

Rother Local Plan 2025–2042 Development Strategy and Site Allocations Regulation 18 Consultation January 2026

Response Form

8 week public consultation period: 26th January – 23rd March 2026

Rother District Council is inviting residents, businesses, and stakeholders to take part in a vital consultation on its emerging Local Plan.

The consultation period runs for eight weeks from Monday 26th January to 5:00pm on Monday 23rd March 2026.

The Draft Local Plan and all of its supporting evidence base documents can be found and commented on via the Council's website at www.rother.gov.uk/draftlocalplan2026.

The Council prefers to receive your consultation responses via our website.

You may also respond by email or post by filling this form and then sending it by email to draftlocalplan@rother.gov.uk or by post to Planning Policy, Rother District Council, Town Hall, Bexhill-on-Sea, TN39 3JX. Please note that submissions made via post will not receive confirmation that they have been received.

If you are using this form, please state which consultation question(s) you would like to respond to. These questions are found in the draft Local Plan. They also have been attached to the end of this form for your reference.

Personal Details – You must provide these details for us to accept your consultation response

	Please enter your details
Title	Mrs
First Name	Amy
Surname	Head
Job Title (where relevant)	Clerk and RFO
Organisation (where relevant)	Peasmarsh Parish Council
Address	C/O 15 Brickfields, Main Street, Peasmarsh, East Sussex
Post Code	TN31 6SS
Email address	Clerk@peasmarsh-pc.gov.uk

Agents Details or Other Details (if making a representation on behalf of the above consultee)

	Please enter your details
Title	
First Name	
Surname	
Job Title (where relevant)	
Organisation (where relevant)	
Address	
Post Code	
Email address	

Privacy Policy Statement

Rother District Council is committed to ensuring that your privacy is protected and will only use and store your personal data in line with the General Data Protection Regulation 2016 and the Data Protection Act 1998. We collect and use your personal data in order to provide services you have requested from us or to carry out our legal obligations to you. We will not disclose your personal data to any third parties, unless we need to do so to provide a service to you or we are legally required to do so. We may share your personal data with other Council departments in order to provide the service you have requested and to ensure that the information we hold about you is accurate and up to date. Our Privacy Policy sets out how we collect, use and securely hold your data and can be viewed on our privacy policy page at <https://www.rother.gov.uk/data-protection-and-foi/privacy-policy/>. If you want more information on how a particular Council service uses your personal data, please view the Privacy Notices at the bottom of the above privacy policy page.

Please be aware that any comments you submit cannot be treated in confidence as the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012, as amended, requires copies of all representations to be made publicly available. The Council will publish names and representations on its website, but will not publish personal information, such as telephone numbers, emails or private addresses. By submitting a representation you are accordingly confirming that you agree to this and accept responsibility for your comments.

Please write your comments below. Please indicate in the left-hand column which question you are responding to. This will help ensure that your response is considered correctly. Please continue on a separate page or sheet of paper if necessary.

Question Number	Your Comments
<p>Part 1, chapter 2 1. Do you have any comments on the amended Rother Local Plan Strategic Spatial Objectives shown in Figure 1?</p>	<p><i>7. Focus growth in sustainable locations across the district, or places that can be made sustainable, through the timely delivery of strategic and other supporting infrastructure and community facilities.</i></p> <p>These objectives rely on behaviour and budgets of other organisations e.g. infrastructure improvements such as better transport rely on East Sussex County Council.</p> <p>It is contradictory on issues that it does have control over. For example, National Landscapes policies (previously AoNB).</p> <p>In relation to house building, the Environment Agency refer to flooding in association with rivers and sea but do not include surface water flooding in their consultations. The risk of future flooding in Peasmarsch can be seen on this Friends of the Earth website: https://mapst.ac/foe/flood-risk#13.07/50.96793/0.70126 This clearly shows the social impact flooding has on vulnerable residents in Peasmarsch, more so than in other areas of Rother. And in other Environment Agency maps. https://mapst.ac/foe/flood-risk#13.07/50.96793/0.70126</p> <p>The information and sources used by RDC to make decisions about sustainability do not seem to be enough to make decisions about building a large number of houses in this area.</p>

