



Ringmer Parish Council Neighbourhood Plan “Ringmer to 2030”

Regulation 18 Publication of the examiner’s report and plan proposal decisions - Decision Statement

September 2015

1. Introduction

1.1 Under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended), Lewes District Council has a statutory duty to support and advise communities in the preparation of neighbourhood development plans and to take such plans through the examination and referendum stages. The Localism Act 2011 (Part 6 chapter 3) sets out the Local Planning Authority’s responsibilities under Neighbourhood Planning.

1.2 This statement confirms that the modifications proposed by the Examiner’s Report have been accepted, the draft Ringmer Neighbourhood Development Plan consequently amended; and that this plan may now proceed to referendum.

2. Background

2.1 The Ringmer Neighbourhood Area, covering the entire Parish, was designated by Lewes District Council on 1st October 2012. This area primarily lies within the Lewes District Local Planning Authority area, however the southern section lies within the South Downs National Park Authority (SDNPA) area. The Neighbourhood Area was also designated by the SDNPA at Planning Committee on 13 September 2012. Lewes District Council and the South Downs National Park Authority have an agreement in place to determine which authority provides the support in parishes straddling both planning authorities. This agreement confirms that support will be given by the planning authority where the main centre of population is based and so, as Ringmer village is located outside of the National Park, the decision was made that Lewes District Council would assume responsibility.

2.2 The Ringmer Neighbourhood Plan was submitted to Lewes District Council in August 2014. The Regulation 16 consultation took place between the 22nd September and 3rd November 2014 whereby the Plan was publicised and representations were invited on the Plan.

2.3 Mr Nigel McGurk was appointed by Lewes District Council with the consent of the Parish Council, to undertake the examination of the Ringmer Neighbourhood Development Plan and to prepare a report of the independent examination.

2.4 The Examiner’s Report concludes that subject to making the modifications recommended by the Examiner, the Plan meets the basic conditions set out in the legislation and should proceed to a Neighbourhood Planning referendum.

3. Decision

3.1 The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 requires the local planning authority to outline what action to take in response to the recommendations of an examiner made in a report under paragraph 10 of Schedule 4A to the 1990 Act (as applied by Section 38A of the 2004 Act) in relation to a neighbourhood development plan.

3.2 Having considered each of the recommendations made by the Examiner's Report, and the reasons for them, Lewes District Council in consent with Ringmer Parish Council has decided to accept the modifications to ensure that the Plan meets the basic conditions set out in legislation.

3.3 Table 1 outlines the alterations made to the draft plan under paragraph 12(6) of Schedule 4B to the 1990 Act (as applied by Section 38A of 2004 Act) in response to each of the Examiner's recommendations and the justification for this.

3.4 As a result of the modifications recommended by the Examiner, it was decided that the 'General Planning Policies' section would be removed and the remaining policies not recommended for deletion would be dispersed elsewhere in the Plan. This resulted in policy section and policy number changes which for ease of reference, and to avoid the need to detail individual changes in Table 1, are outlined in Table 2.

3.5 Some of the modifications vary slightly from that proposed by the Examiner, primarily to improve the readability of the Plan. Lewes District Council is confident that these minor variances do not impact on the Plan meeting the basic conditions. Also, some further minor modifications have been made to the Plan and listed in Table 1 which are in addition to the Examiner's recommendations. These are minor modifications to correct mistakes, update information for accuracy and align the Plan with the Examiner's recommendations and have been agreed with officers of Lewes District Council.

3.6 Also, to alleviate concerns raised by LDC at the Regulation 16 consultation, the parish council agreed to revise their Sustainability Appraisal to provide the reasoning for the sustainability appraisal assessments in order to ensure compliance with European obligations¹. No new options were appraised and no new conclusions were drawn and so no further consultation is required; however the thought process behind the assessment scoring, as set out in Sustainability Appraisal submitted to Lewes District in August 2014, has been articulated.

¹ Regulation 12(3) of the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes (SEA) Regulations

Table 1. Recommendations by the Examiner, further modifications agreed by Lewes District Council and Ringmer Parish Council and the justification for these changes.

