

“Ringmer to 2030”

Basic Conditions Statement



*View across Ringmer Green and Ringmer church towards the South Downs National Park.
Photograph courtesy of Peter Mullins and the Sussex Express.*

Introduction

We, Ringmer Parish Council, have submitted our proposed Neighbourhood Plan proposal, “Ringmer to 2030”, to Lewes District Council and the South Downs National Park Authority to allow for an examination to take place.

Regulation 15(1)(d) of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations (2012) requires that a proposed plan, when submitted to the local planning authorities, should include:

“a statement explaining how the proposed neighbourhood development plan meets the requirements of paragraph 8 of Schedule 4B to the 1990 Act.”

With regards to neighbourhood plans, Schedule 4B of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 states the following¹:

- “(1) The examiner must consider the following -***
- (a) whether the draft neighbourhood development plan meets the basic conditions (see sub-paragraph (2))***
 - (b) whether the draft neighbourhood development plan complies with the provision made by or under sections 38A and 38B of this Act***
 - (d) whether the area for any referendum should extend beyond the neighbourhood area to which the draft neighbourhood development plan relates, and***
 - (e) such other matters as may be prescribed***
- (2) A draft neighbourhood development plan meets the basic conditions if –***
- (a) having regard to national policies and advice contained in guidance by the Secretary of State, it is appropriate to make the neighbourhood development plan,***
 - (d) the making of the neighbourhood development plan contributes to the achievement of sustainable development***
 - (e) the making of the neighbourhood development plan is in general conformity with the strategic policies contained in the development plan for the area of the authority (or any part of that area)***
 - (f) the making of the neighbourhood development plan does not breach, and is otherwise compatible with, EU obligations, and***
 - (g) prescribed conditions are met in relation to the neighbourhood development plan and prescribed matters have been complied with in connection with the proposal for the neighbourhood development plan***
- (6) The examiner is not to consider any matter that does not fall within sub-paragraph (1) (apart from considering whether the draft neighbourhood plan is compatible with the Convention rights).”***

This Basic Conditions Statement is to explain how our Neighbourhood Plan, “Ringmer to 2030”, meets these requirements and conditions.

Meeting the Legal Requirements

This section of this document shows how the requirements of the first and sixth paragraphs of Schedule 4B of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 are met. This section does not cover paragraph 1(a) which is dealt with in the subsequent section of the report.

¹ Excluding certain paragraphs as required by section 38C of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004

1(b) The examiner must consider... whether the draft neighbourhood development plan complies with the provision made by or under sections 38A and 38B of this Act.

The full wording of sections 38A and 38B of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 can be found in Appendix 1. The table below shows how the parts of the sections have been met:

Paragraph Number	How the requirement has been met
Section 38A	
(1)	Ringmer Parish Council is a qualifying body for the purposes of initiating a Neighbourhood Plan. The Parish Council successfully applied to Lewes District Council and the South Downs National Park Authority (the planning authorities) to designate the entire parish of Ringmer as a Neighbourhood Area to allow for a neighbourhood development plan to be produced. Notification that the Ringmer Parish Neighbourhood Area was designated was received on from the planning authorities on 1 October 2012.
(2)	If adopted, " <i>Ringmer to 2030</i> " will be a Neighbourhood Plan guiding development in the designated area.
(3)-(12)	The remaining paragraphs of the section deal with procedures that are to happen once the plan has been submitted to the planning authorities. It is assumed that these procedures will be carried out by the relevant bodies according to the regulations.
Section 38B	
(1)(a)	The Neighbourhood Plan will last until 2030, matching the dates of the Lewes District Joint Core Strategy (Local Plan part 1), currently at the latter stages of production.
(1)(b)&(6)	The Neighbourhood Plan does not relate to excluded development.
(1)(c)	The Neighbourhood Plan relates only to the designated Ringmer Parish Neighbourhood Area.
(2)	There is no other neighbourhood plan in place in the designated Neighbourhood Area.
(3)	It is accepted that if a policy conflicts with any other statement or information in the plan, then the policy takes precedence.
(4)&(5)	Not applicable to the Parish Council as it relates to processes for which the planning authorities and Secretary of State are responsible.

(1)(c) The examiner must consider... whether the area for any referendum should extend beyond the neighbourhood area to which the draft neighbourhood development plan relates.

It is the view of the Parish Council and the electoral authority (Lewes District Council) that it would be unnecessary to extend the referendum beyond the Neighbourhood Area.

(1)(d) The examiner must consider... such other matters as may be prescribed.

There are no other matters that need to be considered.

(6) The examiner is not to consider any matter that does not fall within sub-paragraph (1) (apart from considering whether the draft neighbourhood plan is compatible with the Convention rights).

It is considered that the plan is compatible with the Convention rights.

Meeting the conditions

This section of the document considers how the Neighbourhood Plan meets the 'basic conditions' required by Paragraph 2 of Schedule 4B of the Town and Country Planning 1990 Act.

(2)(a) A draft neighbourhood development plan meets the basic conditions if... having regard to national policies and advice contained in guidance by the Secretary of State, it is appropriate to make the neighbourhood development plan.

In March 2012, the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), its related technical guidance and planning policy for traveller sites were published. Collectively, they replaced the suite of Planning Policy Statements (PPSs) and Planning Policy Guidance Notes (PPGs) and represent the government's policy on land use planning.

NPPF paragraphs 183-185 are of particular relevance to neighbourhood planning. They set out how neighbourhood plans should be prepared and what they should facilitate. Importantly, paragraph 183 explains that "*neighbourhood planning gives communities direct power to develop a shared vision for their neighbourhood and deliver the sustainable development they need.*"

What this makes clear is that the plan must contain a clear vision that the plan itself must deliver. "*Ringmer to 2030*" contains in its section 2 a clear vision, which aligns to the vision of the Joint Core Strategy. This vision has been subject to community consultation and drives the policies contained in the remainder of the Neighbourhood Plan. Section 3 of "*Ringmer to 2030*" develops four key principles required to deliver the vision, which have also been subject to community consultation.

The detailed principles and provisions of the NPPF have guided the preparation of "*Ringmer to 2030*" throughout. The Parish Council's commitment to securing economic growth that creates jobs and prosperity in this rural area (NPPF paragraphs 18 & 28) underpins our policies on employment (section 6 of this Neighbourhood Plan). The requirement to plan for a mix of housing based on the needs of different groups in this rural community and future demographic trends (NPPF paragraphs 50 & 54) underpins our policies for residential development (section 7) and some aspects of the Village Design Statement (section 10). Our assessment of the current quality and capacity of Ringmer's infrastructure (NPPF paragraph 162) has led us to identify key infrastructure constraints on development (section 9), while the planned delivery of necessary infrastructure improvements in a timely fashion (NPPF paragraph 177) dictates key aspects of the phasing proposed for delivery of new employment and housing sites (see, for example, policy 7.8). The importance of securing good design in new development (NPPF paragraphs 56-65) has guided the content of the Village Design Statement (section 10).

At a more detailed level there more examples than can be listed here. For illustration, policy 4.1 on the section of the parish within the South Downs National Park is guided by NPPF paragraphs 115 & 116; policy 4.6 makes provision for adequate parking based on evidence of local car ownership and use as required by NPPF paragraph 39; policies 4.7 & 4.8 on the avoidance of unnecessary light pollution and nuisance to neighbours are guided by NPPF paragraphs 125 & 123; policy 5.7 on heritage buildings gives local effect to NPPF paragraph 169; policy 5.10 on biodiversity aligns with NPPF paragraph 118; policy 6.2 seeks to define and protect Ringmer's best and most versatile agricultural land, in accordance with NPPF paragraph 112; policy 7.5 prioritises the use of previously used sites and buildings over greenfield land, in accordance with NPPF paragraph 111; section 8 of

this Neighbourhood Plan seeks to deliver the social and recreational facilities needed by the village community as required by NPPF paragraph 70; and policy 10.10 aims to simplify the planning application process for allocated employment and housing sites through the provision of development briefs, in accordance with NPPF paragraph 188. We believe that “*Ringmer to 2030*” is fully compatible with all the twelve core planning principles of NPPF paragraph 17. The detailed analysis in appendix 2 below has identified no policies in this Neighbourhood Plan that are incompatible with the National Planning Policy Framework or other aspects of national planning regulations.

In allocating sites for new employment and housing development, viability and deliverability have been key considerations, as required by NPPF paragraphs 173 & 183. This is a particular issue for new employment sites, where the professional view is that speculative development is currently of at best marginal viability. Section 6.1 of Neighbourhood Plan appendix A considers in detail how the new development required can be delivered, in the light of the (much more positive) experience of local site owners and entrepreneurs. Viability is considered a much less serious issue for residential development, as experience has demonstrated that even very small residential sites in Ringmer are fully viable. Recent planning applications have mostly been for very small sites, and almost all successful applications have been delivered promptly. Here site availability is considered the key issue for deliverability. Hence particular attention, documented in Neighbourhood Plan appendix F, has been paid to ensuring that development of all sites allocated for residential development up to 2024 is fully supported by the relevant landowner or developer. Sites where the strict early-availability criteria adopted are not currently met have been included only in the pool of sites for the final (2025-2030) phase of the Neighbourhood Plan. A reserve greenfield site that does meet the availability criteria is included in the final phase of development in case insufficient of these ‘developable’ sites come forward to meet the minimum housing target planned in policy 7.1.

(2)(d) A draft neighbourhood development plan meets the basic conditions if... the making of the neighbourhood development plan contributes to the achievement of sustainable development.

Sustainable development is defined by United Nations General assembly resolution 24/187 as meeting the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs. Achieving sustainable development is the key unifying principle underpinning the NPPF, and the requirement for a presumption in favour of sustainable development is laid out in paragraphs 11-16. The application of this presumption to neighbourhood plans is particularised in paragraph 16. This approach is explicitly endorsed in section 1.5 of “*Ringmer to 2030*”. The three key dimensions of sustainable development are described in NPPF paragraph 7.

