td>Montford</td>
<td>Access Matters</td>
<td>Strawberry Hill Knoll Hill Ablington Kent TN25 7B2</td>
<td>mention to relevant disability legislation (Equality Act include mobility UN convention on Rights of Disabled People etc are missing from your list and must be added</td>
<td>P41 Add heading at end &quot;Relevant Legislation and include Countryside &amp; Rights of Way Act 2000; Equality Act 2010 and UN Convention on the Rights of Disabled People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francoise</td>
<td>Montford</td>
<td>Access Auditor</td>
<td>Hand written</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nichola</td>
<td>Watters</td>
<td>Rother District Council</td>
<td></td>
<td>On page 41, I would like to see reference to 'adopted development plans' in the first paragraph – perhaps after 'national policies'? It would also be useful to include weblinks/hyperlinks where possible on this page.</td>
<td>P41 add heading 'Adopted Development Plan' with links to the planning policy pages of each Council (this will pick up Neighbourhood Plans as well).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Konstantinos</td>
<td>Gallo</td>
<td>SGN Network Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td>SGN would therefore request that, where the Council are in discussions with developers via the Local Plan, early notification requirements are highlighted.</td>
<td>Noted, no amendments required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francoise</td>
<td>Montford</td>
<td>Access Auditor</td>
<td>Hand written</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>Noble</td>
<td>West Sussex Local Access Forum</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chapter 4: Appendices (page 40)– Creating a meaningful Design &amp; Access (DAS) statement– This section is strongly supported, particularly DAS in the Pre-Application Process.</td>
<td>Noted, no amendments required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna</td>
<td>Card</td>
<td>East Sussex County Council - Public Health</td>
<td><a href="mailto:anna.card@eastsussex.gov.uk">anna.card@eastsussex.gov.uk</a></td>
<td>Indeed there was a lack of guidance with regards to the development of any community facilities with in the design guide - these types of facilities are of key importance within rural areas such as the AONB and I thought if any developments are going to include any type of facility however big or small you would want to include guidance on how this should work within the AONB setting. &lt;br/&gt; &lt;br/&gt;The addition of a sentence could be included around the provision of suitable infrastructure with promotes physical activity and good health could be included e.g. community or residential cycle storage/facilities which would support active travel and recreational cycling</td>
<td>The Design Guide only relates to the design of new housing developments, the requirement for community facilities and other infrastructure would be covered in Local Plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louise</td>
<td>Kleinschmidt</td>
<td>Chiddingstone Parish Council</td>
<td><a href="mailto:louise.clerk@chiddingstone.org">louise.clerk@chiddingstone.org</a></td>
<td>Our main concern is that, currently, Inheritance Tax law does not encourage woodland to be left undisturbed. Unless it is used as a business (ie tree felling) or cleared to allow animals to graze, it will be subject to Inheritance Tax. Consequently there is no incentive to leave woodlands undisturbed. The government should be asked to this situation with a view to encouraging wooded areas to be left undisturbed for wildlife.</td>
<td>Noted, no amendments required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ian</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td><a href="mailto:heffalump@gmail.com">heffalump@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>As advised above - air quality, embodied emissions in construction and emissions from building operation, electrical infrastructure for electric vehicles and heating, provision for on street car charging, need to move away from traditional construction materials and adopt wooden construction</td>
<td>Section on sustainable design to be added.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emma</td>
<td>Grundy</td>
<td>Horsham District Council</td>
<td><a href="mailto:emma.grundy@horsham.gov.uk">emma.grundy@horsham.gov.uk</a></td>
<td>Reference to sustainable issues such as solar panels/LVP and how these should be addressed, fuel supplies-oil fuels (tanks where to be located, access for oil delivery lorries)? More guidance on materials to be used for hard-surfaced areas not just tarmac perhaps.</td>
<td>Section on sustainable design to be added. Oil tanks not encouraged. Guidance for hard surfacing contained in DG9.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Comoley</td>
<td>Save Wealden from Oversevelopment Team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Noted, no amendments required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Surname</td>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Email address</td>
<td>Other aspects comments</td>
<td>Recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natalie</td>
<td>Brit</td>