Policy/Section	Independent Examiner’s Recommended Modification	Justification
Introduction to the Ringmer Neighbourhood Plan		
Legislative Background	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Para 1.1.2 change to “A Neighbourhood Plan must have regard to national policy and be in general conformity with the strategic policies of the development plan for the area. It takes...” <p><i>LDC and RPC have agreed to make the above modification</i></p>	Legislation is fundamental to neighbourhood planning and it is important that it is not misinterpreted.
The Local Planning Authorities for Ringmer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Para 1.3.1 change line 7 to “...and the SDNP Authority is an emerging document. The SDNP Authority...” <p><i>LDC and RPC have agreed to make the above modification</i></p>	Lewes District Core Strategy is an emerging planning document. It is not produced “in parallel” with the neighbourhood plan.
Development of the Ringmer Neighbourhood Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Delete paras 1.4.1 to 1.4.4 inclusive. Replace with a new paragraph “<i>In accordance with legislation, this Neighbourhood Plan is supported by a Consultation Statement and a Basic Conditions Statement. A Sustainability Appraisal has also been produced. These documents and other information are available on the Parish Council website.</i>” <p><i>LDC and RPC have agreed to make the above modification</i></p>	Not relevant or referred to elsewhere.
A portrait of Ringmer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pages 6 to 14 comprise a lot of unbroken text. If this cannot be made more concise, it would be helpful for readers if it can be broken up with photographs or images. <p><i>LDC and RPC have agreed to make the above modification - a number of appropriate images have been dispersed throughout this section.</i></p>	To aid the readability of the plan.
Vision and Four Key Principles		
	No changes proposed	
General Planning Policies for Ringmer		
Policy 4.1 (now policy 4.2)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Delete “Such development...Plan” Delete the final sentence of Policy 4.1 <p><i>LDC and RPC have agreed to make the above modifications</i></p>	To remove reference to a planning document that is the responsibility of another authority and ensure compliance with the basic conditions

		Policies and policy sections have been realigned on reflection of the examiner's recommendations as a whole.
Policy 4.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Delete Policy 4.2 and associated supporting text <p><i>LDC and RPC have agreed to make the above modification</i></p>	Unnecessary repetition
Policy 4.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Delete Policy 4.3 and associated supporting text <p><i>LDC and RPC have agreed to make the above modification</i></p>	To ensure compliance with the basic conditions
Policy 4.4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Delete Policy 4.4 and associated supporting text <p><i>LDC and RPC have agreed to make the above modification</i></p>	To ensure compliance with the basic conditions
Policy 4.5 (now Policy 8.1)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy 4.5, change to "...large-vehicle traffic must demonstrate that they would not result in severe detrimental impacts to the local road system." Policy 4.5, delete the final sentence Delete paras 4.5.1 and 4.5.2 <p><i>LDC and RPC have agreed to make the above modifications</i></p>	<p>To ensure compliance with the basic conditions</p> <p>To remove paragraph of supporting text that is written as though it is a policy</p>
Policy 4.6 (now Policy 8.3)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy 4.6, add, "...visitor parking and cycle parking, in accordance" <p><i>LDC and RPC have agreed to make the above modification</i></p>	To make reference to "cycle parking" and to ensure compliance with the basic conditions
Policy 4.8 (now para 9.11 of VDS)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Delete Policy 4.8. Replace as a paragraph of supporting text. Change final sentence to "...odours, it will be important to protect neighbours..." <p><i>LDC and RPC have agreed to make the above modification</i></p>	This is a general statement not a land use policy.
Policies for Ringmer's Countryside and Heritage		
Policy 5.2 (now Policy 4.3)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Delete "...the integrity of..." <p><i>LDC and RPC have agreed to make the above modification</i></p>	To make the policy clearer and to meet the basic conditions

	<i>Map number in policy wording has changed from 5.1 to 4.2 to reflect the policy re-numbering.</i>	
Policy 5.3 (now Policy 4.4)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Change to “Development that encourages recreational...” <p><i>LDC and RPC have agreed to make the above modification</i></p> <p><i>Map number in policy wording has changed from 5.2 to 4.3 to reflect the policy re-numbering.</i></p>	To make the policy clearer
Policy 5.4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delete Policy 5.4 and supporting text <p><i>LDC and RPC have agreed to make the above modification</i></p>	As worded, the policy was overly onerous and failed to have regard to national policy.
Policy 5.5 (now Community Action 4.5)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delete Policy 5.5 • Replace it as a “Community Action” • Re-word “The Parish Council aspires to maintain Ringmer’s public footpath network and if possible, further improve it through...” <p><i>LDC and RPC have agreed to make the above modifications. The wording has been amended slightly to ensure a consistent approach to community actions throughout the plan but the examiner’s intent has been maintained. The wording is as follows:</i></p> <p><i>“Community Action 4.5: Ringmer parish council will seek to maintain Ringmer’s public footpath network and if possible further improve it through the creation of....”</i></p>	As worded, the policy was not implementable as a land use planning policy.
Policy 5.6 (now Policy 4.6)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Change wording to “The development of accessible natural or semi-natural greenspace, including a community-managed woodland, in Ringmer Parish, will be supported.” <p><i>LDC and RPC have agreed to make the above modification</i></p>	To make the policy clearer and to meet the basic conditions
Policy 5.7 (now Policy 4.7)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delete Para 5.7.1 Replace with “National policy recognises that the provision of a local list of non-designated heritage assets can improve the predictability of the potential for sustainable development. As part of the supporting evidence for the Neighbourhood Plan, a study has assessed and identified twenty buildings considered to warrant inclusion on such a list.” <p><i>LDC and RPC have agreed to make the above modification although “and structures” has been</i></p>	To make the policy clearer and to meet the basic conditions

