

Crowhurst Neighbourhood Plan Review

Submission Version 2018 – 2028

Report of Examination

February 2025

Undertaken for Rother District Council with the support of Crowhurst Parish Council on the submission version of the revised plan.



Independent Examiner:

Liz Beth BA (Hons) MA Dip Design in the Built Environment MRTPI

Contents

Summary	3
1. Introduction and Background.....	4
1.1 Neighbourhood Development Plans	4
1.2 Independent Examination	5
1.3 Planning Policy Context.....	7
2. Plan Preparation and Consultation	8
2.1 Pre-submission Process and Consultation.....	8
2.2 Regulation 16 Consultation Responses.....	9
3. Compliance with the Basic Conditions Part 1	10
4. Compliance with the Basic Conditions Part 2: National Policy and the Development Plan	12

Abbreviations used in the text of this report:

The Crowhurst Neighbourhood Development Plan Review is referred to as ‘the Review Plan’ or ‘CNDP-Review’.

The Crowhurst NDP made in 2019 is abbreviated to ‘CNDP2019’.

Crowhurst Parish Council is abbreviated to ‘Crowhurst PC’ or referred to as the ‘Qualifying Body’.

Rother District Council is abbreviated to ‘RDC’. They are the Local Planning Authority ‘LPA’.

The National Planning Policy Framework Dec2023 is abbreviated to ‘NPPF’.

The National Planning Practice Guidance is abbreviated to ‘NPPG’.

The Rother Local Plan Core Strategy 2014 is abbreviated to ‘RLPCS’.

The Rother Development and Site Allocations Local Plan is abbreviated to ‘DSALP’.

Regulations 14 and 16 are abbreviated to ‘Reg14’ and ‘Reg16’ respectively.

Local Green Space is abbreviated to ‘LGS’.

Summary

- I have undertaken the examination of the Crowhurst Neighbourhood Plan Review (CNDP Review) during January and February of 2025 and detail the results of that examination in this report.
- The Review of the CNDP has made material changes, but they are not so significant to require a referendum re-run.
- Crowhurst Parish Council have undertaken extensive consultation with residents and stakeholders on this Review, and it complies with legislative requirements. The development plan for Rother District continues to provide a strategic policy framework and a new local plan is in progress.
- I have considered the comments made at the Regulation 16 Publicity Stage, and where relevant these have to an extent informed some of the recommended modifications.
- Subject to the modifications recommended, the Plan meets the basic conditions and may be made the replacement Review Plan of the CNDP2019.

Acknowledgements: Thanks to Local Authority and qualifying body staff for their assistance with this examination. My compliments to the local community volunteers and Rother District Council, who have again engaged productively and effectively with the neighbourhood plan process.

1. Introduction and Background

1.1 Neighbourhood Development Plans

1.1.1 The Localism Act 2011 empowered local communities to develop planning policy for their area by drawing up neighbourhood plans. For the first time, a community-led plan that is successful at referendum becomes part of the statutory development plan for their planning authority.

1.1.2 Giving communities greater control over planning policy in this way is intended to encourage positive planning for sustainable development. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) para 29 states that:

“neighbourhood planning gives communities the power to develop a shared vision for their area. Neighbourhood Plans can ... help to deliver sustainable development”.

Further advice on the preparation of neighbourhood plans is contained in the Government’s Planning Practice Guidance website:

<http://planningguidance.planningportal.gov.uk/blog/guidance/neighbourhood-planning/>

1.1.3 Neighbourhood plans can only be prepared and reviewed by a ‘qualifying body’, and in Crowhurst that is the Crowhurst Parish Council (PC). Drawing up the original Neighbourhood Plan was undertaken by the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group, comprised of parish councillors and local residents.