Sustainability, and the need for the plan to help achieve sustainable development in Ringmer, has been an important part of the process since Ringmer was awarded Vanguard status as a neighbourhood plan frontrunner in March 2011. Work on “*Ringmer to 2030*” and an associated Sustainability Appraisal began before the Neighbourhood Planning Regulations were published in the following year. When the Scoping Report was first prepared it was envisaged that a Sustainability Appraisal akin to that for a local authority Development Plan Document would be required. A Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report was published in July 2012 and was subject to consultation with statutory consultees and local residents. Responses were received from Natural England, the Environment Agency, a District councillor and three local residents. While it has since become apparent that this is not a formal requirement, the approach has provided a valuable tool for assessing alternative options and policies. A Sustainability Appraisal against the economic, social and environmental objectives identified in the Scoping Report has thus been carried out on the content of the plan, albeit not in quite the same way as envisaged in the Scoping Report. Undertaking this Sustainability Appraisal has helped ensure that the plan contributes to the

achievement of sustainable development so that the Parish Council can be confident that this condition has been met.

(2)(e) A draft neighbourhood development plan meets the basic conditions if... the making of the neighbourhood development plan is in general conformity with the strategic policies contained in the development plan for the area of the authority (or any part of that area).

Currently, planning applications in Ringmer are determined on the basis of policies contained in the Lewes District Local Plan (2003) that were saved in 2007 and are seen to be consistent with the NPPF². The latest list of such saved policies considered to be NPPF-consistent was approved by Lewes District Council in April 2012. They do not cover all areas addressed in this Neighbourhood Plan, but the compliance of the Neighbourhood Plan with these saved policies is considered in detail in appendix 2 below.

While the majority of Neighbourhood Plan policies were fully compliant with these saved policies, six exceptions are identified below in appendix 2. It should be noted that it is not clearly identified which of the saved NPPF-compliant policies of the 2003 Lewes District Local Plan should be considered as strategic policies. However, it is not thought that three of these saved policies (policies E8(b), RG4 or RES2) could be considered as strategic policies and/or compliant with current national planning regulations, while another minor conflict affecting policy RG4 and Neighbourhood Plan policy 8.4 reflects an updated assessment of specific needs within the same overall un-met need for additional sports pitches and facilities in Ringmer. A fifth saved policy, T14, has been superseded by more recent East Sussex County Council Guidance, with which Neighbourhood Plan policy 4.6 is compliant. It does not appear to the Parish Council that saved policy T14 is compliant with NPPF paragraph 39. The final conflict relates to Neighbourhood Plan policy 7.2 on the level of affordable housing to be provided. In the light of evidence of an urgent and un-met need for more affordable housing in Ringmer, policy 7.2 seeks to include in the Neighbourhood Plan, from the date that it is made, new affordable housing policies in line with those included in the proposed Core Strategy, which are in turn based on updated evidence of need and affordability.

Unusually, there are two planning authorities in the parish, Lewes District Council and the South Downs National Park Authority. Both planning authorities have been working together to produce a replacement Lewes District Local Plan.

The replacement Local Plan will be produced in different parts, with Part One of the plan known as the Joint Core Strategy. Part Two of the Local Plan for the area outside of the National Park will be the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document, which is being produced by Lewes District Council. The National Park Authority will produce their own Local Plan for their area in due course, with adoption currently scheduled for 2017. Although about 20% of the land area of Ringmer parish lies within the National Park, this contains less than 2% of Ringmer households. Of the many sites proposed for development or re-development in the Neighbourhood Plan (listed in Neighbourhood Plan appendix C and appendix F), only one lies within the National Park. This is a currently derelict farmyard complex at Old House Farm which is proposed for conversion to residential use in connection with the nearby employment site at Glyndebourne Opera House, within easy walking distance. The detailed analysis in appendix 2 below has identified no policies in this Neighbourhood Plan that are incompatible with the Vision or strategic policies proposed for the Joint Core Strategy.

² The list of policies that continue to be used to determine planning applications can be found at [http://www.lewes.gov.uk/Files/plan_Cabinet_Appendix\(1\).pdf](http://www.lewes.gov.uk/Files/plan_Cabinet_Appendix(1).pdf)

It was initially anticipated that “*Ringmer to 2030*” would be adopted only after the Joint Core Strategy had come into force. However, as both documents have progressed, delays have affected the likely adoption date of the Joint Core Strategy and it is now uncertain which document will come into force first. The Joint Core Strategy has completed its consultation stages but has not yet been submitted for examination. Nevertheless, “*Ringmer to 2030*” is written to be in general conformity with the strategic policies contained in the proposed submission version of the Joint Core Strategy, as well as those saved from the 2003 Local Plan.

The January 2013 version of the Joint Core Strategy identifies eleven strategic objectives, six spatial policies and fourteen core delivery policies. This was submitted for consultation during January-March 2013, and a synopsis of the consultation responses has been reported, but the planning authorities’ response to these is still awaited. Some focused amendments to the Joint Core Strategy were published in May 2014, and submitted for consultation May-July 2014. This also included eleven strategic objectives, six spatial policies and fourteen core delivery policies covering the same topics, but with some changes to the wording. No synopsis of the consultation responses is as yet available. Ringmer Parish Council was amongst the consultees submitting responses to both consultations.

Not all these Joint Core Strategy strategic policies have direct relevance to Ringmer, but delivery of many would be supported by policies included in “*Ringmer to 2030*”. For example, the Neighbourhood Plan policy 7.2 on the provision of affordable housing relies on and reflects the evidence that underpins the proposed Core Policy 1 of the Joint Core Strategy. Core Policy 1 is not affected by any of the proposed focused amendments. Similarly, Neighbourhood Plan policies 10.2 (on housing densities within new developments), 10.7 (types of housing within larger developments) and 10.8 (provision of new centrally-located accommodation for the elderly and disabled) all reflect and develop Core Policy 2 of the Joint Core Strategy, which is also unaffected by the proposed focused amendments. The Neighbourhood Plan employment policies in section 6 of “*Ringmer to 2030*” support in the local rural context the District-wide policies in Core Policies 4, 5 and 6, all of which are unaffected by the proposed focused amendments. The Neighbourhood Plan is, however, more ambitious than the Joint Core Strategy for the delivery of new employment opportunities in Ringmer. As noted above, no significant conflicts between any of the Joint Core Strategy strategic policies and the policies included in “*Ringmer to 2030*” have been identified.

Three of the Spatial Strategies in the Joint Core Strategy make direct reference to Ringmer. Its settlement hierarchy categorisation of Ringmer village as a ‘rural service centre’ and the Broyleside as a ‘local village’ is accepted and utilised in the Neighbourhood Plan. Spatial policy 2 allocates a total of 220 net additional housing units to Ringmer village and the Broyleside (unaffected by the focused amendments), while policy 7.1 of the “*Ringmer to 2030*” plans for a minimum of 240 new houses in Ringmer parish. The Neighbourhood Plan allocation does include some new housing outside the two settlements, not envisaged in the Joint Core Strategy, but part of this represents exception site development on the edges of existing settlements and in any case the distribution of new housing within a Neighbourhood Area is legitimately a matter for local determination. Spatial policy 5 proposes that the allocation of sites for the Ringmer housing allocation of 220 units should be delegated to the Ringmer Neighbourhood Plan, but also includes provision for a contingent strategic site for 110 housing units north of Bishops Lane, Ringmer, in the event that the Neighbourhood Plan is not made as intended or, when made, does not include specified provisions for residential housing delivery. While the imposition of a strategic site of this size would conflict with Neighbourhood Plan policy 7.7 (a policy which has almost universal support from local residents), no conflict will arise if the Neighbourhood Plan is made as intended. If the Neighbourhood Plan is not made, or does not meet the specified requirements, then Core Strategy

Spatial Policies 2 & 5 will ensure the delivery of new housing in Ringmer, albeit not in the manner that local people favour.

Earlier versions of the Joint Core Strategy included in Spatial Policy 1 provision for additional employment site development in Ringmer. This provision was omitted from the January 2013 version on the basis that delivery of the site considered could not be guaranteed (paragraph 6.25). Policy 6.1 of "*Ringmer to 2030*" does plan for the delivery of additional Ringmer employment sites, at a number of locations where delivery is supported by the landowners (including locations not identified in the Joint Core Strategy or its evidence base). A start on the delivery of this policy has already been made. Such provision is essential for the delivery of key principle 2 and the overall vision of the Neighbourhood Plan. However, this Neighbourhood Plan policy should not be considered in conflict with the Joint Core Strategy. A Neighbourhood Plan may not plan for a lower level of development than is set out in the Local Plan (NPPF paragraph 184), but it may legitimately plan for a higher level.

(2)(f) A draft neighbourhood development plan meets the basic conditions if... the making of the neighbourhood development plan does not breach, and is otherwise compatible with, EU obligations.

To ensure that "*Ringmer to 2030*" meets this requirement a Habitat Regulations Screening Assessment has been undertaken. It concluded that there would be no likely significant effect to any site protected by the Birds and Habitats Directives as a consequence of the policies in the plan. As a result no further work was required to meet the requirements.

A Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) Screening has also been undertaken in conjunction with the Sustainability Appraisal, contributing to the environmental objectives and indicators developed in the Scoping Report, especially environmental objectives ENV12 & ENV13. In the Sustainability Appraisal fourteen policies appraised positively against objective ENV12 and thirteen against ENV13. No policies were found to appraise negatively against either policy. It was thus concluded that there would be no significant negative environmental effects caused by the plan and thus there was no need to carry out a full SEA.

As a result of the work undertaken, the Parish Council and the planning authorities consider that this condition has been met.

(2)(g) A draft neighbourhood development plan meets the basic conditions if... prescribed conditions are met in relation to the neighbourhood development plan and prescribed matters have been complied with in connection with the proposal for the neighbourhood development plan.

Ringmer Parish Council believes that all the prescribed conditions have been met.