	<p><i>inserted after “buildings” for accuracy.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy 5.7 re-word “The following buildings are recognised as non-designated heritage assets. The effect of an application on the significance of these will be taken into account in determining the application, with regard to the scale of any harm or loss to, and the significance of, the heritage asset: (INCLUDE LIST OF 20 BUILDINGS HERE, TOGETHER WITH A NOTE REFERENCING APPENDIX B).” <p><i>LDC and RPC have agreed to make the above modification although “and structures” has been inserted after “buildings” for accuracy. Also, Appendix B has now been renamed as Appendix 1 which is referenced in the policy.</i></p>	
Policy 5.8 (now para 4.8)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delete Policy 5.8 <p><i>LDC and RPC have agreed to make the above modification. Supporting text has been retained.</i></p>	The policy does not meet the basic conditions.
Policy 5.9 (now Policy 4.9)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delete “Existing....will be maintained and enhanced, and...” (The rest of the Policy now begins “Where...”) <p><i>LDC and RPC have agreed to make the above modification</i></p>	As worded, the policy was not implementable as a land use planning policy.
Policy 5.10 (now policy 4.10)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Change wording to “Development proposals should consider their impact on biodiversity and where appropriate, include provisions to ensure biodiversity is maintained, or where possible, enhanced.” <p><i>LDC and RPC have agreed to make the above modification although there is a minor grammatical change to the examiner’s wording to improve readability (without changing the intent).</i></p>	To ensure the policy is implementable as a land use planning policy.
Policies for Employment in Ringmer		
Policy 6.1 (now Policy 5.1)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include the names of the allocated sites and plans showing their boundaries below Policy 6.1. Remove references to Appendix C in the Policy. • Remove reference to “providing they are in general conformity with the general planning policies for Ringmer (section 4)” <p><i>LDC and RPC have agreed to make the above modification. It was decided to include the list of</i></p>	To make the policy clearer for decision makers and to meet the basic conditions

	<p><i>sites within the policy wording to ensure consistency with the examiner's recommendations for Policy 5.7 (Heritage).</i></p> <p><i>Site maps have been included and labelled below the policy wording. All references to Appendix C have been removed but some minor additional wording has been included to compensate. One reference to Appendix 2 has been added to direct users to further detail on the sites.</i></p>	
Policy 6.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delete Policy 6.2 and related supporting text <p><i>LDC and RPC have agreed to make the above modification</i></p>	The policy set an onerous requirement which does not have regard to national planning policy.
Policy 6.3 (now Policy 5.2)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delete "Parking facilities...service users." • Delete criteria a) to d) inclusive • Delete e) and re-word as "Development must not result in a reduction in the total number of parking spaces." <p><i>LDC and RPC have agreed to make the above modifications although the formatting of the policy and some minor changes to the examiner's wording have been made to improve the readability and usability of the policy. Also, reference to Appendix C has been removed as the site allocation is now included in the neighbourhood plan.</i></p>	To ensure the policy is clear and implementable as a land use planning policy.
Policy 6.4 (now Policy 5.3)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delete first sentence • Delete second sentence • Last sentence, delete "and in conformity...4)." <p><i>LDC and RPC have agreed to make the above modifications</i></p>	<p>To ensure the policy is clear and implementable as a land use planning policy.</p> <p>The policy set an onerous requirement which does not have regard to national planning policy.</p>
Policy 6.5 (now Policy 5.4)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delete a) and d) and delete second sentence of c) <p><i>LDC and RPC have agreed to make the above modifications</i></p>	To ensure the policy is clear and implementable as a land use planning policy.
Policy 6.6 (now Policy 5.5)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delete b) and end a) at "...new employment." <p><i>LDC and RPC have agreed to make the above modification although the formatting of the policy</i></p>	To ensure the policy is clear and implementable as a land use planning policy.

	<i>and some minor changes to the examiner's wording have been made to improve the readability and usability of the policy.</i>	
Policies for Residential Development in Ringmer		
Policy 7.1 (now Policy 6.1)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delete paras 7.1.1 and 7.1.2 • Delete Para 7.1.3 • Add new paragraph "The Neighbourhood Plan does not seek to limit the amount of housing to be built in the Neighbourhood Area during the plan period. However, it does allocate land for around 240 houses and thus provides for certainty with regards sustainable growth up until 2030. In so doing, a wide range of factors have been taken into account, including information related to the emerging Lewes District Core Strategy." <p><i>LDC and RPC have agreed to make the above modifications although made some minor modifications and included an additional final sentence to read as follows:</i></p> <p><i>"The Neighbourhood Plan does not seek to limit the amount of housing to be built in the Neighbourhood Area during the plan period. However, it does allocate land for around 240 homes and thus provides for certainty with regard to sustainable growth up to 2030. In so doing, a wide range of factors have been taken into account, including information relating to the emerging Lewes District Core Strategy. These 240 new homes are in addition to 40 new homes to be built at the Caburn Field site allocated for residential development as site RG1 of the Lewes District Local Plan"</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy 7.1 re-word "The Neighbourhood Plan allocates land for at least 240 houses. This figure reflects the minimum number of new houses to be developed in the Neighbourhood Area during the Plan Period." <p><i>LDC and RPC have agreed to make the above modifications although the word "houses" has been replaced with "dwellings".</i></p>	<p>Amendments made for accuracy and clarity</p> <p>To set the policy context and clarify that the Caburn Field site (previously allocated as RES26 in the neighbourhood plan but recommended for removal by the examiner) will not count towards the minimum of 240 units planned through the neighbourhood plan.</p>
Paragraph 7.2.2 (now 6.2.2.)	The following amendment was not proposed by the Examiner but has been made to reflect the fact that Appendix A no longer exists.	To reflect that Appendix A no longer exists.