1.1.4 Neighbourhood Plans, like other development plans need to be regularly reviewed and revised if necessary. This examination is considering a revision to the original Crowhurst Neighbourhood Development Plan, made after a successful referendum on the 8th July 2019. Not every revision of a neighbourhood plan needs to repeat all the formal procedures required for the original Plan. The NPPG (ID: 41-106-20190508) sets out a hierarchy of three potential routes a review may take. They are as follows:

- Minor and non-material changes including errors; the LPA may make these changes with the agreement of the Qualifying Body.
- Material modifications which do not change the nature of the Plan significantly. In this case consultation and an examination are required but no referendum.
- Where changes and modifications to the original Plan are so significant that they change the nature of the Plan, legislation requires that the full neighbourhood plan process set out in legislation is run again, with an examination and new referendum.

1.1.5 I consider the proposed modifications to the CNDP-Review to be material but not significantly altering the nature of the original neighbourhood plan. The review incorporates a new Design Guide for the Parish, designates a small new Local Green Space, makes minor amendments to existing policies and introduces two new policies. The LPA and Qualifying Body (Crowhurst Parish Council) agree with this assessment. No referendum will be required therefore and this examination will consider if the proposed modifications comply with the Basic Conditions and other legislative requirements before making a decision on whether or not the Plan may be revised and the CNDP-Review made.

1.2 Independent Examination

1.2.1 Once Crowhurst PC had revised their neighbourhood plan and consulted on it, they submitted it to Rother District Council (RDC). After publicising the plan with a further opportunity for comment, RDC were required to appoint an Independent Examiner, with the agreement of Crowhurst PC to that appointment.

1.2.2 I have been appointed to be the Independent Examiner for this Plan. I am a chartered Town Planner with over thirty years of local authority and voluntary sector planning experience in development management, planning policy and project management. I have worked with communities on planning issues throughout my career, and supported many groups producing neighbourhood plans. I have been appointed through the Neighbourhood Plan Independent Examiners Referral Service (NPIERS). I am independent of any local connections to Crowhurst and RDC, and have no conflict of interest that would exclude me from examining this plan.

1.2.3 As the Independent Examiner I am required to produce this report and recommend either:

- (a) That the revised neighbourhood plan as modified complies with the Basic Conditions and other legislative requirements and the CNDP Review should be made and published by the LPA.
- (b) That the Review Plan is not made as it does not meet the necessary legal requirements.

1.2.4 As before, the revised Plan is legally required to meet the 'Basic Conditions', which I consider in sections 3 and 4 below. The revised Plan also needs to continue to meet the following requirements under Paragraph 8(1) of Schedule 4B to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990:

- It has been prepared and submitted for examination by a qualifying body;
- It has been prepared for an area that has been properly designated by the Local Planning Authority;
- It specifies the period during which it has effect;
- It does not include provisions and policies for excluded development;
- It does not relate to land outside the designated neighbourhood area.

The CNDP Review complies with the requirements of Paragraph 8(1). The Neighbourhood Area was designated on the 24th November 2015 by RDC. The Plan does not relate to land outside the designated Neighbourhood Area. It specifies the period during which it has effect as 2018-2028 and has been submitted and prepared by a qualifying body and people working to that qualifying body. With the implementation of modification 6 it does not include policies about excluded development; effectively mineral and waste development or strategic infrastructure.

1.2.5 I made an unaccompanied site visit to Crowhurst to familiarise myself with the area and visit relevant sites and areas affected by the revised policies. This examination has been dealt with by written representations.

1.3 Planning Policy Context

1.3.1 The Development Plan for Crowhurst, not including documents relating to excluded mineral and waste development, is comprised of the saved policies from the Rother District Local Plan 2006; the Rother Local Plan Core Strategy 2014 (RLPCS); the Development and Site Allocations Local Plan (DSALP) 2019 and the CNDP. All policies in the RLPCS are considered strategic for the purposes of neighbourhood planning, except for those policies superseded by policy in the DSALP. In the DSALP most policies are non-strategic, with the exception of Policies DHG1; DHG2; DEC3; DEN3 and HAS1.