Question Number	Your Comments
<p>Part 2, chapter 4 – Infrastructure Needs</p> <p>5. Do you have any comments on infrastructure needs or priorities to support the proposed Development Strategy?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <p>• Transport and movement – Bus services are still too infrequent, unreliable and miss connections to allow new residents to proposed developments to choose public transport over owning a car. Recently ESCC has said that they are withdrawing its evening and Sunday service of the 313 between Northiam and Rye Harbour due to lack of funding.</p> <p>Trains to London and other commuter areas are infrequent and there are only a few minutes to meet connecting services to Ashford. Making it a difficult choice for those with limited fitness, disability or those with buggies. Many have to travel to Ashford station to get quicker and more frequent services to London.</p> <p>Cycling – it is difficult for RDC to promote healthy, environmental transport options when the road between Peasmarsch and Rye and Peasmarsch and Beckley is unsafe for cycling with no designated cycle path and no speed limit between Peasmarsch and Playden causing dangerous conditions. The A268 is very narrow for an A road and poorly maintained with many potholes.</p> <p>• Education – Peasmarsch primary school is small and has limited potential for expansion. Any expansion would involve taking back two classrooms which are currently used by the pre-school nursery which rents the space separately from the school. This would risk the closure of this nursery with no other pre-school provision available in the village. Peasmarsch, Beckley and Playden primary schools are already federated to be able to share resources and an increase in population would add pressure to this. Rural schools are already subject to closure if undersubscribed, with</p>

Question Number	Your Comments
	<p>residents likely re-directed to nearer larger schools like Rye Primary School. This would involve an increase in the need to drive rather than walk to school.</p> <p>Secondary school provision in Peasmarsch and Sussex is limited with many parents opting to send their children to secondary schools in Kent such as Homewood School and Sixth Form Centre in Tenterden and other Ashford schools. Rye and Robertsbridge Colleges do not have Sixth Form facilities, therefore to continue in education as is legally required to 18 years old, students need to travel to Bexhill, Hastings or Plumpton Colleges. These involve lengthy journeys by bus or train with all the issues highlighted in the Transport paragraph above.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Health and social care – Northiam GPs are not taking on new patients from Peasmarsch. Therefore, the nearest GP, Rye Medical Centre will have an additional burden when they already serve Peasmarsch, Playden, Rye and Camber amongst other local villages (with additional pressure during the summer months due to tourism). <p>Local care home Peasmarsch Place is a residential care home and not a nursing home. Also acute services such as Cardiology and Stroke Services have been transferred from Hastings Conquest Hospital to Eastbourne District General Hospital impacting on Peasmarsch residents with the associated travel issues.</p> <p>The Church grounds are subject to flooding (even though they are at the highest point of the village), therefore there is a lack of provision to bury the dead.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Green and blue infrastructure, and flood defence – As highlighted in the Parish Council’s

Question Number	Your Comments
	<p>objection to the Kitewood planning application (RR/2025/1499/P), the capacity of the existing sewerage system is already at its limits and in 2024 Southern Water released sewerage into the River Rother 50 times for a duration of 435 hours and so far in 2026 there have already been 27 dumps of sewerage for a duration of 283 hours. (Source: Top of the Poops - https://top-of-the-poops.org/)</p> <p>In the Appendix to the Peasmarsh Neighbourhood Development Plan (PNDP) A3.4-8 the Parish Council illustrates the issue with flooding and sewerage with many photographs supplied by residents.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Utility and energy – The Appendix to the PNDP also highlights the issues related to electricity and gas supply as well as telecommunications and broadband. In February 2026, there was a broadband outage for circa one week. A resident also reported receiving 7 alerts from South East Water related to a water outage or low water pressure.
<p><u>Part 3, chapter 6 – Development Strategy for Rother</u> 8. Do you have any comments on the Council’s proposed Overall Development Strategy?</p>	<p>The PC is concerned that if the developments go ahead as listed in the Site Allocations, the strategic gap between Peasmarsh and Rye Foreign will disappear as it will lead to village sprawl.</p>

Question Number	Your Comments
<p>13. Do you have any comments on the proposed Vision and development strategy for Rye and the Eastern Settlements Cluster, including the development figures shown in Figures 23 and 24? (Please not that comments on individual sites should not be made in response to this question, please see questions 42 to 52 instead).</p>	<p><i>6.76. The parish is within the High Weald National Landscape and the only suitable sites for development are within or adjacent to the village itself. Four sites have been allocated in the parish; the existing services indicate that it is a sustainable location for development.</i></p> <p>The PC think that undue weight has been placed on the existing services of Jempsons. Jempsons does have a post office, petrol station, post office and supermarket but it is shut on a Sunday and it may not be economically viable in the future as well as being an expensive option for a large part of the local demographic.</p> <p>4 out of the 5 sites are to be built on green fields which does not seem to support sustainable development. Developers appear to under report the amount of wildlife in the area – see photo below.</p>
<p>15. Do you have any comments on the proposed Vision for the Countryside?</p>	<p>There does not seem to be a Vision for the Countryside as the strength of being in a National Landscape area (AoNB as it was called) has now been downgraded in new planning legislation.</p> <p>The PC is also concerned about the impact on the night skies with 143 new houses being proposed in Peasmarsch, a rural village. Especially with development on higher land, this will inevitably increase light pollution. Peasmarsch will not feel like it is located in the countryside anymore.</p>