Policy 7.2 (now Policy 6.2)	<p><i>Removal of reference to “Appendix A” in final sentence.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Retain first and fourth sentences, delete the rest of the Policy <p><i>LDC and RPC have agreed to make the above modification</i></p>	To ensure the policy is clear, implementable and meets the basic conditions
Policy 7.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Delete Policy 7.3 and related supporting text <p><i>LDC and RPC have agreed to make the above modification</i></p>	The policy is not implementable nor meets the basic conditions
Policy 7.4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Delete Policy 7.4 and related supporting text <p><i>LDC and RPC have agreed to make the above modification</i></p>	The policy is unnecessary and detracts from the clarity of the neighbourhood plan.
Policy 7.5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Delete Policy 7.5 and related supporting text <p><i>LDC and RPC have agreed to make the above modification</i></p>	The policy is unclear and fails to have regard to national policy. It does not meet the basic conditions.
Policy 7.6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Delete Policy 7.6 and associated supporting text <p><i>LDC and RPC have agreed to make the above modification</i></p>	The policy is unclear and fails to have regard to national policy. It does not meet the basic conditions.
Policy 7.7 (now Policy 6.3)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Para 7.7.1 delete from “It must be recognised...” to end of para. Delete final sentence of Policy 7.7 <p><i>LDC and RPC have agreed to make the above modifications</i></p>	To ensure the policy is clear, implementable and meets the basic conditions
Policies 7.8, 7.9, 7.10 and 7.11 (now Policy 6.4 and accompanying site allocation maps)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy 7.8 delete text and re-word “The allocated housing sites will be split into two phases, with land for around 170 dwellings up to 2024; and land for around 70 dwellings between 2024 and 2030.” <p><i>LDC and RPC have agreed to make the above modification although the wording has been amended slightly to read as follows:</i></p> <p><i>“The new housing sites allocated will be split into two phases, with land for around 170 dwellings up to 2024, and land for around 70 dwellings between 2024 and 2030”</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Phase 1 sites comprise: INCLUDE LISTS FROM POLICIES 7.9 AND 7.10 HERE 	<p>To ensure the policy is clear, deliverable, implementable and meets the basic conditions.</p> <p>The phasing strategy was founded on a flawed basis and has been modified to allow flexibility and to meet the basic conditions.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Phase 2 sites comprise: ...” INCLUDE LIST FROM POLICY 7.11 HERE, BUT DELETE RES26 and RES32 AND REPLACE WITH RES35 <p><i>LDC and RPC have agreed to make the above modification although the wording has been amended slightly to read as follows:</i></p> <p><i>“Phase 1 sites, for development up to 2024, comprise:”</i> <i>“Phase 2 sites, for development between 2024 and 2030, comprise:”</i></p> <p><i>RES26 and RES32 have been removed from the policy.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Show the boundaries of all the sites (Phase 1 and Phase 2) above, excluding those identified as already having planning permission on a Plan or Plans, ensuring that site boundaries are legible. <p><i>LDC and RPC have agreed to make the above modifications</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Delete Policies 7.9, 7.10 and 7.11 Delete paragraphs 7.8.1, 7.9.1, 7.10.1, 7.11.1 Delete Map 7.1 and Map 7.2 <p><i>LDC and RPC have agreed to make the above modifications</i></p>	<p>To remove a non-deliverable site (RES32) as the landowners has stated the site is not available.</p> <p>To remove a site (RES26 – Caburn Field) that is already allocated in the Lewes District Local Plan (2003).</p> <p>Site location maps added to give decision makers clarity.</p>
Policies for Social and Leisure Facilities in Ringmer		
Policy 8.1 (now Policy 7.1)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Delete first sentence and end Policy 8.1 “...will be supported.” <p><i>LDC and RPC have agreed to make the above modifications</i></p>	To ensure the policy is clear, implementable and meets the basic conditions
Policy 8.2 (now Policy 7.2)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Re-word, “Development that harms the character of the village green at Ringmer Green will not be permitted. The development of Ringmer’s other managed open spaces, listed below, 	To ensure the policy is clear, implementable and meets the basic