1.3.2 The National Planning Policy Framework 2023 (NPPF) is still relevant for this examination, as the review Plan was submitted to the LPA before the transition date for submission of 12th March 2025, specified in the December 2024 revision of the NPPF Annex 1 para 239. The NPPF sets out government planning policy for England, and the National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) website offers guidance on how this policy should be implemented.

1.3.3 During my examination of the CNDP Review I have considered the following documents:

- National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2023
- National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) 2014 and as updated
- Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended)
- Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004
- The Localism Act 2011
- The Neighbourhood Planning Regulations 2012 (as amended)
- Submission version Crowhurst Neighbourhood Development Plan Review (CNDP Review)
- Crowhurst NDP made July 2019 (CNDP2019)
- The Basic Conditions Statement submitted with the CNDP Review
- The Consultation Statement submitted with the CNDP Review
- The Strategic Environmental Assessment Screening Decision for the CNDP Review
- Neighbourhood Area Designation (map)
- Rother Local Plan Core Strategy (RLPCS) Adopted September 2014
- Development and Site Allocations Local Plan Rother DC Adopted December 2019
- Rother District Local Plan 2020 – 2040 Regulation 18 version April 2024
- Climate Strategy of Rother District Council
- High Weald National Landscape Authority Management Plan 2024-29
- Representations received during the publicity period (reg16 consultation)

2. Plan Preparation and Consultation

2.1 Pre-submission Process and Consultation

2.1.1 Crowhurst is a village in East Sussex located within Rother District. It lies to the north west of Hastings and north of St Leonards. The parish is mainly rural in nature, and most of the village and northern half of the parish is within the High Weald National Landscape (AONB).

2.1.2 A Design Guide Task Group was set up just after the original Plan was made, with the intention of drawing up a Design Guide that could be incorporated into a review of the original Plan at a later date. In February 2023 this group was renamed to make it explicit that it had become a neighbourhood plan review group.

2.1.3 The Consultation Statement sets out the nature and form of consultation prior to the formal Reg14 six week consultation. There was a village wide consultation on the Draft Design Guide, with a mailing to all residents. Updates were given in the monthly Crowhurst News village Magazine.

2.1.4 As required by regulation 14 of the Neighbourhood Planning Regulations 2012, the formal consultation on the pre-submission Draft CNDP Review ran from the 13th November 2023 to the 12th January 2024 – extended beyond the statutory requirement of six weeks due to the Christmas and New Year holiday falling within the consultation period. The consultation was advertised with a flyer delivered to all households, and advertised in the village magazine, with local posters and online. Events were held in the Parish to gather comments, and representations could be made online or by paper copy. Statutory bodies were notified of the consultation by email and invited to comment.

2.1.5 Representations were received from individuals and several organisations during the Reg14 consultation period, including the LPA and County Council and Southern Water. Historic England welcomed the review. I am satisfied that due process has been followed during the consultation undertaken on the Plan. The record of comments and objections received during the Reg14 consultation shows that these were properly considered, and where appropriate resulted in amendments to the plan to accommodate points raised.

2.1.6 As required, the amended plan, together with a Basic Conditions Statement, a Consultation Statement, The Environmental Screening Opinion and a plan showing the neighbourhood area was submitted to Rother District Council (RDC) on the 11th October 2024.

2.2 Regulation 16 Consultation Responses

2.2.1 RDC undertook the Reg 16 consultation and publicity on the CNDP Review for six weeks, from the 25th October to the 6th December 2024. Thirteen representations were received during this consultation, five from various sections of East Sussex County Council. Of these five responses, three were supportive of the Plan Review. The Highways and Rights of Way sections of the County Council made some suggestions for changes that are not Basic Condition issues and thus I cannot consider them in this examination. Four organisations wrote to support the Plan review, and four statutory bodies had no specific comments to make on this Plan but offered general guidance.