<td>Withyham Parish Council</td>
<td><a href="mailto:n.britt@withyhamparishcouncil.org.uk">n.britt@withyhamparishcouncil.org.uk</a></td>
<td>We note again that there is little or no reference to the detrimental effects of the increased number of private use vehicles and inadequate public transport on narrow roads. This is exacerbated by a lack of footpaths and cycle paths.</td>
<td>Noted, no amendments required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan</td>
<td>Richards</td>
<td>Aviscali.co</td>
<td><a href="mailto:alanjohnrichards@tiscali.co.uk">alanjohnrichards@tiscali.co.uk</a></td>
<td>This area suffers from an inadequate infrastructure relative to the current level of population and requires upgrading of hospital, roads, education to cope with a significant increase in housing development.</td>
<td>Noted, no amendments required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharon</td>
<td>Maden</td>
<td>Little intermail.com</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sharonnwanden@littleinternet.com">sharonnwanden@littleinternet.com</a></td>
<td>Please do not build or develop these areas. We need a lot of countryside in the South EAST. We do not just want to concrete over the entire south east...</td>
<td>Noted, no amendments required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris</td>
<td>artillery</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jimpfintrart@gmail.com">jimpfintrart@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>The current policies of WDC that prevent any development in the AONB</td>
<td>Noted, no amendments required.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>Bacon</td>
<td>Essenden Design Limited</td>
<td><a href="mailto:james@essenden.design">james@essenden.design</a></td>
<td>There should be provision for allotments where gardens are small</td>
<td>Noted, no amendments required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>Gonzalez</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sunnyekg@gmail.com">sunnyekg@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>Hilary <a href="mailto:hosford@gmail.com">hosford@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>we must make houses for people who are poorer as well, not just the rich. So we don’t forget nature, and this country really loves wildlife; you have to have gardens. Area of Outstanding Beauty</td>
<td>Noted, no amendments required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milton</td>
<td>Cartwright</td>
<td><a href="mailto:miltoncartwright@aol.com">miltoncartwright@aol.com</a></td>
<td>Have one last overarching comment and that is the need to ensure that this guide is consistently applied across authority boundaries.</td>
<td>Noted, no amendments required.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie</td>
<td>Holt</td>
<td>Kent County Council</td>
<td>The Design Guide provides robust and practical advice as to how new developments should take account challenges arise as a result of being within the AONB. It does not refer specifically to design issues that relate to the historic environment and their management in the face of new development. This advice could form a separate section of the guide, as set out in the following paragraphs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hilary</td>
<td>Hosford</td>
<td>CHOBROOK Conservation Area Advisory Committee (CCAC)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:hilary.hosford@gmail.com">hilary.hosford@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>Just more support to innovative and / or Eco design which supports the tenets of the Guide. Other countries in Europe eg Netherlands have been more successful with new design. We don’t just want pastiche all the time.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joanne</td>
<td>Petford</td>
<td>hastoe.com</td>
<td>Joanna Petford; <a href="mailto:rjpetford@hastoe.com">rjpetford@hastoe.com</a></td>
<td>Affordable housing viability: Affordable housing schemes are already marginal in terms of financial viability and the prescriptive nature of this document will increase building costs. Due regard should be given to the housing need and in some cases the design requirements may have to be reduced – i.e. using local materials is often prohibitively expensive.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin</td>
<td>Longdon</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jonlongdon@gmail.com">jonlongdon@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>Jon; longdon@<a href="mailto:jon@gmail.com">jon@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>Non combustible cladding is used</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew</td>
<td>Hickey</td>
<td><a href="mailto:andrew.t.hickey@gmail.com">andrew.t.hickey@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>Carbon neutrality targets are now set by government and developers need to be nudged/guided towards this aim by design guides like this. I would like to have seen some reference to this topic and the implications thereof.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lucy O’Neill  lucyco125@gmail.com  Encouraging animals from the surrounding area  Mental wellbeing  Noted, no amendments required.