	<p>will only be permitted where any harm arising is outweighed by community need for their use for other purposes. PROVIDE LIST OF THE MANAGED OPEN SPACES HERE AND REFERENCE APPENDIX A”</p> <p><i>LDC and RPC have agreed to make the above modification, including the listing of the managed open spaces. Minor changes to the Examiner’s wording were made to improve the readability and usability of the policy and reflect the change in name of Appendix A to Appendix 4.</i></p>	conditions
Policy 8.3 (now Community Action 7.3)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Delete Policy 8.3 and replace as a “Community Action” <p><i>LDC and RPC have agreed to make the above modifications. The wording has been amended slightly to ensure a consistent approach to community actions throughout the plan but the examiner’s intent has been maintained. The wording is as follows:</i></p> <p><i>“Community Action 7.3: Ringmer parish council will seek to facilitate the further development of, and increased public access to, this valued community asset”.</i></p>	The policy is unclear and is better suited to a community action.
Paragraph 8.4.2 (now para 7.4.2)	<p>No changes were proposed to this paragraph by the Examiner, however the following amendment has been made to reflect the deletion of Policy 5.4, as recommended by the Examiner.</p> <p>Third sentence - <i>“strategic green gap” has been replaced with “green open fields and countryside”</i></p> <p>Fourth sentence – removal of <i>“and the sports pitches themselves would not compromise the strategic Green Gap (Policy 5.4)”.</i></p>	To reflect the deletion of Policy 5.4 (Strategic Green Gap) as recommended by the Examiner.
Policy 8.4 (now Policy 7.4)	<p>Also, a minor change to the policy was made to reflect the map number change from:</p> <p><i>“map 8.1” to “map 7.1”. The title for the associated map has also been changed.</i></p>	To reflect the re-ordering of the neighbourhood plan sections.
Policy 8.5 (now Policy 7.5)	<p>No changes to this policy/section were proposed by the Examiner, however a minor amendment to paragraph 8.5.1 (now 7.5.1) was made to reflect the re-ordering of the plan as follows:</p> <p><i>“section 8.2” to “section 7.2”</i></p>	To reflect the re-ordering of the neighbourhood plan sections.

Policy 8.7 (now Policy 7.7)	No changes to this policy/section were proposed by the Examiner, however due to the reordering and subsequent renumbering of policies within the plan, the map numbers have reordered and therefore have been amended to the following: <i>“Map 8.2” to “Map 7.2”.</i>	To reflect the re-ordering of the neighbourhood plan sections and re-numbering of the policies themselves.
Paragraph 8.8 (now paragraph 7.8)	The following wording has been inserted to provide consistency with other sections of the neighbourhood plan: <i>“There is no policy 7.8”</i>	To provide consistency with other sections of the neighbourhood plan:
Policy 8.9 (Now Community Action 7.9)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Delete Policy 8.9 and replace as a “Community Action” removing the aspiration for replacement by “higher quality assets” <p><i>LDC and RPC have agreed to make the above modifications. The wording has been amended slightly to ensure a consistent approach to community actions throughout the plan but the examiner’s intent has been maintained. The wording is as follows:</i></p> <p><i>“Community Action 7.9: Ringmer parish council will seek to retain the assets listed in Appendix 5 for the benefit of the community unless their role is replaced by alternative 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”</i></p> <p>Reference to “Appendix H” has been amended to “Appendix 5” in the ‘community action’ and supporting text to reflect the name change.</p>	<p>The policy is aspirational, unclear and is better suited as a community action. It does not meet the basic conditions.</p> <p>To ensure a consistent approach to community actions throughout the plan</p> <p>To reflect the appendix name change</p>
Infrastructure Requirements		
Policy 9.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Delete Policy 9.1 and associated supporting text/Map 9.1 <p><i>LDC and RPC have agreed to make the above modifications.</i></p>	The policy presents a barrier to sustainable development and hence does not meet the basic conditions
Policy 9.2 (now Policy 8.2)	No changes were proposed to this policy by the Examiner, however the following amendment has been made to the map accompanying the policy to reflect the re-ordering of the neighbourhood plan sections and re-numbering of the policies themselves. <i>“Map 9.2” has been changed to “Map 8.1”</i>	To reflect the re-ordering of the neighbourhood plan sections and re-numbering of the policies themselves.
Paragraph 9.5.4	No changes were proposed to this policy by the Examiner, however a minor amendment has	To reflect the re-ordering of the