2.2.2 I am specifically limited by legislation to correcting with recommended modifications the Plan's compliance with the Basic Conditions and other legal requirements. Comments in the Reg16 responses suggesting significant additions are not something this examination is authorised to consider. Notification of minor corrections needed to the text are very useful, but again cannot be the subject of any modifications I recommend. The LPA will be aware however that it is authorised to correct minor errors that may have been missed so far [Town and Country Planning Act 1990 Schedule 4B section 12(6)].

3. Compliance with the Basic Conditions Part 1

3.1 General legislative requirements of the 1990 Town and Country Planning Act (TCPA) other than the Basic Conditions are set out in paragraph 1.2.4 above. The same section of this report considers that the CNDP Review has complied with these requirements. What this examination must now consider is whether the Plan complies with the Basic Conditions, which state it must:

- Have regard to national policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State;
- Contribute to the achievement of sustainable development;
- Be in general conformity with the strategic policies of the development plan for the area;
- Be compatible with and not breach assimilated obligations and comply with human rights law; and
- Not breach the requirements of Chapter 8 of Part 6 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (*prescribed basic condition since December 2018*).

3.2 The Basic Conditions Statement considers how the Plan and its policies promote the social, economic and environmental goals of sustainable development. The policies are assessed individually for their impact on sustainable development, and demonstrated to be positive or neutral in each case. I accept that the Plan does contribute to sustainable development in line with the Basic Conditions.

3.3 It is a requirement of the Basic Conditions that a neighbourhood plan is compatible with and does not breach 'assimilated obligations' which refers to legal requirements that have followed on from EU obligations. This, and the 2018 Basic Condition in effect cover the need to comply with environmental protection legislation. The relevant legislation is the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004 and the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017.

3.4 A screening opinion has been issued by the LPA which considers whether Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) and Habitat Regulations Assessment (HRA) are required to be redone for this Review Plan. These environmental requirements are incorporated into UK law by the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004 and the Conservation of Habitats etc Act 2017. The Screening opinion states that:

- SEA and HRA outcomes are not considered to be altered by the changes in the Review Plan and thus a review of the 2018 SEA and HRA Reports is not required.

I accept this assessment; the changes in the CNDP Review are material but not so significant that the nature of the Plan has significantly changed, and the CNDP Review complies with the Basic Conditions regarding environmental protections.

3.4 The CNDP Review in my view complies with Human Rights Legislation. It has not been challenged with regard to this, and the consultation statement showed that the need to consult with a wide cross-section of the community was appreciated as contributing to ensuring people with protected characteristics and their needs were considered.

4. Compliance with the Basic Conditions Part 2: National Policy and the Development Plan

4.1 The final and most complex aspect of the Basic Conditions to consider is whether the CNDP Review meets the requirements as regards national policy and the development plan. This means firstly that the revised Plan must still have regard to national policy and guidance, which for this neighbourhood plan is the NPPF 2023 and the NPPG. Secondly the CNDP review must be in general conformity with the strategic policies of the development plan. The phrase ‘general conformity’ allows for some flexibility. If I determine that the Review Plan as submitted does not comply with the Basic Conditions, I may recommend modifications that would rectify the non-compliance.

4.2 The Review Plan and its policies are considered below in terms of whether they comply with the Basic Conditions as regards national policy and the development plan. If not, then modifications required to bring the plan into conformity are recommended. I have indicated where policies are carried over from the previous CNDP2019 with little or no change to text, and confirmed that they still comply with the Basic Conditions.

Modifications are boxed in this report, with text to *remain in italics*, new text **highlighted in Bold** and text to be deleted ~~shown but struck through~~. Instructions for alterations are underlined.