Appendix 1 – Sections 38A and 38B of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004

38A Meaning of “neighbourhood development plan”

- (1) Any qualifying body is entitled to initiate a process for the purpose of requiring a local planning authority in England to make a neighbourhood development plan.
- (2) A “neighbourhood development plan” is a plan which sets out policies (however expressed) in relation to the development and use of land in the whole or any part of a particular neighbourhood area specified in the plan.
- (3) Schedule 4B to the principal Act, which makes provision about the process for the making of neighbourhood development orders, including—
 - (a) provision for independent examination of orders proposed by qualifying bodies, and
 - (b) provision for the holding of referendums on orders proposed by those bodies,is to apply in relation to neighbourhood development plans (subject to the modifications set out in section 38C(5) of this Act).
- (4) A local planning authority to whom a proposal for the making of a neighbourhood development plan has been made—
 - (a) must make a neighbourhood development plan to which the proposal relates if in each applicable referendum under that Schedule (as so applied) more than half of those voting have voted in favour of the plan, and
 - (b) if paragraph (a) applies, must make the plan as soon as reasonably practicable after the referendum is held.
- (5) If—
 - (a) there are two applicable referendums under that Schedule as so applied (because the plan relates to a neighbourhood area designated as a business area under section 61H of the principal Act), and
 - (b) in one of those referendums (but not the other) more than half of those voting have voted in favour of the plan,the authority may (but need not) make a neighbourhood development plan to which the proposal relates.
- (6) The authority are not to be subject to the duty under subsection (4)(a) if they consider that the making of the plan would breach, or would otherwise be incompatible with, any EU obligation or any of the Convention rights (within the meaning of the Human Rights Act 1998).
- (7) Regulations made by the Secretary of State may make provision as to the procedure to be followed by local planning authorities in cases where they act under subsection (6).
- (8) The regulations may in particular make provision—
 - (a) for the holding of an examination,
 - (b) as to the payment by a local planning authority of remuneration and expenses of the examiner,
 - (c) as to the award of costs by the examiner,
 - (d) as to the giving of notice and publicity,
 - (e) as to the information and documents that are to be made available to the public,

- (f) as to the making of reasonable charges for anything provided as a result of the regulations,
 - (g) as to consultation with and participation by the public, and
 - (h) as to the making and consideration of representations (including the time by which representations must be made).
- (9) The authority must publish in such manner as may be prescribed—
- (a) their decision to act under subsection (4) or (6),
 - (b) their reasons for making that decision, and
 - (c) such other matters relating to that decision as may be prescribed.
- (10) The authority must send a copy of the matters required to be published to—
- (a) the qualifying body that initiated the process for the making of the plan, and
 - (b) such other persons as may be prescribed.
- (11) If a neighbourhood development plan is in force in relation to a neighbourhood area—
- (a) a qualifying body may make a proposal for the existing plan to be replaced by a new one, and
 - (b) the process for the making of the replacement plan is the same as the process for the making of the existing plan.
- (12) For the purposes of this section—
- “local planning authority” has the same meaning as it has in Part 2 (see section 37), but the Broads Authority are to be the only local planning authority for the Broads,
- “neighbourhood area” has the meaning given by sections 61G and 61I(1) of the principal Act,
- “prescribed” means prescribed by regulations made by the Secretary of State, and
- “qualifying body” means a parish council, or an organisation or body designated as a neighbourhood forum, authorised for the purposes of a neighbourhood development plan to act in relation to a neighbourhood area as a result of section 61F of the principal Act, as applied by section 38C of this Act.

38B Provision that may be made by neighbourhood development plans

- (1) A neighbourhood development plan—
- (a) must specify the period for which it is to have effect,
 - (b) may not include provision about development that is excluded development, and
 - (c) may not relate to more than one neighbourhood area.
- (2) Only one neighbourhood development plan may be made for each neighbourhood area.
- (3) If to any extent a policy set out in a neighbourhood development plan conflicts with any other statement or information in the plan, the conflict must be resolved in favour of the policy.
- (4) Regulations made by the Secretary of State may make provision—
- (a) restricting the provision that may be included in neighbourhood development plans about the use of land,
 - (b) requiring neighbourhood development plans to include such matters as are prescribed in the regulations, and
 - (c) prescribing the form of neighbourhood development plans.

- (5) A local planning authority must publish each neighbourhood development plan that they make in such manner as may be prescribed by regulations made by the Secretary of State.
- (6) Section 61K of the principal Act (meaning of “excluded development”) is to apply for the purposes of subsection (1)(b).

Appendix 2 – Compliance of the Vision, Key Principles and Policies of the Ringmer Neighbourhood Plan with the Basic Conditions

Contents

1. Introduction
2. Compliance of the Vision
3. Compliance of the Four Key Principles
4. Compliance of the policies included in section 4 of the Neighbourhood Plan
5. Compliance of the policies included in section 5 of the Neighbourhood Plan
6. Compliance of the policies included in section 6 of the Neighbourhood Plan
7. Compliance of the policies included in section 7 of the Neighbourhood Plan
8. Compliance of the policies included in section 8 of the Neighbourhood Plan
9. Compliance of the policies included in section 9 of the Neighbourhood Plan
10. Compliance of the policies included in section 10 of the Neighbourhood Plan
11. Conclusions
12. Abbreviations used

1. Introduction

1.1 This appendix assesses the compliance of the policies proposed in the Ringmer Neighbourhood Plan against:

- National planning policy, including in particular the NPPF
- The saved policies of the 2003 Lewes District Local Plan considered compliant with the NPPF, published in April 2012 and available at [www.lewes.gov.uk/Files/plan_Cabinet_Appendix\(1\).pdf](http://www.lewes.gov.uk/Files/plan_Cabinet_Appendix(1).pdf).
- The strategic policies of the proposed submission Lewes District Core Strategy (Local Plan part 1 first published in January 2013 (PSCS) and then republished with focused amendments in May 2014 (PSCSFA). Both are available on the Lewes District Council website www.lewes.gov.uk.

2. Assessment of the compliance of the Vision

Vision for Ringmer in 2030: By 2030, the Low Weald village of Ringmer, the Broyleside settlement and the wider countryside within the parish will have retained, and where possible enhanced, their attractive character and identity. Although the majority of recent development will have been directed to the urban areas of the District, development that meets Ringmer’s housing and community needs and supports the rural economy will have been sensitively accommodated. Development of new and improved employment opportunities in Ringmer parish will have reduced the need for out-commuting, thereby supporting local services. To enable this, existing employment sites will be maintained and improved, new sites will be identified and established as necessary, and businesses, including working at or from home, will be supported by the provision of modern business accommodation and access to high quality and high speed e-communications.

Compliance: This Vision is compliant with NPPF paras.28-30, 34, 37 & 42. It is modelled on, and entirely compliant with, the PSCS/PSCSFA Visions for the rural areas of the Low Weald and the SDNP.

3. Assessment of the compliance of the Four Key Principles

Key principle 3.1: Ringmer is, and should stay, a village. *Ringmer is a large parish with two main settlements, Ringmer village and the Broyleside. The surrounding countryside is highly valued and extensively used by residents, and includes a significant rural population. Ringmer village has a good range of services. Despite its population being larger than many small towns, Ringmer maintains a ‘village feel’, and this is prized by residents as a key asset. ‘Village feel’ includes both landscape and social aspects.*

Compliance: ‘Village feel’ is a specific example of ‘sense of place’, noted as important in NPPF para.58 (bullet point 2), and of the ‘shared vision’ promoted by NPPF para.69. ‘Village feel’ is essentially the same as the ‘village atmosphere’ whose preservation was sought as objective 1 of the Rolleston on Dove (East Staffordshire) Neighbourhood Plan, which was found sound at examination [<http://www.rolleston.org.uk/planning/Rolleston-on-Dove%20NP%20-%20Submission%20Version.pdf>].

Key principle 3.2: Ringmer should regain sustainability. *Up to the mid-1960s Ringmer was a large but sustainable village community. The predominant reason for living in Ringmer was that you were employed in Ringmer. Since then planned changes have doubled the size of the village by allowing commuter development, while the major local employer closed in the 1980s. Commuting from Ringmer has become far more ambitious and extensive than was ever envisaged. This Neighbourhood Plan will seek to redirect the community towards sustainability by (a) increasing employment opportunities within Ringmer and (b) ensuring that new housing is on a scale and of a type to meet village need.*

Compliance: This key principle is compliant with NPPF paras.7- 9, 14-17 & 28. It is also compliant with PSCS/PSCSFA policies CP4.1-4.5 & CP13

Key principle 3.3: Ringmer should be a balanced, healthy and inclusive community. *There was serious concern, expressed in the 2003 Village Plan, that in the last decades of the 20th century the Ringmer community became unbalanced. The traditionally high proportion of affordable housing was greatly reduced, and young families were priced out of the village housing market. Recruitment to the village primary school plummeted. The 2003 Village Plan sought to correct this, with partial success – the primary school is now full again. This Neighbourhood Plan will seek to ensure that Ringmer returns to being a fully balanced, healthy and inclusive community.*

Compliance: This key principle is compliant with NPPF paras.69 & 70. It is also compliant with PSCS/PSCSFA policy CP2.

Key principle 3.4: Ringmer and the South Downs National Park. *After hearing detailed evidence, the Inspector drew the National Park boundary tightly around the south-east and west boundaries of Ringmer village, leaving the parish partly within and partly outside the SDNP, but almost all residents living outside the boundary. This Neighbourhood Plan will include policies to respect this decision, ensuring that only development that supports the National Park purposes and duty takes place within the Ringmer section of the SDNP.*

Compliance: This key principle is compliant with NPPF paras.109 (bullet point 1), 113, 115 & 116, and with the SDNP purposes and duty. It is also compliant with PSCS/PSCSFA policy CP10.2.

4. Assessment of the compliance of the policies included in section 4 of the Neighbourhood Plan

Policies included in section 4 of the Neighbourhood Plan are:

- 4.1 The South Downs National Park
- 4.2 New development to conform to the Village Design Statement
- 4.3 Landscape impact and screening
- 4.4 Quiet lanes to be maintained for recreational use
- 4.5 Access to the local road system

- 4.6 Provision of adequate off-road parking
- 4.7 Avoidance of light pollution
- 4.8 Avoidance of nuisance to neighbours

The assessment of the compliance of each of these policies is given below.

Policy 4.1: *Development in the parts of Ringmer parish within the SDNP should preserve and enhance the statutory purposes and duty of the SDNP and should make a positive contribution to maintaining and enhancing its special qualities. Such development must conform to the SDNP Management Plan. In considering proposed development immediately adjacent or close to the SDNP boundary, or having a substantial impact on views from the SDNP, weight will be given to the impact of the proposed development on the use and enjoyment of the SDNP and the natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage of the SDNP.*

Compliance: This policy gives local effect to NPPF paras.109 (bullet point 1), 113, 115 & 116, and is compliant with the SDNP purposes and duty. It is also compliant with PSCS/PSCSFA policy CP10.2 & CP11.ii.

Policy 4.2: *New development of all types shall be in conformity with the Village Design Statement.*

Compliance: This policy is compliant with NPPF paras.56-61.

Policy 4.3: *All new development must, through either its design or effective screening, make a positive contribution to the rural landscape. Where landscape mitigation measures are required of a development, conditions will be imposed to ensure that it is both created and maintained, and that new planting is in keeping with the local landscape character.*

Compliance: This policy is compliant with NPPF paras.109 (bullet point 1) & 113. It is also compliant with 2003 Local Plan policies ST3(a) & (f) and ST11 and with PSCS/PSCSFA policy CP10.1.