Chris Langton  christlangton50@yahoo.com  As said above, the volume of appropriate development is equally important in the design, but is not dealt with.  Noted, no amendments required.

Kathleen Foster  Kathie.thefosters@gmail.com  Please add something about fencing in relation to the movement of wildlife between gardens. As we build more and more there are fewer opportunities for animals such as hedgehogs to roam.  2019 Add link to Wildlife Trust Guide ‘Homes for people and wildlife’.

Robert Wear-Oasis  Montgomery20@yahoo.com  How is affordable housing to be offered to those in desperate need with security of tenure at a reasonable price? Rural hamlets without adequate public transport needs are shown to be a disaster for the environment as everyone will have to drive. Where are the extra schools and hospitals and GP surgeries going to come from. This is a profit making scheme for those who quite frankly don’t need the extra cash.

Francoise Montford  strawberryhillknollhillaldingtonken TNT25 7B2  What about solar panels if we are serious about our environment these must now appear on all newly built homes.

Francoise Montford  Hand written  what about solar panels if we are serious about our environment these must now appear on all newly built houses.

Jan Miller  jan.miller@education.gov.uk  What impact it has on people in the area and surrounding areas. What affect does it have on doctors, schools, shops, roads and hospitals. Do not build just because you think the homes are needed from people who are not local as you just end up pushing the local people out and push the problem onto somewhere else.

Royal Tunbridge Wells access group  all local planning authorities and highway authorities have a legal duty since 2000 to comply with the requirements of Articles 9,19 & 28 of the UNCRDP and UKDS by virtue of the ESLG - please see rest of letter.

Phil Moore  philmoore@yahoo.co.uk  How to help the HWACONB make sure that this great guide is implemented more rigorously in practise.

A DAS is a good tool but needs to have sufficient weight and to involve the parishes not just the planning authority as many rural Weald villages have Neighbourhood Plans and the planning teams often overlook consultation with those who wrote the NPs preferring to defer to their own officers in isolation.  Neighbourhood Plans!!!  Some of us even have Design Guides!! Balcombe won a CABE grant of an enabler for a year as our aim was to have design led housing.  Our experience in Balcombe has been that the District Council has given advice outside the NP and also were unaware when they advised, on the first scheme to come forward under the NP, of the Design Guide which forms a supporting document to our NP.

Kia Trainor  Kia.trainor@cpresussex.org.uk  Please see our earlier comments in relation to sections on community involvement and climate change.

Ian Hollidge  philhollidge@icloud.com  Yes the Welsh Travel Act gives access and rights of way more importance than Manual for Streets. How people move and access their property should be a starting point not something that is an afterthought. Future transport is likely to include electric charging requirements and working towards zero carbon is another development consideration.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Role/Position</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Clerk</td>
<td>Spellhurst Parish Council</td>
<td><a href="mailto:asst.clerk@spellhurstparishcouncil.gov.uk">asst.clerk@spellhurstparishcouncil.gov.uk</a></td>
<td>It would be helpful if all the photograph examples of either good or bad practice were specifically identified, in order to make them more helpful to any user of the DG. The DG does not fully face up to the very serious challenges of climate change, in that there is no reference to designing in energy efficiency and climate change impacts, in terms of design, materials, energy supply sources, and site layout. It does not refer to the clutter of signage, which may be generated by any new development. There should be useful guidance about the size, type and location of street signs, as well as way markers for footpaths or bridle paths. There should be specific reference throughout to affordable housing, which is generally needed in the High Weald area; your guidance must apply to all types of housing. The Guidance does not question the need for housing within the High Weald area; it appears to accept that housing development is inevitable. There should be guidance to assess whether and if so, to what degree a proposed development within or adjacent to the area would harm its character and landscape; therefore asking the question whether it should be allowed at all.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen Harding</td>
<td>part of CPRE response</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sustainability – Additional or modified emphasis should be placed on sustainable energy initiatives; for example, solar energy, discouraging the use of wood burning stoves and open fires, as these can cause air pollution and an impact on the environment and may be subject to future legislation. The document should mention the provision of electric car charging points to promote this form of transport use. 2. Heritage: The document should emphasise the importance of taking into consideration Heritage aspects of the built environment content, to include: Archaeological Notification Areas, Conservation Areas, Listed and Locally Listed Buildings, Scheduled Monuments, Historic Parks and Gardens.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiona Hensher</td>
<td>Heathfield and Waldron Parish Council</td>
<td><a href="mailto:asstclerk@hwpc.org.uk">asstclerk@hwpc.org.uk</a></td>
<td>Redrow broadly support the introduction of the Design Guide and feel that it will make a useful contribution towards local planning guidance for developers, planners and the public. However, a balance must be struck between using the Guide to outline the development the Unit feels is most appropriate and highlighting key local vernacular, meeting the needs of the modern housing market, modern housing standards, and the need to provide quantum and quality, and protect our existing human and natural places. As such, the guide should have some ‘built-in’ flexibility to allow all types of appropriate development to come forward in the variety of unique circumstances that may arise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew Bessant</td>
<td>Redrow</td>
<td></td>
<td>As stated above - Ideally guidance on: - how to ensure adoption of the guide - how best to enforce the guide - how to objectively measure (and what is considered acceptable change) some of the elements described (e.g. views, tranquility etc etc) - how other ancillary development should be incorporated into designs (e.g. commercial / public buildings that form part of the scheme) - other street furniture such as planters, rubbish bins, benches etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philip Moore</td>
<td>Planning Secretary, Green Street Green Village Society, Planning Co-ordinator, Bromley Friends of the Earth</td>
<td><a href="mailto:philipmoore@yahoo.co.uk">philipmoore@yahoo.co.uk</a></td>
<td>Spaces to store bicycles, and to secure them when not at home. • Charging points for electric vehicles and the fact that in the near future most vehicles are likely to get much smaller. • The carbon footprint of buildings: o How much insulation and of what kind is used? For example it should not be carcinogenic like rockwool and not flammable either. Thermafoam insulation might be better. o Favourable designs for solar panels, both for hot water and for electricity. o Geothermal power opportunities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamara Galloway</td>
<td>Planning Secretary, Green Street Green Village Society, Planning Co-ordinator, Bromley Friends of the Earth</td>
<td><a href="mailto:tamaragalloway@yahoo.com">tamaragalloway@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
them, as they may be spread over a number of sections. The officials of the High Weald unit may notice the way the Core Strategy of Rother District Council has been drafted. In that document, the policies for each section are put prominently together in a box. This feature must have saved a very large number of hours of people’s time.