4.3 The layout and presentation of the document is very good. There are some additional corrections to the text needed to update the CNDP2019 to be consistent with the CNDP Review requirements however. Section 1.1 is referring to the original process of drawing up the CNDP2019, and needs to be updated. Section 1.3 needs to be updated with regard to the relevant NPPF. It is the December 2023 version that is relevant for this Review Plan, and the transition arrangements confirming this are in the NPPF2024 Annex 1 para 239. Paragraph 1.4.2 of the Review Plan needs amending – this Review Plan will not need to go to another referendum. Paragraph 1.5.1 needs to add ‘remain’ at the end. Section 1.7 refers to a requirement for SEA, which is not relevant for the Review Plan. This needs to be corrected with reference to the recent screening opinion from the LPA that decided the changes were not significant enough to require the 2018 SEA and HRA to be redone. In Para 1.9.1 the reference to ‘this Plan’ is confusing, as it is in fact referring to the original Plan (CNDP2019). It is quite acceptable to keep text explaining the original process for the CNDP2019, but it needs to be clear that this document is the Review Plan and not the original plan. Some of these alterations are not significant enough to require alteration in order that the Review Plan complies with the Basic Conditions. However in the interests of clarity and accuracy I am

recommending that the amendments noted in this paragraph of my report are implemented, and that other updates needed are also amended in the interests of accuracy. Where the LPA and Qualifying Body agree changes needed for accuracy, they may be made without further recommendation from myself as examiner.

Modification 1: The text of the Review Plan to be amended as set out and explained in paragraph 4.3 of this 2025 examination report of the CNDP Review. Amendments also to be made as required elsewhere to make it clear when the original CNDP is referred to, and when it is the current Review document referred to.

4.4 Policy CS1 – Development Boundaries: This Policy is unchanged from the CNDP 2019 and complies with the Basic Conditions.

4.5 Policy CE1 - Landscape Character: The new Design Guide has been referenced in the text and the policy still complies with the Basic Conditions.

4.6 Policy CE2 - High Weald National Landscape: This Policy is unchanged from the CNDP 2019 and complies with the Basic Conditions.

4.7 Policy CE3 – Biodiversity: This Policy has been strengthened in line with Rother DC's Climate Strategy and a draft policy in the emerging new Local Plan (Policy GTCV8). A minimum of 10% net gain in biodiversity for new development is required by legislation (Sch7A TCPA1990). The Climate Strategy of Rother DC states that a 20% net gain of biodiversity will be aimed for in new development if the emerging Local Plan permits this. The draft policy GTCV8 in the emerging Local Plan states that "All qualifying development proposals must deliver at least a 20% measurable biodiversity net gain". However the explanatory text for this policy (para 3.49) states that the evidence base for this higher requirement is currently being collated, and at present the emerging Local Plan does not have much weight as there is another consultation stage required before the Plan is submitted for examination.

4.7.1. I do not consider therefore that at present the evidence for raising the minimum requirement for biodiversity net gain so significantly is in place, nor is there a strategic policy justification for the CNDP Review Policy of a 20% requirement. Given the stated intent of the LPA to raise the national minimum level locally, it is acceptable to promote this higher level. In order that Policy CE3 in the CNDP Review complies with the Basic Conditions and is in general conformity with national policy I recommend it is amended as shown in Modification 2.

Modification 2: The first sentence of Policy CE3 to be amended as follows:

“Any new development will be required to demonstrate that there will be a net gain in biodiversity of the site of at least ~~20%~~ 10% or the higher of this and any subsequent strategic policy or regulations (bar allowed exception sites), shown using the Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) metric....”

Para 4.2.5.3 to be amended to state that the minimum is 10%, but advise that 20% is encouraged and future Local Plan policy may require this.

4.8 **Policy CE4 – Natural Features:** The policy has added ‘watercourses’ to the original list of natural features for clarity, the list was not limited to features specifically mentioned and the policy still complies with the Basic Conditions.