Policy 4.4: *High priority will be given to the protection for their current recreational uses of the quiet lanes dotted in red on map 4.2 [Norlington Lane, Green Lane, the upper section of Broyle Lane, Potato Lane and the section of Neaves Lane south of the sewage works]. Their appearance as attractive country lanes will be retained and design changes that encourage greater vehicular use or speed will be avoided. Minor development, such as conversion of redundant agricultural buildings to residential or office use or provision of accommodation for essential rural workers, will be permitted. Larger-scale development that would create a material increase in traffic flows, and especially development for employment or leisure purposes that attracted additional large-vehicle traffic incommensurate with the present farm traffic, would discourage recreational use and be contrary to this policy.*

Compliance: This policy is, because of Ringmer's lack of accessible greenspace (see section 5.6), important for compliance with NPPF para.171. It will also help to deliver the objectives of NPPF para.69 (bullet point 3) and 75. It is also important in giving local effect to PSCS/PSCSFA policy CP8.5.

Policy 4.5: *Proposals for development that would create material increases in traffic flows, and especially development for employment or leisure purposes that will attract material increases in large-vehicle traffic, must have direct access to the main road system or demonstrate that access to the main road system is within the capacity of the local road system. The country lanes dotted in blue on map 4.2 [Wellingham Lane, Harveys Lane and Moor Lane] are considered to have little additional capacity for large-vehicle traffic and are thus unsuitable for new development other than small scale development in accordance with NPPF paragraph 55.*

Compliance: This policy is compliant with NPPF paras.30, 35 (bullet point 3) & 162 (bullet point 1).

Policy 4.6: All new development in Ringmer must make adequate provision for off-road parking for the numbers and types of vehicles likely to be attracted by the development. Parking for new development in the countryside should be appropriately located or screened to minimise landscape impact. New residential development should include off-road parking provision at the following minimum ratios:

1 parking space per 1-2 bed home designed specifically for older residents

2 parking spaces per 1-3 bed home

3 parking spaces per 4 bed or larger home.

In addition provision should be made for off-road visitor parking, in accordance with the scale recommended by East Sussex County Council.

Compliance: This policy is compliant with, and seeks to give local effect to, NPPF para.39 and gives local effect to the East Sussex County Council Guidance for Parking at New Residential Development (2012). It is also compliant with 2003 Local Plan policy ST3(e) but is not compliant with policy T14, which refers to maximum parking standards. It is compliant with PSCSFA policy 13.6 (on the assumption that the Local Planning Authority adopts the County Council guidance in approving its parking guidance).

Policy 4.7: New development, especially new development in the countryside, should minimise additional light pollution, through careful design, location and inclusion of mitigation measures if necessary.

Compliance: This policy is compliant with NPPF para.125.

Policy 4.8: Planning policies and decisions should balance supporting sustainable rural activities and development against the need to avoid the creation of noise or other nuisances giving rise to significant adverse impacts on the residential amenities and the health or quality of life of neighbours. In considering applications for large animal facilities or businesses and leisure activities creating excessive noise or odours, great weight should be given to the need to protect neighbours from such adverse impacts.

Compliance: This policy is compliant with NPPF para.123 & para.109 (bullet point 4). It is also compliant with 2003 Local Plan policy ST3(c) & (d).

5. Assessment of the compliance of the policies included in section 5 of the Neighbourhood Plan

Policies included in section 5 of the Neighbourhood Plan are:

- 5.1 The countryside in Ringmer
- 5.2 The Plashett Wood SSSI, Plashett Park Farm and Clay Hill Farm
- 5.3 The River Ouse banks between Lower Stoneham and Barcombe Mills
- 5.4 The strategic Green Gap between the Ringmer village and Broyleside settlements
- 5.5 Access to the countryside: public footpaths
- 5.6 Accessible countryside and natural or semi-natural greenspace
- 5.7 Heritage buildings
- 5.8 Archaeological sites in Ringmer
- 5.9 Green corridors, ponds and streams
- 5.10 Maintaining and enhancing biodiversity

The assessment of the compliance of each of these policies is given below.

Policy 5.1: Proposals for new development outside planning boundaries that are not in accordance with other policies in this Neighbourhood Plan or other material planning policies, and would have an

adverse effect on the countryside or the rural landscape, will not be permitted unless it can be demonstrated that the benefits of the development clearly outweigh the adverse impacts and that they cannot be located on an alternative site that would cause less harm.

Compliance: This policy is compliant with NPPF paras.55 & 118 (bullet point 1). It is also compliant with the saved and NPPF-compliant aspects of 2003 Local Plan policy CT1.

Policy 5.2: *Any development proposals for the area indicated in map 5.1 must maintain or enhance the integrity of this highly valued and richly biodiverse Wealden ancient woodland and parkland landscape.*

Compliance: This policy is compliant with NPPF paras.76, 77, 109 (bullet points 1-3) & 118 (bullet points 2 & 5). It is also compliant with PSCS/PSCSFA policy CP10.1.

Policy 5.3: *Development of measures that encourage recreational or tourism use of the River Ouse bank between Chalkham Farm and Barcombe Mills will be supported, provided that the rural beauty of the area shown in map 5.2 is conserved or enhanced, and that appropriate measures are taken to mitigate any detrimental impacts.*

Compliance: This policy is important for giving local effect to NPPF para.75, and is compliant with NPPF paras.76 & 77. It is also compliant with the 2003 Local Plan policy RE7 and would help to achieve the recreational objectives of policy T4. It would also contribute to achieving the objectives of PSCS/PSCSFA policy CP8.5.

Policy 5.4: *To maintain the separation between the two Ringmer settlements of Ringmer village and the Broyleside, development or change of use in the strategic Green Gap between the settlements identified in map 5.3 will be permitted only when the development or use preserves the openness, separation and character of the countryside.*

Compliance: This policy is compliant with NPPF paras.76 & 77. This principle is similar in principle to policy OS1 of the Rolleston on Dove (East Staffordshire) Neighbourhood Plan, whose intent was to maintain a green gap between Rolleston on Dove and nearby settlements. This neighbourhood plan was found sound at examination [<http://www.rolleston.org.uk/planning/Rolleston-on-Dove%20NP%20-%20Submission%20Version.pdf>].

Policy 5.5: *Ringmer's public footpath network will be maintained and if possible further improved through the creation of new licensed footpaths. Enhanced access to the SDNP will be particularly encouraged.*

Compliance: This policy is important for giving local effect to NPPF para.75 and compliant with para.171. It is also important in giving local effect to PSCS/PSCSFA policy CP8.5.

Policy 5.6: *Appropriate proposals to develop sufficient accessible natural or semi-natural greenspace, including a community-managed woodland, in Ringmer parish to meet the needs of the present population, and any future increase in population, will be supported.*

Compliance: This policy is important for giving local effect to NPPF para.73 and compliant with para.171. It is also important in giving local effect to PSCS/PSCSFA policy CP8.5.

Policy 5.7: *The English Heritage list of Ringmer's listed buildings requires systematic review. Until such review has been completed, the heritage buildings listed in appendix B as apparently meeting English Heritage criteria for formal listing will be treated as additional Ringmer heritage assets for the purposes of NPPF paragraphs 126-141.*

Compliance: This policy is required to give local effect to NPPF paras.17 (bullet point 10) & 126-141 until such time as the review of the English Heritage list for Ringmer can be completed in accordance with NPPF para.169. This policy gives local effect to the provisions of PSCS/PSCSFA policy CP11 re historic assets.

Policy 5.8: *New development in Ringmer will need to take account of the rich heritage of the parish and in particular archaeological remains associated with the regionally important medieval pottery industry. Proposals for development in Ringmer must be designed to take account of the historic character of the parish and seek to conserve and enhance heritage assets, including buried archaeological remains, in a manner proportionate to their significance and the scale of the development. Proposals for development likely to impact on heritage assets with archaeological interest, and in particular those likely to be associated with the medieval pottery industry (for information contact the Historic Environment Record: county.her@eastsussex.gov.uk), must be accompanied by appropriate assessment and field evaluation.*

Compliance: This policy is compliant with NPPF paras.126, 128-136, 139 & 141. It gives local effect to provisions of PSCS/PSCSFA policy CP11 re archaeological remains.

Policy 5.9: *Existing green corridors, ponds, streams and other important wildlife habitats within development boundaries will be maintained and enhanced, and where appropriate new green corridors will be included within new development sites. Where a new development site intervenes between open countryside and an existing wildlife habitat in a developed area, new green corridors will be required to allow passage of wildlife.*

Compliance: This policy is important to give local effect to NPPF paras.109 (bullet points 1-3), 113, 114 (bullet point 1), 117 (bullet points 2 & 3) & 118 (bullet points 4 & 5). This policy is important to give local effect to PSCS/PSCSFA policies CP8 & CP10.1.

Policy 5.10: *All development proposals should consider their impact on biodiversity, and include provisions to ensure that overall biodiversity is at least maintained, and where possible enhanced.*

Compliance: This policy is important to give local effect to NPPF paras.109 (bullet points 1-3), 113, 117 (bullet points 2 & 3) & 118. It is also compliant with PSCS/PSCSFA policy CP10.1.

6. Assessment of the compliance of the policies included in section 6 of the Neighbourhood Plan

Policies included in section 6 of the Neighbourhood Plan are:

- 6.1 Employment in Ringmer
- 6.2 Agriculture, horticulture and woodland management
- 6.3 Retail facilities in Ringmer
- 6.4 Services for elderly & disabled people
- 6.5 Education providers
- 6.6 Tourism and leisure activities

The assessment of the compliance of each of these policies is given below.

Policy 6.1: *This Neighbourhood Plan will ensure that there are sufficient suitable employment sites available to support economic growth throughout the planning period. These will include major employment sites, minor sites, retail sites, and sites for service, leisure and tourism provision. This requirement will be met as follows.*

- (a) *By seeking to retain or develop for employment use the major business, retail, service and leisure employment sites listed in appendix C. Conversion to other uses will be resisted unless there is clear evidence that the use of the sites for employment purposes has become unviable or it is necessary to achieve environmental gains. Appendix C includes provision for more than sufficient new employment land in major sites to meet the anticipated level of demand over the plan period. The new sites identified may come forward for development at any stage within the*

Neighbourhood Plan period providing that key infrastructure requirements affecting the site have been met.