6. The titles to the sections provide little if any assistance to the reader. This is made more significant because there is no index.

7. The section titles give too little help to the reader to find the relevant section. The division is in conflict with the aim of the guide to be clear and succinct. The section titles in the substituted part above provide a much better division of this document than those in the draft for consultation. The substituted section titles are readily understandable and do not have a particular policy split into different sections. The reader might find it helpful to note that the sections above have their policies spread widely in the draft document.

8. For committee meetings and public inquiries, it would help if para numbers were inserted in order to direct participants to the right section of a page quickly. Para numbers are standard tools in planning and other official directive documents.

9. The use of the word CHECKLIST is unhelpful. It should be replaced by REQUIREMENTS. The document is about policies and the policies are what should be highlighted rather than how to approach the difficulties that may arise.

10. A number of people have considered the document with me and all have found sections they found confusing. In each area the other readers could not assist as to what the guidance meant. Since 1986, the authorities have given clear, concise and easy to understand. The planning jargon in the document is not clear because jargon has a number of interpretations. The language in the substituted section which I have found ambiguous and I have had to leave them in. Unless I know what the authors meant to say, that is all I can do.

11. Examples of the ambiguities can be found in the photographs at pages 12, 15, 17-18, 25 and 34-35. The photographs would benefit from more and better descriptions next to them. If some of the photos are simply there to lighten the text, those photographs will confuse the reader if they are next to others which seek to illustrate a point.

During the workshop, concerns were raised that the guidance did not express support for more architectural variety. Redrow build traditional homes, many of which would work well within the boundaries of the guidance provided. However, the guidance should be more open to both other traditional architectural styles and contemporary architecture. Whilst the most recent incarnation of the NPPF focuses more heavily on design, it does not prescribe that architectural style should be constrained where different styles can make a positive contribution to place-making. The guidance should reflect this nuance and demonstrate an understanding that whilst it describes a development style and architectural type which would most usually be appropriate, other positive contributions are welcome.

We support the guidance that the use of high quality materials is a key factor in the creating High Weald housing development that are genuinely of the place. Paragraph 124 of 1h NPPF states that being clear and design expectations and how these will be tested is essential in achieving better places to live and work. We consider that the Design Guide does set out a clear design vision so those preparing applications in the AONB can see what would and would not be acceptable. However we consider that allowing a degree of variety as set out by Paragraph 126 of the NPPF has not been fully achieved. For instance, the Guide does not consider whether outstanding and innovation designs would be appropriate with the AONB. Paragraph 131 is the NPPF provides great weight to outstanding design and we consider there is opportunity within the Guide to explore this further. We would advise that not all developments that do not reflect traditional materials is harmful and that thought should be given to contemporary architecture and how this can positively contribute to the landscape. We consider the AONB should not just be conserved yet also enhanced through innovative designs as supported by the NPPF (paragraphs 131/172).