4.9 **Policy CE5 – Blue Infrastructure:** Criteria 1 of the policy needs to be clear that it is flood zones 2 and 3 referred to. The new sentence added to the policy in this review at the end of this criteria is at present too vague and all encompassing. There will be development that is either too small scale (a porch for example), or not near enough a watercourse to be a significant pollution risk. Monitoring water quality during construction is a novel planning requirement, but not in some circumstances unreasonable. The South East Rivers Trust project is encouraging monitoring of watercourses by volunteers and there is an active group in Crowhurst. Monitoring after development is not a reasonable requirement of a development and would need to be undertaken by other agencies if considered necessary. In order that Policy CE5 complies with the Basic Conditions and has paid due regard to government guidance (NGGP ID: 41-005-20190509) that requires neighbourhood plans to not undermine deliverability of development, I recommend Policy CE5 Criteria 1 is amended as shown in Modification 3 below.

Modification 3: Criteria 1 of Policy CE5 to be amended as follows:

*"1. No development will be permitted within identified flood zone areas **2 and 3**, see CNDP Map 4, unless it can meet the relevant requirements of the other relevant policies of the development plan and the Planning Practice Guidance (or any subsequent guidance thereafter). ~~Any~~ **Where appropriate, development that is allowed within, or immediately adjacent to, floodzones 2 and 3** ~~must~~ **will be required to monitor water quality of nearby watercourses during and after** development to ensure no pollution is caused;"*

4.10 Policy CE6 – Dark Skies: This is a new policy, and in line with the aspirations and vision of the High Weald National Landscape Authority. The policy complies with the Basic Conditions.

4.11 Policy CF1 – Community and Recreational Facilities: Support for a community area and allotments should proposals be forthcoming has been added, and the policy still complies with the Basic Conditions.

4.12 Policy CF2 – Rights of Way and Recreation: The policy has added a requirement for accessibility for all ages in criteria 3. This may not always be possible, but the policy 'encourages' rather than requires new facilities, and I find the policy with this aspiration still complies with the Basic Conditions.

4.13 Policy CF3 – Local Green Space (LGS): A new LGS has been designated with the owner's support at Muriel's Meadow. The site is situated a little outside of the main settlement, but Crowhurst is a dispersed settlement and the site is linked to the village by the footpath network. I accept that the new designation complies with the requirements of the NPPF and thus the Basic Conditions as well. Map 3 in Appendix 1 will need to be amended to show Muriel's Meadow as designated, but this can be done as an accuracy update.

4.14 Policy CB1 - Design: This policy has been re-written to incorporate the new Crowhurst Design Guide a very useful addition to the NDP evidence base. Criteria 8 has been added to the policy, and just requires that all other policies in the NDP be followed. This does not need stating, it is understood. There are other instances of this reference to following all policies in the Plan. When specific policies or other guidance are mentioned as well, I regard it as allowable as there is a clarity benefit. However the bald statement of fact is contrary to the NPPF (para 16f) in that it does not serve any purpose.

4.14.1 Criteria 7 has added a reference to “...overbearing impacts including all forms of pollution by following County Council guidance”. This wording is muddled and lacks clarity. Policy OSS4 in the RLPCS provides for the protection of amenities of adjoining properties, and reference to ‘all forms of pollution’ in this policy does not add any additional clear guidance to a prospective developer. As explained in para 4.14 above, it is understood that County Council guidance needs to be followed. In order that the NPPF (para 16f) is followed in this criteria, and the Basic Conditions complied with, I recommend that Policy CB1 is amended as shown in Modification 4.

Modification 4: Criteria 7 of Policy CB1 to be amended as follows:

“...7 Development should not adversely affect the amenity of neighbouring properties in terms of massing, overlooking, loss of light or privacy or other overbearing impacts. ~~including all forms of pollution by following County Council guidance;~~”

Criteria 8 to be deleted.

4.15 Policy CB2: Heritage: A new criteria has been added advising that Historic England advice should be followed, particularly with regard to energy efficiency improvements. The policy still complies with the Basic Conditions.