(b) By the more intensive use of the existing major employment, retail, service and leisure sites listed in appendix C. Proposals for the more intensive use of these sites, and the upgrading of their facilities, will be supported providing they are in conformity with the general planning policies for Ringmer [section 4].

(c) By supporting proposals for the conversion to employment use of suitable redundant agricultural buildings providing they are in conformity with the general planning policies for Ringmer [section 4].

Compliance: This policy is entirely in compliance with, and seeks to give local effect to, NPPF paras.18-20, 28 & 34. It is also compliant with 2003 Local Plan policies E1(a)-(c) & (e). Policy SP1 of the PSCS & PSCSFA does not envisage a need to plan for additional employment space in Ringmer, but a Neighbourhood Plan is permitted to make provision for a greater level of development than is required by the Core Strategy (Local Plan part 1) and on the basis of the evidence collected in appendix A we are confident that this can be delivered. This policy is thus compliant with policy SP1. It is also compliant with PSCS/PSCSFA policies CP4.1-4.5.

Policy 6.2: *To maintain a productive countryside:*

(a) The best and most versatile agricultural land, and countryside accepted for participation in landscape stewardship schemes, will be retained for productive agricultural use. Proposals for change of use will be permitted only in exceptional circumstances in which there is clear evidence of community benefit that could not be delivered at an alternative site on lower quality agricultural land or land of lower landscape value.

(b) Proposals for new buildings required to improve agricultural production or for better woodland management will be supported providing that they are in conformity with the general planning policies for Ringmer [section 4].

(c) Proposals for farm diversification or that contribute to the development of local food networks will be supported providing that they are in conformity with the general planning policies for Ringmer [section 4].

(d) Proposals to return unproductive land to productive agricultural use, to woodland or to countryside uses of value to the community will be supported. However, the fact that potentially productive land has been neglected or otherwise allowed to become unproductive, will not be considered a positive factor when considering proposals for residential or employment development.

Compliance: This policy is in compliance with, and seeks to give local effect to, NPPF paras.7, 14, 28 & 112. It is compliant with 2003 Local Plan policy CT1(k). Policy 6.2(c) is compliant with PSCS/PSCSFA policy CP5.6.

Policy 6.3: *The core retail area in Ringmer village (employment site EMP1 in appendix C) will be retained for predominantly retail, service, office and leisure uses. Parking facilities in the immediate area are crucial to the viability of this site: the number of spaces should be maintained or increased, and their management should prioritise shoppers and service users. Additional development or redevelopment within this area will be supported providing that it meets the following criteria:*

(a) It maintains or increases the number or quality of employment opportunities in Ringmer.

(b) It improves the variety or quality of retail or other services available in Ringmer.

(c) The traditional “village” appearance of the buildings fronting Lewes Road and the Village Green (within the Ringmer Conservation Area) is conserved.

(d) The development is in conformity with the general planning policies for Ringmer [section 4].

(e) Parking provision is maintained to at least its present level.

Compliance: This policy is entirely in compliance with, and seeks to give local effect to, NPPF para.28. It is also compliant with NPPF para.70. It is also compliant with 2003 Local Plan policy E8(a)

but might be considered more relaxed about the conversion of existing shops to alternative service and business uses than policy E8(b). Policy 6.3(c) is also compliant with 2003 Local Plan policy H5 while policy 6.3(e) is compliant with 2003 Local Plan policy T13. It is also compliant with PSCS/PSCSFA policy CP6 as applied to local retail centres such as Ringmer.

Policy 6.4: *The provision of care and nursing homes within Ringmer should be maintained to at least its 2010 level (prior to the closure of 39 Harvard Road) and additional provision for older residents will be required. Conversion of extant care premises or the site at 39 Harvard Road to residential or other use will be resisted unless equivalent alternative facilities are provided elsewhere in Ringmer village or their redundancy is established. Proposals for new provision for the elderly & disabled will be supported provided that they are within the Ringmer village planning boundary and in conformity with the general planning policies for Ringmer [section 4].*

Compliance: This policy is entirely in compliance with, and seeks to give local effect to, NPPF para.28. It is also compliant with NPPF paras.70 & 162. It is also compliant with PSCS/PSCSFA policy CP2.4.

Policy 6.5: *Further development of Ringmer Community College within its site, and expansion of associated recreational activities onto the adjoining site RG3 allocated for recreational use in the 2003 Lewes District Local Plan, will be supported, subject to the conditions below.*

(a) Sustainable travel planning, including new and safer road traffic and pedestrian access to the College is provided.

(b) Negative impact on the landscape is avoided by any new buildings or car parking being sited behind (south of) the existing College buildings.

(c) Any new parking necessary is accommodated off-road and does not intrude into the wider landscape. New parking should not compromise the strategic Green Gap [policy 5.4].

(d) The proposals are in conformity with the general planning policies for Ringmer [section 4].

Compliance: This policy is compliant with NPPF paras.28, 70 & 162.

Policy 6.6: *Development of employment opportunities relating to tourism and leisure at existing sites will be encouraged, and development of new opportunities at new sites will be supported, providing that they meet the following criteria:*

(a) The new opportunities will generate new employment and/or will provide health-promoting outdoor activities that compensate for any loss of agricultural production.

(b) The development is in conformity with the general planning policies for Ringmer [section 4].

Compliance: This policy is in compliance with, and seeks to give local effect to, NPPF para.28. It is also compliant with 2003 Local Plan policy E10 and with PSCS/PSCSFA policies CP4.6 & CP5.1.

7. Assessment of the compliance of the policies included in section 7 of the Neighbourhood Plan

Policies included in section 7 of the Neighbourhood Plan are:

- 7.1 Total new housing numbers in Ringmer to 2030
- 7.2 Affordable housing numbers and types
- 7.3 Housing for families with a local connection
- 7.4 Distribution of new housing within Ringmer parish
- 7.5 Priorities in selecting residential development sites
- 7.6 Conversion of redundant agricultural buildings to residential use
- 7.7 Scale of new residential developments
- 7.8 Phasing of new residential development to 2030
- 7.9 Sites selected for development within Phase 1, 2010 to 2015

- 7.10 Sites selected for development within Phase 2, 2016 to 2024
- 7.11 Sites selected for development within Phase 3, 2025 to 2030

The assessment of the compliance of each of these policies is given below.

Policy 7.1: *The minimum number of new housing units planned for Ringmer parish in the period 2010-2030 shall be 240. This Neighbourhood Plan will allocate sites for this new housing, specify appropriate timing for their delivery and identify a maximum appropriate scale for individual village developments (policies 7.7-7.11).*

Compliance: This policy is compliant with NPPF paras.7, 14 & 47 (bullet points 1-3). This policy is also compliant with NPPF paras.34, 54 and 95 (bullet point 1). Policy 7.1, in conjunction with policies 7.4, 7.5 and 7.8-7.11, will deliver the number of new Ringmer housing units required by PSCS/PSCSFA policies SP2 and SP5 (a minimum of 220 units), within the time frame required by those policies.

Policy 7.2: *The 240 housing units to be developed in Ringmer to 2030 should include at least 80 affordable units. Affordable housing within market developments should be indistinguishable in design and quality from comparable market housing and should be “pepper-potted” within the development. New housing developed under policy 7.3 below will be included within the affordable housing target. Where new affordable housing is included within a market development the majority of the new units shall be 2-bed or 3-bed houses suitable for young families. In other respects provision of affordable housing sought in new market housing developments will be in accordance with the policies of the local planning authority once the Lewes District Core Strategy (Local Plan part 1) has been approved. If this Neighbourhood Plan is adopted in advance of the Core Strategy, then for the period up to the adoption of the Core Strategy the proportion of new affordable housing sought will be 1 unit for new developments of 3-4 units, 2 units for new developments of 5-7 units, 3 units for new developments of 8-9 units and 40% for new developments of 10 units or more.*

Compliance: This policy is compliant with NPPF paras.50 (bullet point 3), 54, 173 & 174. The 2003 Local Plan policy RES9 seeks a lower percentage of affordable housing than is proposed by the interim proposals above and limits the requirement to sites in Ringmer of 15 units or more. This policy is compliant with, indeed relies upon, policy CP1 of the PSCS (maintained unchanged in the PSCSFA) but seeks to introduce the requirements of policy CP1 for Ringmer development from the date that this Neighbourhood Plan is made, should that be in advance of the date of adoption of the Core Strategy (Local Plan part 1).

Policy 7.3: *A proposal based on the model outlined in appendix E will be developed and tested for suitability for a new form of affordable housing for local people. Such housing will qualify for inclusion in exception site developments.*

Compliance: This policy is compliant with NPPF para.50 (bullet point 3) and para.54. We have confirmed that in the opinion of Lewes D.C. this policy is compliant with 2003 Local Plan policy RES10 and policy CP1 of the PSCS and PSCSFA.

Policy 7.4: *The new housing to be developed in Ringmer to 2030 will be divided between Ringmer village, the Broyleside and the rural areas of the parish as follows. About 160 new units will be accommodated in Ringmer village, including within extensions to the current Ringmer village planning boundary. About 40 new units will be added to the Broyleside, mainly within an extension to the current Broyleside planning boundary. About 40 new units (including affordable housing units on exception sites) will be developed in the rural parts of the parish.*

Compliance: This policy is compliant with NPPF paras.54 & 55. Policy 7.4, in conjunction with policies 7.1, 7.5 and 7.8-7.11, will deliver the number of new Ringmer housing units required by PSCS/PSCSFA policies SP2 and SP5 (a minimum of 220 units), within the time frame required by

those policies. The distribution of the new units within the Neighbourhood Planning area is a matter for the Neighbourhood Plan rather than for the Core Strategy (Local Plan part 1).

Policy 7.5: *Priority in allocating sites for new residential development will be given to redevelopment of previously used land, development on other land within the existing Ringmer village and Broyleside planning boundaries and conversions of existing redundant buildings from other uses. The Ringmer village and Broyleside planning boundaries will be extended to accommodate new housing on greenfield sites only when, and to the extent that, the housing required cannot be accommodated within sites in the first four categories above. Proposals for residential development at other greenfield sites in the countryside will be permitted only for affordable housing on exception sites or when in full accordance with policies in NPPF paragraph 55.*

Compliance: This policy is compliant with NPPF paras.17 (bullet point 8) & 111. Policy 7.5, in conjunction with policies 7.1, 7.4 and 7.8-7.11, will deliver the number of new Ringmer housing units required by PSCS/PSCSFA policies SP2 and SP5 (a minimum of 220 units), within the time frame required by those policies.