<p>(now para 8.6.4)</p>	<p>been made to reflect the re-ordering of the neighbourhood plan sections and re-numbering of the policies themselves.</p> <p><i>“There is no Policy 9.5” to “There is no Policy 8.6”</i></p>	<p>neighbourhood plan sections and re-numbering of the policies themselves.</p>
<p>Paragraph 9.6.2 (now para 8.7.2)</p>	<p>No changes were proposed to this paragraph by the Examiner, however a number of minor amendments has been made to reflect that the phasing to the residential site allocations has been changed as recommended by the Examiner and to reflect the re-ordering of policy numbers:</p> <p>The wording in the fourth sentence has been changed from: <i>“plus the need generated by the relatively small amount of new development envisaged in phase 1 (see 7.8 and 7.9)”</i></p> <p>To: <i>“plus the need generated by a small amount of new development in the early part of the plan period”</i></p> <p>Also in the fifth sentence <i>“policy 7.1”</i> has been replaced by <i>“policy 6.1”</i></p>	<p>To reflect the changes made to the phasing of the residential site allocations as recommended by the Examiner</p> <p>To reflect the re-ordering of the neighbourhood plan sections and re-numbering of the policies themselves.</p>
<p>Policy 9.6 (now Policy 8.7 and Community Action 8.7)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remove first two sentences of Policy 9.6 and place in a new supporting text paragraph above the Policy <p><i>LDC and RPC have agreed to make the above modifications. However, the precise amendment that the Examiner recommended would have resulted in repetition and so the final sentence of paragraph 9.6.2 (now 8.6.2) has been modified to ensure that the first two sentences of Policy 9.6 (now 8.7) are reflected in the supporting text.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remove the last two sentences of Policy 9.6 and place in a new “Community Action” paragraph <p><i>LDC and RPC have agreed to make the above modifications. The wording has been amended slightly to ensure a consistent approach to community actions throughout the plan but the</i></p>	<p>To make the policy clearer and to meet the basic conditions. The first two sentences comprise background information and are better served as supporting text.</p> <p>The final two sentences are better suited as a community action.</p>

	<p><i>examiner's intent has been maintained. The wording is as follows:</i></p> <p><i>"Community Action 8.7: Ringmer parish council will seek to ensure that the valued co-location of the Ringmer Nursery School with Ringmer Primary School is maintained, and that expansion of the Primary School will not be at the expense of displacement of the Ringmer Nursery School"</i></p>	To ensure a consistent approach to community actions throughout the plan
Policy 9.7 (now Community Action 8.8)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delete Policy 9.7 and replace as a "Community Action" <p><i>LDC and RPC have agreed to make the above modifications. The wording has been amended slightly to ensure a consistent approach to community actions throughout the plan but the examiner's intent has been maintained.</i></p> <p><i>Also, reference to "general planning policies for Ringmer "Section 4"" has been removed as the section no longer exists and the Examiner recommended deletion of such references elsewhere in his report. The wording is as follows:</i></p> <p><i>"Community Action 8.8: Ringmer parish council will seek to facilitate the provision of an effective youth service serving Ringmer and the wider rural area"</i></p> <p>Also, the following wording has been inserted to provide consistency with other sections of the neighbourhood plan:</p> <p><i>"There is no policy 8.8"</i></p>	<p>This is not a land use policy and is better suited as a community action.</p> <p>To ensure a consistent approach to community actions throughout the plan</p> <p>To provide consistency with other sections of the neighbourhood plan</p>
Policy 9.8 (now Policy 8.9)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Re-word, "...needs that are not currently met..." • End policy at "...will be supported." <p><i>LDC and RPC have agreed to make the above modifications.</i></p>	To make the policy clearer and to meet the basic conditions
Policy 9.9 (now Policy 8.10)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • End policy at "...will be supported." <p><i>LDC and RPC have agreed to make the above modifications. In addition, reference to "appendix 6" has been removed in the final sentence of paragraph 9.9.1 (now 8.10.1).</i></p>	<p>To ensure compliance with the basic conditions</p> <p>For consistency</p>
Policy 9.10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy 9.10, add "...sewage works. New and improved utility infrastructure will be encouraged 	To fully reflect the results of

(now Policy 8.11)	and permitted in order to meet the identified needs of the community. Development proposals must...” <i>LDC and RPC have agreed to make the above modifications.</i>	consultation with Southern Water who are a statutory consultee.
Policy 9.11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Delete Policy 9.11 and associated supporting text <i>LDC and RPC have agreed to make the above modifications.</i>	This policy relates to matters outside the control of the neighbourhood plan.
Policy 9.12 (now Policy 8.12 and Community Action 8.12)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> End Policy 9.12 “...impact on neighbouring amenities.” Move last sentence of the Policy to a new “Community Action” <i>LDC and RPC have agreed to make the above modifications. The wording has been amended slightly to ensure a consistent approach to community actions throughout the plan but the examiner’s intent has been maintained. The wording is as follows:</i> <i>“Community Action 8.12: Ringmer parish council will seek to improve sustainability and avoid unnecessary travel contributing to poor air quality in Lewes by facilitating new arrangements for the local recycling of garden waste and constructions waste”</i>	<p>To ensure the policy is implementable as a land use planning policy.</p> <p>The final sentence is not a land use policy and is better suited as a community action.</p> <p>To ensure a consistent approach to community actions throughout the plan</p>
Policy 9.13 (now Policy 8.13)	No changes were proposed to this policy by the Examiner, however the map number has been amended in the policy wording and map label to reflect the change from the following: <i>“map 9.3” to “map 8.2”.</i>	To reflect the re-ordering of the neighbourhood plan sections
Policy 9.14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Delete Policy 9.14 and associated supporting text <i>LDC and RPC have agreed to make the above modification.</i>	The policy does not provide decision makers with clarity nor meets the basic conditions
Village Design Statement		
9.Ka4.4	No changes were proposed to this policy by the Examiner, however reference to the “strategic green gap” has been removed from this paragraph in line with Examiner’s recommended deletion of Policy 5.4. The first sentence now reads: <i>“Although the Broyleside has distinct edges to green open fields and countryside to the east...”</i>	To reflect the deletion of Policy 5.4 (Strategic Green Gap) as recommended by the Examiner.
Paragraph 10.1 (now para 9.1)	No changes were proposed to this policy by the Examiner, however the following sentence has been removed as Appendix A no longer exists.	For clarity as Appendix A no longer exists.