4.16 Policy CH1 - Land adjoining Station Rd and Forewood Lane: This site allocation has added an encouragement to provide over 40% affordable dwellings, reference to the new Design Guide and provided some further guidance on the site plan. Criteria 10 comes close to just being repetition, and contrary to policy in the NPPF (para16f). However I consider that where a specific policy in the Development Plan is referred to, there is a clarity reason to include a reference to complying with

other policy in the Development Plan, something that is otherwise understood and redundant. The policy still complies with the Basic Conditions.

4.17 Policy CH2 - Land South of Forewood Rise: Changes to this policy are similar to those made to the allocation in Policy CH1 and the policy still complies with the Basic Conditions.

4.18 Policy CH3 - Land adjacent to the Station Car Park: The policy has included reference to the new Design Guide, and still complies with the Basic Conditions.

4.19 Policy CC1 - Economic Sustainability: Minor textual changes for accuracy and increased clarity have been made, together with reference to the LPA's recent Climate Strategy. The policy still complies with the Basic Conditions.

4.20 Policy CC2 - Infrastructure: Criteria 5 in this policy has been moved from the previous CNDP2019 Design Policy and placed in this infrastructure policy. However the Building Regulations (Part S) now cover the provision of electric vehicle charging points, and this criteria is therefore now redundant and not serving a clear purpose contrary to the NPPF (para16f). In order that Policy CC2 complies with the Basic Conditions and pays due regard to government policy, I recommend it is amended as shown in Modification 5.

Modification 5: <u>Criteria 5 to be deleted and following criteria to be re-numbered as needed.</u>
--

4.21 Policy CC3 - Renewables: This is a new policy offering useful guidance on acceptable renewable energy projects. The specific guidance on particular technologies that follows the first 5 criteria cannot be referred to as "requirements" however. There are other regulations besides planning governing some of these aspects, and waste is an excluded development from neighbourhood plans. In the case of criteria 2, the requirement for any scheme to provide community benefits will not always be appropriate, or acceptable in law. In order that Policy CC3

complies with the Basic Conditions and pays due regard to government guidance with regard to the permitted scope of a neighbourhood plan (NPPG ID: 41-004-20190509) I recommend it is amended as shown in Modification 6.

Modification 6: Policy CC3 to be amended as follows:

*To help mitigate the causes and effects of climate change, ~~the Parish welcomes various~~ small-scale and community renewable energy initiatives **that comply with the following requirements and guidelines are supported**. These include solar panels and farms, wind turbines, farm-scale anaerobic digesters (ADs), air source heat pumps and ground source heat pumps. ~~While the Parish generally supports renewable energy, adherence to certain criteria is necessary;~~*

~~General Requirements for~~ **Renewable Energy Projects should:**

- 1. Improve biodiversity through measures such as wildflower meadows, enhanced native planting and provisions for bird/bat boxes and wildlife friendly habitats;*
- 2. **Where possible and appropriate**, provide ongoing benefits to the community or be community led;*
- 3. Avoid adverse environmental impacts on Ancient Woodland, protected areas and species, including noise, water, air and light pollution;*
- 4. ~~Should~~ not negatively affect important areas and views as indicated in CNDP Map 2;*
- 5. ~~Should~~ preserve and seek to enhance the landscape and scenic beauty of the High Weald National Landscape.*

~~Specific requirements for~~ **Guidelines for specific technologies:**

.... Anaerobic digesters:

- 1. ADs should be situated within existing farmsteads and appropriately screened to minimize visual impact;*
- 2. They should be designed at an appropriate scale to ~~utilise onsite waste only and~~ cater to onsite energy needs, so reducing the importation of fuel;*
- 3. Construction should prioritise the use of locally sourced materials;*
- 4. Odour management strategies should be implemented;*
- 5. Limitations on fuel transport and related vehicle movements should be considered. ...*