Policy 7.6: *Conversion of redundant agricultural buildings to residential use within the parts of Ringmer parish within the SDNP, or conversion of such buildings in areas of the parish outside the SDNP when the development does meet the criteria for permitted development subject to prior approval, will be supported provided that the conditions below are met:*

(a) The buildings make a positive contribution to the landscape, are traditional in form and have useful remaining life; and

(b) The location of the buildings is appropriate for residential use, and the proposal is in conformity with the general planning policies for Ringmer [section 4].

Compliance: This policy is compliant NPPF para.55 and with a 2014 statutory instrument, the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (Amendment and Consequential Provisions) (England) Order, 2014 No.564, that was made in March 2014 and came into effect in April 2014. The section of most relevance to this Neighbourhood Plan is Class MB.

Policy 7.7: *All new proposals for development within or extending the village planning boundaries should respect the village scale. Only developments that respect the village scales appropriate to Ringmer village or the Broyleside will be permitted. If an area of land is identified for development that will accommodate more than 30 units, then it should be developed progressively rather than as a single large estate-style development.*

Compliance: This policy is important for the maintenance of 'village feel' (see key policy 1 above). A very similar policy in the adopted Tattenhall (Cheshire) Neighbourhood Plan was challenged unsuccessfully at judicial review in May 2014 [BDW Trading Ltd (t/a Barratt Homes) & Anor v Cheshire West & Chester Borough Council & Ors [2014] EWHC 1470]. The Ringmer policy, despite its identical choice of scale, was developed entirely independently. A similar policy, with a smaller maximum scale, was included in the Rolleston on Dove (East Staffordshire) Neighbourhood Plan, which was found sound at examination [<http://www.rolleston.org.uk/planning/Rolleston-on-Dove%20NP%20-%20Submission%20Version.pdf>].

Policy 7.8: *The Neighbourhood Plan will aim to ensure that residential development in Ringmer to 2030 is phased to allow as steady a rate of development as is consistent with economic circumstances, the overall delivery of the planned target for new housing and the availability of key infrastructure. A total of 50 new units for development by 2015 (phase 1) are identified in section 7.9 below, including some countryside sites that will not connect to the Ringmer (Neaves Lane) sewage works. A further 120 housing units, identified in section 7.10 below, will be developed in the period 2016-2024 (phase 2). Any unexpected delay in the provision of the key infrastructure required [see sections 9.1, 9.6 & 9.10] will necessarily be matched by a delay in the start of phase 2. Sites for the*

final 70 housing units to be delivered within the period 2025-2030 (phase 3) are identified in section 7.11 below.

Compliance: This policy is considered essential for compliance with NPPF paras.47 (bullet point 4), 176 & 177. This policy is also considered important for compliance with NPPF para.34. Policy 7.8, in conjunction with policies 7.1, 7.4, 7.5 and 7.9-7.11, will deliver the number of new Ringmer housing units required by PSCS/PSCSFA policies SP2 and SP5 (a minimum of 220 units), within the time frame required by those policies.

Policy 7.9: The following sites are allocated for residential development in phase 1(2010-2015):

Sites within the Ringmer village planning boundary (30):

Built, building or with planning permission (5)	
Westbourne, Lewes Road (12)	RES1
East of Little Manor, Vicarage Way (5)	RES2
North-west and south-east of Anchor Field (8)	RES3

Sites within the Broyleside planning boundary (11):

Built, building or with planning permission (2)	
Careys Cowshed, Broyle Lane (3)	RES4
Parcels of land at Broyle Close (6)	RES5

Sites in the rural areas of Ringmer parish (22)

Built, building or with planning permission (15)	
Upper Broyle farmhouse, Broyle Lane (1)	RES6
Downsview Farm, farmhouse and herd manager's cottage (2)	RES7
Holfords Cottages, Norlington Lane (2)	RES8
Red Barn Farm barn conversion (1)	RES9
Lower Mount Farm (1)	RES10

Exception site developments in Ringmer parish (18)

Built, building or with planning permission (4)	
Neaves House Paddock (6)	RES11
Lower Lodge Farm (8)	RES12

The sites are identified in greater detail in appendix F.

Compliance: This policy is compliant with NPPF paras.55, 111 & 115. The exception site proposals in this policy are compliant with 2003 Local Plan policy RES10 and policy CP1 of the PSCS & PSCSFA. However, the proposed allocation of Carey's Cowshed for residential development is not compliant with policy RG4 of the 2003 Local Plan, which identifies this site for community or recreational uses. Policy 7.9, in conjunction with policies 7.1, 7.4, 7.5, 7.8, 7.10 & 7.11, will deliver the number of new Ringmer housing units required by PSCS/PSCSFA policies SP2 and SP5 (a minimum of 220 units), within the time frame required by those policies.

Policy 7.10: The following sites are allocated for residential development in the period 2016-2024. The start of phase 2 in 2016 is contingent on the expected timetable for the delivery of key infrastructure elements [see sections 9.1, 9.6 & 9.10] being met. The planning boundaries for Ringmer village and the Broyleside will be adjusted to include the additional greenfield land shown in map 7.1 and map 7.2 respectively at the start of this phase.

Allocations (above 50) carried forward from phase 1 (31)

Sites within the extended Ringmer village planning boundary (95):

Diplocks Business Park redevelopment as mixed use (12)	RES13
Behind Old Forge Pine (20)	RES14
Bishops Field stages 1 & 2 (50)	RES15
Chapters garden, Bishops Lane (4)	RES16
Sunnymede Garden, Norlington Lane (9)	RES17

Sites within the extended Broyleside planning boundary (30):

<i>Lower Lodge Farm (30)</i>	<i>RES18</i>
<i>Sites in the rural areas of Ringmer parish (14)</i>	
<i>Farmhouse, Upper Lodge Farm (1)</i>	<i>RES19</i>
<i>Broyle Mill Farm barn conversions (3)</i>	<i>RES20</i>
<i>Clay Hill House barn conversion (1)</i>	<i>RES21</i>
<i>Barn complex, Old House Farm (5)</i>	<i>RES22</i>
<i>Rural brownfield site, Ashton Green (2)</i>	<i>RES23</i>
<i>Norlington Farm barn conversion (1)</i>	<i>RES24</i>
<i>Green Lane Farm, barn conversion (1)</i>	<i>RES25</i>

The sites are identified in greater detail in appendix F.

Compliance: This policy is compliant with NPPF paras.55, 111, 112 & 115. The policy that the start of phase 2 should be dependent on the date of delivery of necessary key infrastructure is important in giving local effect to 2003 Local Plan policy ST1. Policy 7.10, in conjunction with policies 7.1, 7.4, 7.5, 7.8, 7.9 & 7.11, will deliver the number of new Ringmer housing units required by PSCS/PSCSFA policies SP2 and SP5 (a minimum of 220 units), within the time frame required by those policies. The policy that the start of phase 2 should be dependent on the date of delivery of necessary key infrastructure is compliant with the detailed provisions of policy SP5 and with policy CP7.4. The inclusion of the Diplock's Business Park redevelopment for mixed use is in accordance with policy 4.2(iii) & (v).

Policy 7.11: *The following sites are identified as the preferred sites for residential development in the period 2025-2030.*

Allocations (above 170) carried forward from phases 1 & 2 (50)

Sites within the extended Ringmer village planning boundary (90):

<i>Caburn Field redevelopment (40)</i>	<i>RES26</i>
<i>Redevelopment of shopping precinct maisonettes (14)</i>	<i>RES27</i>
<i>Busy Bee redevelopment (8)</i>	<i>RES28</i>
<i>Farthings garden, North Road (6)</i>	<i>RES29</i>
<i>Pippins garden development, Bishops Lane (6)</i>	<i>RES30</i>
<i>East of Chapters, Bishops Lane (6)</i>	<i>RES31</i>
<i>Orchard adjacent to Vicarage Close (10)</i>	<i>RES32</i>

Sites within the extended Broyleside development boundary (0)

Sites in the rural areas of Ringmer parish (5)

<i>Barnfield Farm barn conversions (2)</i>	<i>RES33</i>
<i>Plashett Park Farm barn conversions (3)</i>	<i>RES34</i>

The sites are identified in greater detail in appendix F.

If monitoring establishes that development of these preferred sites allocated for phases 1-3 is unlikely to deliver the full number of 240 new housing units by 2030, then the reserve site below will be brought forward in phase 3 to make good the deficiency.

New greenfield site adjoining the Ringmer village planning boundary (up to 30):

<i>Potters Field, Bishops Lane (part) (up to 30)</i>	<i>RES35</i>
--	--------------

Compliance: This policy is compliant with NPPF paras.55, 111, 112 & 115. The flexibility in the starting date for phase 2 is considered essential for compliance with NPPF paras.176 & 177. The 2003 Local Plan policy RES2 allocated Caburn Field for residential development, subject to conditions, for the period 2001-2006, but the allocation did not come forward because the conditions could not be met. Despite this development phase having ended some years ago, policy RES2 is considered a saved and NPPF-compliant policy. Policy 7.11, in conjunction with policies 7.1, 7.4, 7.5 and 7.8-7.10, will deliver the number of new Ringmer housing units required by PSCS/PSCSFA policies SP2 and SP5 (a minimum of 220 units), within the time frame required by those policies. The inclusion of the Busy Bee redevelopment is in accordance with policy CP4.2(iv).

8. Assessment of the compliance of the policies included in section 8 of the Neighbourhood Plan

Policies included in section 8 of the Neighbourhood Plan are:

- 8.1 Community meeting facilities
- 8.2 Ringmer Green & other managed open spaces
- 8.3 Ringmer community swimming pool
- 8.4 Sports pitches and tennis courts
- 8.5 Outdoor play facilities for children
- 8.6 Outdoor facilities for young people & adults
- 8.7 Allotments and the community orchard
- 8.9 Community assets

The assessment of the compliance of each of these policies is given below.

Policy 8.1: *Additional community meeting facilities are required in Ringmer village as the present facilities do not have the capacity to meet identified community needs. Applications to provide additional community meeting facilities will be supported providing that they conform to the general planning policies for Ringmer [section 4].*

Compliance: This policy is important to give local effect to NPPF paras.69 (bullet point 1), 70 (bullet point 1), 73 & 171. It is also compliant with 2003 Local Plan policy RE10 and with PSCS/PSCSFA policies CP7.1-7.2.