Question Number	Your Comments
<p><u>Part 3, chapter 7</u> <u>– Site Allocations</u> 47. Do you have any comments on the proposed site allocations in Peasmarsch, detailed in Policies PE1 to PE5?</p>	<p><u>PE1 – Kitewood</u> The PC has previously objected to this site in a planning objection which can be found on RDC’s planning website under the application – RR/2025/1499/P – some of the reasons, amongst others are; accessing the site, a lack of infrastructure in the village, poor drainage, flooding, traffic management, housing numbers, affordable housing and the protection of local views.</p> <p><u>PE2 – Pippins</u> The PC has previously objected to this site in a planning objection which can be found on RDC’s planning website under the application – RR/2023/1707/P. The site was approved for development by the RDC Planning Committee in July 2024 but it has yet to agree the Section 106 terms and conditions with the developer. RDC has already allowed the developer to rescind their agreement to provide 40% affordable housing, so this information in the supporting text needs to be removed as it is no longer true. What is to say the same clause will be removed from other housing developments such as PE1? If the Developer can’t afford to fulfil this obligation (as requested in the PNDP) what other obligations will they be allowed to avoid? A lot of weight is given to the SuDS system that could deal with surface water drainage, but this area is already flooded in winter without the additional pressure of more houses being built on this land.</p> <p><u>PE3 – Tanyard</u> Previous proposed developments on this site have been for many more houses than 15. The PC feels that this is a Trojan Horse for further development in the future, as it is unlikely that a development of 15 affordable houses would be financially viable for a developer. Especially considering the Pippins developer could not fulfil their affordable housing quota.</p>

Question Number	Your Comments
	<p>In the policy text (viii) it states that the site must “<i>Protect the residential amenity of the occupiers of adjoining dwellings</i>”. This feels like a claim that can’t be fulfilled as occupants of properties that back onto this site have already experience regular flooding including the Pub (The Horse and Cart) which requires the water companies to pump out their drains. This site is already full of natural springs and most of the houses have French drains fitted at the rear of their properties to try to deal with the level of run off from the fields behind them.</p> <p>PE4 – Orchard Way</p> <p>In the supporting text it states that “<i>It is allocated for 7 dwellings in the Peasmarsh Neighbourhood Plan</i>”. This is incorrect – Pg 71 of the PNDP states that it should be allocated for up to 5 dwellings.</p> <p>This site is accessed via a privately owned road with access width for one car. Any access for plant machinery would need to involve overhead cables being moved. There is no mains drainage and therefore any new properties would require a private sewerage system. There has been surface water flooding in the lane as well as the area to be built on. This is acknowledged in the supporting text as follows:- “<i>...surface water flooding is a risk in the southern half of the site and there is a pond located in the southeast corner</i>”.</p> <p>PE5 – Malthouse Business Park</p> <p>The PC is concerned about the disruption to the existing tenants of the business units whilst this build goes ahead. How will this impact the lease agreements they have? It is hard to find affordable business units in the area and work opportunities in the village. This area is already busy with access to the Maltings development and the Old Hop Garden. The parking spaces at the front of the business units are used regularly by those using the Recreation Ground/Play area, including local football teams. The loss of these spaces will just increase the parking</p>

Question Number	Your Comments
	<p>issues already experienced in this area. The PC is looking into options as to how to make the Recreation Ground more accessible to disabled users and the loss of the car park next to it will make this very difficult.</p>
<p><u>Sustainability Appraisal</u> 68. Do you have any comments on the Interim Sustainability Appraisal in support of the Regulation 18 stage consultation on the Development Strategy and Site Allocations (January 2026)?</p>	<p>5.137 - The sustainability appraisal for Peasmarsh puts a burden on Jempsons now and in the future to provide “<i>essential services</i>”, this does not seem sustainable in the long-term. Especially if Stephen Jempson retires and the business does not continue. The many photos included in the Appendix for the PNDP show that flooding is a local issue unlike the statement in 5.137 which says “<i>On flooding, the parish scores both neutral and minor positives, indicating clearly that this is not a local issue</i>”. Rother District Council is aware of the issues as Graeme Quinnell (Rother District Council’s Housing and Homelessness Partnerships Manager) sought to have a meeting with the PC in January 2026 (he later cancelled) to discuss these concerns. Finally, in the ‘<i>suggested mitigation measures</i>’ under 5.138, it states that RDC would ‘<i>Seek opportunities to make provision for shops or services in the parish area</i>’. If Jempsons encapsulates all these essential services then why would they need to do this? Also, Jempsons would not welcome the competition of additional shops.</p>

Question Number	Your Comments

Should you require further space to respond to make comments please continue on a separate page or sheet of paper as necessary.