	<i>“Appendix A provides further background to these policies”</i>	
Policy 10.2 (now Policy 9.2)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy 10.2 delete “...the PSCS-recommended...” (this is not an adopted planning document) <p><i>LDC and RPC have agreed to make the above modification.</i></p>	To ensure the policy offers clarity to decision makers.
Policy 10.4 (now Policy 9.4)	<p>No changes were proposed to this policy by the Examiner, however the policy, as worded, referenced the design guidance SPD of another authority which is an inappropriate approach and offers no certainty for decision makers. The first sentence of the policy has been re-worded as:</p> <p><i>“Development should be of sufficient size to allow occupants to live and eat comfortably together”</i></p>	To ensure compliance with the basic conditions
Policy 10.6 (now Policy 9.6)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy 10.6 Re-word “Where possible, development should...” (landscaping is not appropriate for all development) <p><i>LDC and RPC have agreed to make the above modification.</i></p>	To ensure the policy offers clarity to decision makers.
Policy 10.8 and 10.9 (now Policy 9.8 and 9.9)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policies 10.8 and 10.9, delete the references to “conforms to the general planning policies for Ringmer (section 4)” <p><i>LDC and RPC have agreed to make the above modification.</i></p>	To ensure the policy offers clarity to decision makers.
Policy 10.10 (now Policy 9.10)	<p>No changes were proposed to this policy by the Examiner, however the following change has been made for clarity:</p> <p><i>“Appendix I” has been changed to “Appendix 6”</i></p>	To reflect that Appendix I is now Appendix 6
Policy 10.11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Delete Policy 10.11 <p><i>LDC and RPC have agreed to make the above modification.</i></p>	The control of highway signs is not a matter for a neighbourhood plan.
Paragraph 9.11	<p>Policy 4.8 was recommended for deletion by the Examiner, however the supporting text was still considered useful supporting text and so has been inserted in the Village Design Statement as paragraph 9.11.</p>	To retain useful supporting text

Table 2 – Changes to policy sections and policy numbers subsequent to the Examiner’s recommendations

Pre-examination Section and Policy Number	Post-examination Section and Policy Number
4.1 (General Planning Policies)	4.2 (Countryside and Heritage)
4.2 (General Planning Policies)	Policy Deleted
4.3 (General Planning Policies)	Policy Deleted
4.4 (General Planning Policies)	Policy Deleted
4.5 (General Planning Policies)	8.1 (Infrastructure)
4.6 (General Planning Policies)	8.3 (Infrastructure)
4.7 (General Planning Policies)	4.11 (Countryside and Heritage)
4.8 (General Planning Policies)	9.11 (Village Design Statement)
5.1 (Countryside and Heritage)	4.1 (Countryside and Heritage)
5.2 (Countryside and Heritage)	4.3 (Countryside and Heritage)
5.3 (Countryside and Heritage)	4.4 (Countryside and Heritage)
5.4 (Countryside and Heritage)	Policy Deleted
5.5 (Countryside and Heritage)	Policy Deleted but replaced as a Community 4.5
5.6 (Countryside and Heritage)	4.6 (Countryside and Heritage)
5.7 (Countryside and Heritage)	4.7 (Countryside and Heritage)
5.8 (Countryside and Heritage)	Paragraph 4.8 - Policy deleted but supporting text retained
5.9 (Countryside and Heritage)	4.9 (Countryside and Heritage)
5.10 (Countryside and Heritage)	4.10 (Countryside and Heritage)
6.1 (Policies for Employment)	5.1 (Policies for Employment)
6.2 (Policies for Employment)	Policy Deleted
6.3 (Policies for Employment)	5.2 (Policies for Employment)
6.4 (Policies for Employment)	5.3 (Policies for Employment)
6.5 (Policies for Employment)	5.4 (Policies for Employment)
6.6 (Policies for Employment)	5.5 (Policies for Employment)
7.1 (Residential Development)	6.1 (Residential Development)
7.2 (Residential Development)	6.2 (Residential Development)
7.3 (Residential Development)	Policy Deleted
7.4 (Residential Development)	Policy Deleted
7.5 (Residential Development)	Policy Deleted
7.6 (Residential Development)	Policy Deleted
7.7 (Residential Development)	6.3 (Residential Development)
7.8 (Residential Development)	Deleted and replaced with Policy 6.4 (Residential Development)
7.9 (Residential Development)	Deleted and replaced with Policy 6.4 (Residential Development)