Policy 8.2: *Ringmer Green, running up to Ringmer church and the centrepiece of the Ringmer Conservation Area, makes a very substantial contribution to Ringmer's 'village feel'. Its conservation and appropriate maintenance will be given very high priority, and development that compromises its character will not be permitted. Efforts to extend the Ringmer Green Conservation Area to include the row of houses along Bishops Lane, facing the Green, between 'Chapters', Bishops Lane, and Tilekiln will be supported. The other open spaces, widely distributed within the Ringmer planning boundaries also make a significant and positive contribution to the village environment and should be retained unless there is an overwhelming community need for their use for other purposes.*

Compliance: This policy is important to give local effect to NPPF paras.69 & 73 and is compliant with NPPF para.127. The aspects of this policy that relate to the Ringmer Green Conservation Area are compliant with 2003 Local Plan policy H5. This policy is compliant with PSCS/PSCSFA policies CP7.1 & 7.2. It gives local effect to provisions of PSCS/PSCSFA policy CP11 re conservation areas.

Policy 8.3: *The community swimming pool is a valued community asset. Proposals for its further development or to make it more accessible to the community will be supported.*

Compliance: This policy is compliant with NPPF paras.70 (bullet point 1), 73 & 171. It is also compliant with PSCS/PSCSFA policy 7.1.

Policy 8.4: *Land to the east of Ringmer Community College, identified on map 8.1, is allocated to meet the identified shortage of outdoor sports facilities in Ringmer. Any associated built facilities necessary, including changing rooms and parking, should be located on the Ringmer Community College campus or on land immediately adjacent to the College boundary.*

Compliance: This policy is important to give local effect to NPPF para.73 and compliant with NPPF paras.70 (bullet point 1) & 171. It is also compliant with 2003 Local Plan policy RES19, recognises the deficiency of such provision in Ringmer under policy RE1 and reflects the key principles of (but is not in the light of subsequent developments identical in detail to) policy RG3. The policy is also compliant with PSCS/PSCS policy CP7.1, as the site identified is well related to the existing settlements.

Policy 8.5: *While current demand for outdoor play facilities is met by current provision, development of new outdoor play facilities will be supported as required to meet additional demand created by new development.*

Compliance: This policy is compliant with NPPF paras.70 (bullet point 1), 73 & 171. It is also compliant with 2003 Local Plan policies RES19, RE1 & RE2. This policy is also compliant with PSCS/PSCS policy CP7.1.

Policy 8.6: *Proposals to provide new facilities for outdoor activities for young people and adults will be supported provided that they comply with other Neighbourhood Plan policies.*

Compliance: This policy is compliant with NPPF paras.70 (bullet point 1), 73 & 171. The policy is also compliant with PSCS/PSCS policy CP7.1.

Policy 8.7: *The number of allotments available to Ringmer residents will be maintained at a level commensurate with demand. Should new demand make it necessary, additional allotments will be developed at appropriate locations to meet this demand. Proposals to extend the community orchard will be supported provided that they comply with other Neighbourhood Plan policies.*

Compliance: This policy is compliant with NPPF paras.69 & 70 (bullet point 1), 73 & 171. It is also compliant, insofar as it relates to allotments, with 2003 Local Plan policy RE9. The policy is also compliant with PSCS/PSCS policies CP7.1 & CP7.2.

There is no policy 8.8

Policy 8.9: *The community assets listed in appendix H should be retained for the benefit of the community unless their role is replaced by higher quality assets to meet the same need at a suitable alternative location or it can be demonstrated that their continuing in their present role is no longer required by the community or no longer viable.*

Compliance: This policy is entirely in compliance with, and seeks to give local effect to, NPPF paras.28, 70 & 74. It is also compliant with 2003 Local Plan policies ST1, RE1, RE2, RE9 & RE10 and with PSCS/PSCSFA policies CP6, CP7.1-7.2 and CP8.

9. Assessment of the compliance of the policies included in section 9 of the Neighbourhood Plan

Policies included in section 9 of the Neighbourhood Plan are:

- 9.1 The main road network serving Ringmer parish
- 9.2 The local road network within Ringmer parish
- 9.3 Provision of cycleways and safe routes for cycles and mobility scooters
- 9.4 Road safety
- 9.5 Public transport
- 9.6 Primary & nursery education
- 9.7 Secondary & further education and services for young people
- 9.8 Health service provision
- 9.9 Water supply
- 9.10 Drainage & sewerage
- 9.11 Electricity & gas supply
- 9.12 Waste disposal & recycling
- 9.13 Cemeteries
- 9.14 e-communications

The assessment of the compliance of each of these policies is given below.

Policy 9.1: *Substantial Ringmer developments that, individually or in aggregate, will add significantly to traffic flows at Earwig Corner and on the A26 between Earwig Corner and the Southerham roundabout will be deferred until there are firm commitments and realistic plans to mitigate the combined effects on this section of road of additional Ringmer development and the much larger development planned for Lewes, Uckfield & Hailsham.*

Compliance: This policy is considered essential for compliance with NPPF paras.176 & 177, and is compliant with NPPF para.162. It is important in giving local effect to 2003 Local Plan policy ST1. This policy is also compliant with, indeed required by, PSCS/PSCSFA policy CP7.4. Because of the impact of traffic queues from these junctions on air quality in central Lewes this policy is also important for the delivery of PSCS/PSCSFA policy CP9.

Policy 9.2: *New development must avoid creating or exacerbating road safety hazards or congestion at identified pinch-points in the local road network. Effective restrictions to discourage commuter traffic diverting from the B2192 to the A26 via Bishops Lane must be retained.*

Compliance: This policy is compliant with NPPF para.162. It is important in giving local effect to 2003 Local Plan policy ST1 and (as some of the roads concerned lie in the Ringmer Conservation Area) policy H7. This policy is also compliant with PSCS/PSCSFA policies CP7.4 & CP11.iv.

Policy 9.3: *High priority will be given to the completion of the cycleway/mobility scooter route between Ringmer village and Lewes, and to the creation of a new route between the Broyleside and the main service sites in Ringmer village. Employment and leisure sites should be linked to Ringmer village by routes safe for bicycles and mobility scooters. New development should contribute to achieving these objectives.*

Compliance: This policy is compliant with NPPF para.35. It is also compliant with 2003 Local Plan policy T7 and with PSCS/PSCSFA policies CP8.5 and CP13.7(iii).

Policy 9.4: *Proposals for new housing development on the north side of the B2192 or B2124 must either demonstrate that there is a safe pedestrian route for new residents to access services and schools on the south side of the B2192 in Ringmer village, or it must contribute to the provision of a safe pedestrian crossing for this purpose. New housing development or employment development within the Broyleside settlement must, where appropriate, contribute towards the provision of effective traffic calming and road safety improvements on the B2192 or B2124, to ensure that the traffic created by the new development can access the main road system safely.*

Compliance: This policy arises from local road safety needs. It is compliant with 2003 Local Plan policies ST1, T8, T9 & T10 and with PSCS/PSCSFA policy CP13.1.

There is no policy 9.5

Policy 9.6: *Maintenance of a primary school able to accept all Ringmer children of primary school age who wish to attend it is essential to maintain Ringmer's 'village feel'. Significant extension of the school building will be required to accommodate the current population. New residential development must be accompanied by the provision of adequate additional primary school accommodation for the children of new residents. It is also a high priority that pre-school education should be available in Ringmer for all who wish to use it. The co-location of the Ringmer Nursery School with Ringmer Primary School is valued by the community and should be maintained. Expansion of the Primary School should not be at the expense of displacement of the Ringmer Nursery School.*

Compliance: This policy is considered essential for compliance with NPPF paras.176 & 177, and is compliant with NPPF paras.72 & 162. It is important in giving local effect to 2003 Local Plan policies ST1 & RES20. This policy is also compliant with, indeed required by, PSCS/PSCSFA policy CP7.4.

Policy 9.7: *Proposals for developments to facilitate the provision of an effective youth service serving Ringmer and the wider rural area will be supported providing that they comply with the general planning policies for Ringmer [section 4].*

Compliance: This policy is compliant with NPPF para.69 (bullet point 1).

Policy 9.8: *New developments at appropriate locations to meet health service needs that are not currently met in Ringmer will be supported, providing they are in conformity with the general planning policies for Ringmer [section 4].*

Compliance: This policy is compliant with NPPF paras.70 & 162. It is also compliant with 2003 Local Plan policy ST1.

Policy 9.9: *Applications to improve the efficiency and increase the capacity of the Barcombe Mills water treatment works will be supported, providing they are in conformity with the general planning policies for Ringmer [section 4].*

Compliance: This policy is compliant with NPPF paras.99 & 162. It is also compliant with 2003 Local Plan policy ST1.

Policy 9.10: *New development in the areas of Ringmer served by the Ringmer sewage works will be permitted only when effective mains drainage and sewerage systems are provided and when such development can be accommodated within the capacity of the Ringmer sewage works. Development proposals must assess the capacity of the local sewerage system, and where this is insufficient the development will need to provide a connection to the nearest point of adequate capacity, as advised by Southern Water. New development in areas that lie below the 15 metre contour, or have a history of recurrent flooding, unresolved drainage or sewerage problems, will be permitted only when flood protection of the new development is ensured and it can be demonstrated that there will be no adverse effect on the drainage or flood protection of existing development.*

Compliance: This policy is considered essential for compliance with NPPF paras.176 & 177, and is compliant with NPPF paras.103 & 162. It is important in giving local effect to 2003 Local Plan policy ST1 and PSCS/PSCSFA policies CP7.4 & CP12. Given the poor (and declining) water quality of Glynde Reach downstream of the Ringmer WWTW, this is also important in giving local effect to PSCS/PSCSFA policy CP10.4.

Policy 9.11: *The electricity supply to new residential or commercial developments in Ringmer village and the Broyleside, and where practicable to new employment developments in rural parts of the parish, should be provided by underground cables. Where practicable, and especially within the SDNP, existing overhead supply lines should be replaced by new underground cables. Proposals to make mains gas available over a wider area in Ringmer parish will be supported.*

Compliance: This policy is compliant with NPPF para.59.

Policy 9.12: *Proposals for developments necessary to increase the range of materials recycled from the doorstep or from a convenient location in or near Ringmer village will be supported provided there will be no undue negative visual impact or an adverse impact on neighbouring amenities and they are in conformity with the general planning policies for Ringmer [section 4]. To improve sustainability and avoid unnecessary travel contributing to poor air quality in Lewes, new arrangements for the local recycling of garden waste and construction waste should be a priority.*

Compliance: This policy is compliant with NPPF para.162.