Consultation Questions: Draft Rother Local Plan 2025–2042 – Development Strategy and Site Allocations

Part 1, chapter 2:

1. Do you have any comments on the amended Rother Local Plan Strategic Spatial Objectives shown in Figure 1?

Part 2, chapter 3 - Development Needs

2. Do you have any comments on the Council's proposed housing target for the Local Plan of 8,427 dwellings over the 17-year plan period, or 495 dwellings annually?
3. Do you have any comments on the identified employment needs, or needs for retail and main town centre uses?
4. Do you have any comments on the identified accommodation needs of gypsies, travellers and travelling showpeople?

Part 2, chapter 4 – Infrastructure Needs

5. Do you have any comments on infrastructure needs or priorities to support the proposed Development Strategy?

Part 3, chapter 5 – Preparing the Development Strategy

6. Do you have any comments on the Council's assessment of the additional Development Strategy Options?
7. Do you have any comments on the preferred approach for housing density shown in Figure 9, or on the updated Density Study (2026)?

Part 3, chapter 6 – Development Strategy for Rother

8. Do you have any comments on the Council's proposed Overall Development Strategy?
9. Do you have any comments on the proposed growth opportunities in the sub-areas as shown in Figure 10?
10. Do you have any comments on the proposed Vision and development strategy for Bexhill, including the development figures shown in Figures 13 and 14? (Please note that comments on individual sites should not be made in response to this question, please see questions 17 and 18 instead)
11. Do you have any comments on the proposed Vision and development strategy for Southern Rother and the Hastings Fringes, including the development figures shown in Figures 17 and 18? (Please note that comments on individual sites should not be made in response to this question, please see questions 26 to 35 instead)
12. Do you have any comments on the proposed Vision and development strategy for Battle and Surrounding Settlements, including the development figures shown in

Figures 20 and 21? (Please note that comments on individual sites should not be made in response to this question, please see questions 36 to 41 instead)

13. Do you have any comments on the proposed Vision and development strategy for Rye and the Eastern Settlements Cluster, including the development figures shown in Figures 23 and 24? (Please note that comments on individual sites should not be made in response to this question, please see questions 42 to 52 instead)
14. Do you have any comments on the proposed Vision and development strategy for Northern Rother, including the development figures shown in Figures 26 and 27? (Please note that comments on individual sites should not be made in response to this question, please see questions 53 to 63 instead)
15. Do you have any comments on the proposed Vision for the Countryside?
16. Do you have any comments on the proposed strategy for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople? (Please note that comments on individual sites should not be made in response to this question, please see question 64 instead)

Part 3, chapter 7 – Site Allocations

17. Do you have any comments on the proposed site allocations in Bexhill?
18. Do you consider that there are any other possible sites in Bexhill which should be allocated for development in the Local Plan?
19. Do you have any comments on proposed Policy BX1: Bexhill Urban Area?
20. Do you have any comments on proposed Policy BX2: Bexhill Cultural Area?
21. Do you have any comments on proposed Policy BX3: London Road – Sackville Road Enhancement Area?
22. Do you have any comments on proposed Policy BX4: Beeching Road Enhancement Area?
23. Do you have any comments on proposed Policy BX18: West Bexhill Growth Area – Infrastructure Policy?
24. Do you have any comments on proposed Policy BX29: North Bexhill Growth Area – Infrastructure Policy?
25. Do you have any comments on proposed Policy BX30: Land south of Haven Brook Avenue – Infrastructure?
26. Do you have any comments on the proposed site allocations in Crowhurst Parish, detailed in Policies CR1 to CR3?
27. Do you have any comments on the proposed site allocation in Fairlight Cove, detailed in Policy FA1?
28. Do you have any comments on the proposed site allocations in the Hastings Fringes (Guestling Parish), detailed in Policies GU1 and GU2?