7.10 (Residential Development)	Deleted and replaced with Policy 6.4 (Residential Development)
7.11 (Residential Development)	Deleted and replaced with Policy 6.4 (Residential Development)
8.1 (Social and Leisure Facilities)	7.1 (Social and Leisure Facilities)
8.2 (Social and Leisure Facilities)	7.2 (Social and Leisure Facilities)
8.3 (Social and Leisure Facilities)	Policy deleted but replaced as a Community Action 7.3
8.4 (Social and Leisure Facilities)	7.4 (Social and Leisure Facilities)
8.5 (Social and Leisure Facilities)	7.5 (Social and Leisure Facilities)
8.6 (Social and Leisure Facilities)	7.6 (Social and Leisure Facilities)
8.7 (Social and Leisure Facilities)	7.7 (Social and Leisure Facilities)
8.8 (Social and Leisure Facilities)	No policy
8.9 (Social and Leisure Facilities)	Policy deleted but replaced as a Community Action 7.9
9.1 (Infrastructure)	Policy Deleted
9.2 (Infrastructure)	8.2 (Infrastructure)
9.3 (Infrastructure)	8.4 (Infrastructure)
9.4 (Infrastructure)	8.5 (Infrastructure)
9.5 (Infrastructure)	No policy
9.6 (Infrastructure)	8.7 (Infrastructure)
9.7 (Infrastructure)	Policy deleted but replaced as a Community Action 8.8
9.8 (Infrastructure)	8.9 (Infrastructure)
9.9 (Infrastructure)	8.10 (Infrastructure)
9.10 (Infrastructure)	8.11 (Infrastructure)
9.11 (Infrastructure)	Policy deleted
9.12 (Infrastructure)	8.12 (Infrastructure)
9.13 (Infrastructure)	8.13 (Infrastructure)
9.14 (Infrastructure)	Policy deleted
10.1 (Village Design Statement)	9.1 (Village Design Statement)
10.2 (Village Design Statement)	9.2 (Village Design Statement)
10.3 (Village Design Statement)	9.3 (Village Design Statement)
10.4 (Village Design Statement)	9.4 (Village Design Statement)
10.5 (Village Design Statement)	9.5 (Village Design Statement)
10.6 (Village Design Statement)	9.6 (Village Design Statement)
10.7 (Village Design Statement)	9.7 (Village Design Statement)
10.8 (Village Design Statement)	9.8 (Village Design Statement)
10.9 (Village Design Statement)	9.9 (Village Design Statement)
10.10 (Village Design Statement)	9.10 (Village Design Statement)
10.11 (Village Design Statement)	Policy deleted

Appendix A	No longer necessary² (Open Space section included as Appendix 4)
Appendix B	Appendix 1
Appendix C	Appendix 2
Appendix D	No longer necessary²
Appendix E	No longer necessary²
Appendix F	Appendix 3
Appendix G	No longer necessary²
Appendix H	Appendix 5
Appendix I	Appendix 6

² Evidence documents that were published to inform the examination of the plan, and subsequently no longer needed, can be found at the following link - <http://www.tbds.org.uk/ringmercouncil/page7.html>


4. Conclusion

4.1 The Independent Examiner recommended that, subject to the modifications proposed, the Ringmer Neighbourhood Plan should proceed to referendum. Some minor amendments to the recommended modifications have been made (as described in Table 1). Lewes District Council is therefore satisfied that the Ringmer Neighbourhood Plan meets the basic conditions mentioned in paragraph 8(2) of Schedule 4B to the Town and Country Planning Act and complies with the provisions made by or under sections 38A and 38B of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. The Neighbourhood Plan can now proceed to referendum.

4.2 The Independent Examiner considered the neighbourhood area, as defined on the 1st October 2012 by Lewes District Council and 13th September by the South Downs National Park Authority, to be appropriate for the purposes of holding a referendum. Lewes District Council and SDNPA have taken account of this advice and therefore the neighbourhood area is the same as the referendum area.

4.3 The referendum is due to be held on Thursday 12 November 2015 which poses the following question:

'Do you want Lewes District Council and the South Downs National Park Authority to use the Neighbourhood Plan for Ringmer Parish to help it decide planning applications in the neighbourhood area?'



Signed.....

Nazeya Hussain

Director of Business Strategy and Development

Date – 18/09/2015



Signed.....

Councillor Tom Jones

Portfolio Holder for Planning

Date – 18/09/ 2015

Decision published on 18 September 2015