Policy 9.13: Land adjoining, and to the south-west of, the new churchyard (map 9.3) is identified as a potential site for a new cemetery and will be protected from alternative uses unless and until an alternative site is acquired.

Compliance: This policy is compliant with NPPF para.28. It is also compliant with PSCS/PSCSFA policy 7.1.

Policy 9.14: Proposals for development necessary to facilitate the provision of first class e-communications facilities throughout Ringmer parish will be supported providing that they are in conformity with the general planning policies for Ringmer [section 4].

Compliance: This policy is entirely in compliance with, and seeks to give local effect to, NPPF paras.42 & 43 and is compliant with NPPF para.162. It is also compliant with PSCS/PSCSFA policy CP4.8.

10. Assessment of the compliance of the policies included in section 10 of the Neighbourhood Plan

Policies included in section 10 of the Neighbourhood Plan are:

Policy 10.1	Design, massing and height of buildings
Policy 10.2	Making good use of available land
Policy 10.3	Materials
Policy 10.4	Housing space standards
Policy 10.5	Pedestrian movement - twittens
Policy 10.6	Hard & soft landscaping
Policy 10.7	Types of residential development
Policy 10.8	Housing for the elderly & disabled
Policy 10.9	Housing for supported living
Policy 10.10	Development briefs
Policy 10.11	Roadside advertising in the countryside

The assessment of the compliance of each of these policies is given below.

Policy 10.1: New development should be of high quality and be designed to fit in with its surroundings. To achieve this, applicants should give careful consideration to the height, massing and scale of a proposal. Houses of more than two storeys are generally inappropriate in a village setting. A degree of design variety within a development is essential but it must take into account the design and detailing of adjacent buildings and the spatial, visual and historical context in which it resides. This is particularly important in Character Areas 1, 2, 4 & 6, and especially within the Conservation Area or near heritage buildings. Exceptional modern design is not precluded. Development applications in Ringmer village should demonstrate how they enhance the visual integration of the village and its open spaces with the enveloping SDNP.

Compliance: This policy is important in giving local effect to NPPF paras.56-61. It is also compliant with 2003 Local Plan policies ST3(a), (b) & (f) and H5 and with PSCS/PSCSFA policy CP11. Restriction of the height of new village development to two storeys is included as policy D2 of the Rolleston on Dove (East Staffordshire) Neighbourhood Plan, which was found sound at examination [<http://www.rolleston.org.uk/planning/Rolleston-on-Dove%20NP%20-%20Submission%20Version.pdf>].

Policy 10.2: Housing developments must make good use of available land. Housing densities outside the PSCS-recommended 20-30 units per hectare will require special justification.

Compliance: This policy is compliant with NPPF para.47 (bullet point 5). It is also compliant with PSCS/PSCSFA policies CP2.3 & CP11.vii.

Policy 10.3: *The preferred external materials for houses are subdued red brick and tile, with roof pitches close to 45 degrees. White render or clapboard and flint walling are also acceptable but should not predominate. Dark grey slates on shallower roof pitches are also acceptable. Materials for other building types should be appropriate for their use and location (see NPPF para.28 for rural employment buildings).*

Compliance: This policy is important in giving local effect to NPPF paras.56-61. It is also compliant with 2003 Local Plan policy ST3(b) and with PSCS/PSCSFA policy CP11.

Policy 10.4: *Housing space standards should be no lower than those set out in the Mid Sussex District Council Dwelling Space Standards Supplementary Planning Document paragraphs 3.1 to 3.5 inclusive, 3.7 and 3.8. Developers should also adopt Secured by Design guidance and build housing for the elderly and disabled to Lifetime Homes standards. Developers are also encouraged to build all other housing to Lifetime Homes standards.*

Compliance: This policy is compliant with NPPF para.59. This policy is compliant with PSCS/PSCSFA policy CP11.v & CP11.vi.

Policy 10.5: *Developments of 20 or more houses should incorporate footpaths and twittens that link to existing village routes or communal spaces as appropriate. Twittens (defined as paved pedestrian ways also suitable for mobility scooter use) should be wide enough to allow two mobility scooters to pass. Roadways with shared pedestrian use e.g. crossings, turning areas, homezones and 20 mph zones, should be defined by paving with brick paviors to roadway specifications.*

Compliance: This policy is important in giving local effect to NPPF para.69 (bullet point 3). It is also compliant with an important aspect of 2003 Local Plan policy T1 and will help to give local effect to PSCS/PSCSFA policies CP13.2 & 13.7(iii).

Policy 10.6: *Development should feature both soft and hard landscaping to enhance its immediate environment, using appropriate native species where possible. The design of new developments should retain existing hedgerows where possible. Development on the edge of the settlements should be screened by tree planting or existing hedgerows or woodland. Planning applications will need to include landscaping details to ensure that this policy is met.*

Compliance: This policy is compliant with NPPF para.109. It is also compliant with 2003 Local Plan policy ST3(g) and important for the local delivery of policy ST11.

Policy 10.7: *Larger developments (20 units or more) should be mixed, but with a high proportion of 2-3 bed houses suitable for young families. They should include some 1-2 bed starter homes and smaller homes built to Lifetime Homes standards for the elderly and disabled. Proposals for sheltered housing, self build schemes, flats or large houses will be considered on their merits.*

Compliance: This policy is compliant with NPPF para.50. It is also compliant with PSCS/PSCSFA policy CP2.1 & CP2.2.

Policy 10.8: *In addition to the requirements of policy 10.7 above, developers will be encouraged to offer additional centrally located accommodation for the elderly and/or disabled that conforms to the general planning policies for Ringmer [section 4].*

Compliance: This policy is compliant with NPPF para.50. It is also compliant with PSCS/PSCSFA policy CP2.1.

Policy 10.9: *Development of an additional supported living facility will be supported if required, providing that it conforms to the general planning policies for Ringmer [section 4].*

Compliance: This policy is compliant with NPPF paras.50 & 69. It is also compliant with PSCS/PSCSFA policies CP2.2 & CP2.4.

Policy 10.10: *Development briefs have been prepared for the development of significant or sensitive sites, including those planned to contain 20 or more houses [see appendix I]. Developers of these sites will be expected to engage with the local community before submitting detailed plans for approval.*

Compliance: This policy is important in giving local effect to NPPF para.66 and is compliant with para.188. The key condition in the development brief proposed for the Caburn Field football pitch is important for giving local effect to NPPF para.74 and 2003 Local Plan policies RE2 & RG1. Individual development briefs are important in delivering compliance with 2003 Local Plan policy ST3, and in particular the development brief for Westbourne is important in delivering compliance with policy H12. They are also important in ensuring delivery of PSCS/PSCSFA policies CP8 & CP10.1.

Policy 10.11: *Advertising signs and roadside locational signs should be designed to harmonise with the village streetscene and to minimise their impact on the rural landscape. Applications for illuminated signs will require exceptional justification. To enhance road safety, locational signs for rural businesses and tourist attractions should be of sufficient size and clarity to enable drivers travelling at normal speed to slow down safely.*

Compliance: This policy is compliant with NPPF para.67. It is also accordance with 2003 Local Plan policy ST29 (which however applies only to conservation areas).

11. Conclusions

11.1 We have identified no policies in this Neighbourhood Plan that are incompatible with the National Planning Policy Framework or other aspects of national planning regulations. Many policies are important for giving local effect to the delivery of NPPF policies in Ringmer.

11.2 The majority of the policies in this Neighbourhood Plan are compliant with the saved NPPF-compliant policies of the 2003 Lewes District Local Plan, and many are important for giving local effect to the delivery of these saved policies in Ringmer. There are however some exceptions.

- NP policy 4.6 & T14 which refers to maximum parking standards
- NP policy 6.3 & E8(b) change of use from retail to service & business
- NP policy 7.2 & RES9 level of affordable housing
- NP policy 7.9 & RG4 Careys Cowshed
- NP policy 7.11 & RES2 Caburn Field
- NP policy 8.4 & RG3 Broyle Gate Farm

It should be noted that it is not clearly identified which of the saved NPPF-compliant policies of the 2003 Lewes District Local Plan should be considered as strategic policies. However, it is not thought that policies RG4 or RES2 could be considered as strategic policies, while the detailed plans of NP policy 8.4 reflect an updated assessment of specific needs within the same overall un-met need for additional sports pitches and facilities in Ringmer. Policy T14 would appear to have been superseded by the more recent East Sussex County Council Guidance (2012), with which policy 4.6 is compliant, and is not amongst the policies proposed for retention in PSCS/PSCSFA appendix 2. Saved 2003 Local Plan policy E8(b) appears to be at variance with current practice in Lewes District, while NP policy 6.3 is in accordance with a series of recently approved Ringmer planning applications, all supported by the Parish Council. Saved 2003 Local Plan policy E8 is not amongst the policies proposed for retention in PSCS/PSCSFA appendix 2. NP policy 7.2 seeks to include in the Neighbourhood Plan, from the date that it is made, the affordable housing policies envisaged by PSCS/PSCSFA policy CP1, even if the Core Strategy (Local Plan part 1) has not at that date been adopted. This is because of evidence of an urgent and un-met need for more affordable housing in Ringmer, and updated District-level evidence on the level of affordable housing that can reasonably be required from new development. Saved 2003 Local Plan policy RES9 is not amongst the policies proposed for retention in PSCS/PSCSFA appendix 2.

11.3 The policies in this Neighbourhood Plan are in compliance with the strategic policies included in the proposed submission Lewes District Core Strategy (Local Plan part 1) in both its Jan 2013 (PSCS) and May 2014 (PSCSFA) versions. No Neighbourhood Plan policies have been identified as incompatible with the strategic policies of the proposed Core Strategy (Local Plan part 1).

12. Abbreviations used

NP Neighbourhood Plan

NPPF The National Planning Policy Framework (April 2012). Available at www.communities.gov.uk/documents/planningandbuilding/pdf/2116950.pdf

PSCS The Proposed Submission Core Strategy for Lewes District, published for consultation in January 2013 by Lewes D.C. and the SDNP Authority, and available on the Lewes District Council website, www.lewes.gov.uk.

PSCSFA The Proposed Submission Core Strategy revised to include a set of focused amendments, published for consultation by Lewes D.C. and the SDNP Authority in May 2014 and available on the Lewes District Council website, www.lewes.gov.uk.

SDNP South Downs National Park

SSSI Site of Special Scientific Interest