29. Do you have any comments on proposed Policy GU3: Rock Lane Urban Fringe Management Area?
30. Do you have any comments on the proposed site allocations in Guestling Green, detailed in Policies GU4 and GU5?
31. Do you have any comments on the proposed site allocation in Three Oaks, detailed in Policy GU6?
32. Do you have any comments on the proposed site allocations in Icklesham, detailed in Policies IK1 and IK2?
33. Do you have any comments on the proposed site allocations in the Hastings Fringes (Westfield Parish), detailed in Policies WS1 and WS2?
34. Do you have any comments on the proposed site allocations in Westfield, detailed in Policies WS3 to WS5?
35. Do you consider that there are any other possible sites in the Southern Rother and Hastings Fringes sub-area (which includes the parishes of Crowhurst, Fairlight, Guestling, Pett, Westfield and Icklesham (west)) which should be allocated for development in the Local Plan?
36. Do you have any comments on the proposed site allocations in Battle, detailed in Policies BT1 to BT11?
37. Do you have any comments on the proposed site allocation in Brightling, detailed in Policy BRI1?
38. Do you have any comments on the proposed site allocations in Catsfield, detailed in Policies CT1 to CT3?
39. Do you have any comments on the proposed site allocations in Netherfield, detailed in Policies NE1 and NE2?
40. Do you have any comments on the proposed site allocations in Sedlescombe, detailed in Policies SD1 to SD11?
41. Do you consider that there are any other possible sites in the Battle and Surrounding Settlements sub-area (which includes the parishes of Ashburnham, Battle, Brightling, Catsfield, Dallington, Mountfield, Sedlescombe and Whatlington) which should be allocated for development in the Local Plan?
42. Do you have any comments on the proposed site allocations in Beckley, detailed in Policies BC1 to BC3?
43. Do you have any comments on the proposed site allocations in Broad Oak, Brede, detailed in Policies BR1 to BR3?
44. Do you have any comments on the proposed site allocations in Camber, detailed in Policies CM1 to CM3?
45. Do you have any comments on the proposed site allocations in Iden, detailed in Policies ID1 and ID2?

46. Do you have any comments on the proposed site allocations in Northiam, detailed in Policies NR1 and NR2?
47. Do you have any comments on the proposed site allocations in Peasmarsch, detailed in Policies PE1 to PE5?
48. Do you have any comments on the proposed site allocations in Playden, detailed in Policies PL1 and PL2?
49. Do you have any comments on the proposed site allocations in Rye, detailed in Policies RY1 to RY9?
50. Do you have any comments on the proposed site allocation in Rye Harbour, detailed in Policy RH1?
51. Do you have any comments on proposed Policy RH2: Employment Land, Harbour Road?
52. Do you consider that there are any other possible sites in the Rye and the Eastern Settlements Cluster sub-area (which includes the parishes of Beckley, Brede, Camber, East Guldeford, Iden, Northiam, Peasmarsch, Playden, Rye Foreign, Rye, Udimore and Icklesham (east)) which should be allocated for development in the Local Plan?
53. Do you have any comments on the proposed site allocations in Burwash, detailed in Policies BW1 to BW4?
54. Do you have any comments on the proposed site allocations in Burwash Common, detailed in Policies BWC1 and BWC2?
55. Do you have any comments on the proposed site allocations in Etchingham, detailed in Policies EC1 to EC3?
56. Do you have any comments on the proposed site allocations in Hurst Green, detailed in Policies HG1 to HG4?
57. Do you have any comments on the proposed site allocations in Robertsbridge, detailed in Policies RB1 to RB6b?
58. Do you have any comments on the proposed site allocations in Staplecross, Ewhurst Parish, detailed in Policies SC1 and SC2?
59. Do you have any comments on the proposed site allocations in Flimwell, Ticehurst Parish, detailed in Policies FW1 to FW3?
60. Do you have any comments on the proposed site allocations in Ticehurst, detailed in Policies TC1 and TC2?
61. Do you have any comments on proposed Policy TC3: Bewl Water?
62. Do you have any comments on the proposed site allocations in Stonegate, Ticehurst Parish, detailed in Policies SG1 and SG2?
63. Do you consider that there are any other possible sites in the Northern Rother sub-area (which includes the parishes of Bodiam, Burwash, Etchingham, Ewhurst, Hurst

Green, Salehurst and Robertsbridge and Ticehurst) which should be allocated for development in the Local Plan?

64. Do you have any comments on the proposed site allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople, detailed in Policies GYP1 to GYP6?

65. Do you consider that there are any other possible sites for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople sites which should be allocated in the Local Plan?

Local Plan Appendices

66. Do you have any comments on the proposed changes to Policy LWL7 (A) (i) (Streets for All)?

67. Do you have any comments on the Appendices?

Sustainability Appraisal

68. Do you have any comments on the Interim Sustainability Appraisal in support of the Regulation 18 stage consultation on the Development Strategy and Site Allocations (January 2026)?

Other comments

69. Are there any other issues, options or other matters you would like to raise?