

# **A strategy for residential development in Ringmer, 2006-2026**

## **July 2009**

This document develops a strategy for residential development in Ringmer parish over the period 2006-2026. This local strategy, based on the Ringmer Village Plan, contributes to the evidence base for the Lewes District Local Development Framework, and is prepared in the context of the South East Regional Strategy for the Sussex Coastal sub-region.

### **Contents**

#### Definitions

1. The planning context.
2. A historical perspective
3. Constraints to development in Ringmer
4. Residential development policies for Ringmer, 2006-2026

### **Definitions**

**Market housing.** Housing available for rent or purchase at prices dependent on market forces. Market housing is the most profitable category of new housing development for landowners and developers. However the rents paid for leased market housing may receive on-going public subsidy via Housing Benefit.

**Social housing.** Housing available for rent at a subsidised rate. Most Ringmer social housing is owned by Lewes District Council, but there are smaller amounts owned by housing associations, by the Glyndebourne Estate (let to present and former Estate employees) and by village charities.

**Affordable housing.** Includes social housing and other forms of subsidised housing, including shared-equity housing (where the property is partly owned and partly leased at a social housing rate from a housing association) and housing for sale or rent to key workers at a discounted price. New affordable housing must necessarily be subsidised, usually by a grant to cover part of the construction cost made by central government or by a developer as a condition of permission to develop associated market housing.

**Housing for the elderly.** Houses and flats that are restricted to occupants of above a specified age, and which may also offer warden support. In Ringmer this includes both market housing and social housing.

### **1. The Planning Context: the Lewes Local Plan, the [draft] South East Plan, the Lewes Local Development Framework and the Ringmer Village Plan.**

Housing development in Ringmer is presently regulated by the Lewes Local Plan, approved in 2003. This divides Ringmer parish into areas within and without delineated village planning boundaries and identifies general policies for housing development for each. The Lewes Local Plan also allocated two new locations within the parish for residential development within the 2001-2006 phase of the Plan. These were a greenfield site (The Forges) at the western end of the village adjoining Lewes Road, allocated for 75 units, and the Caburn Field in the village centre (currently the Ringmer FC ground), allocated for 40 units. The Forges has now been developed as 85 houses and flats but the Caburn Field site has not yet come forward, because

linked conditions on the relocation of Ringmer FC to the site adjoining Ringmer Community College have not yet been met. The Lewes Local Plan also identified two adjacent sites along Bishops Lane (Bishops Field and Potters Field) as suitable for inclusion amongst the sites to be considered for residential development in the Plan's intended 2006-2011 second phase.

The Lewes Local Plan currently remains in force but will be replaced by the Lewes District Local Development Framework, which is being formulated in the context of the South East Regional Plan (presently in draft). These documents cover the period 2006-2026 and will eventually replace the current County Structure Plan and District Local Plan as the statutory Development Plan relating to Ringmer.

The [draft] South East Plan recognises (inter-alia) the regional shortage of housing, particularly affordable housing, and proposes general and sub-region-specific policies, including housing policies. The Plan is based on projections of a need to accommodate more (but smaller) households in the region. The housing target for the Sussex Coastal sub-region, to which Ringmer belongs, has been divided between the sub-region's constituent local authorities and the Lewes Local Development Framework is tasked to identify appropriate sites [work in progress]. There is a presumption that new housing will play a role in the economic resurgence of the sub-region. There is also a specific proposal that 25% of new housing in this sub-region should be social rented housing and a further 15% other categories of affordable housing.

There have been two major surveys of Ringmer residents' opinions in the past 20 years, one conducted in 1988 leading to the Ringmer Village Appraisal, and a second conducted in 2003 to inform the Ringmer Village Plan. Both consulted all Ringmer households, and both received high return rates. Despite being conducted over 15 years apart, both gave similar results. Both showed that Ringmer's village status was considered of great importance and that its surrounding countryside was highly valued. One significant change is that while in 1988 over two thirds of residents were opposed to further substantial housing development in Ringmer, by 2003 the proportion opposing any further expansion outside present village planning boundaries had risen to 92%. This change reflects the steadily increasing local traffic problems, particularly affecting morning peak hour commuter travel from Ringmer to Lewes and the A27. In 1988 those respondents prepared to contemplate additional Ringmer housing thought priority should be given to social housing (21%), low cost market housing (12%) and sheltered accommodation for the elderly (12%). Just 2% wished to see more executive housing in Ringmer, demonstrating a strong mismatch between perceived village needs and the new housing that has actually been delivered. By 2003 the proportions wishing to see the emphasis firmly on affordable housing and on sheltered accommodation for the elderly had doubled, while increasing experience of new executive housing had done little to increase its popularity.

The 2003 Ringmer Village Plan identified and noted with concern significant population trends in the village. The application of market forces, coupled with demographic factors, had led to an unforeseen and unwanted change in Ringmer's population balance over the previous 40 years (see section 2.4. below). This had led to a marked reduction in the numbers of young families with children living in the village and a striking increase in the numbers of older couples and individuals under-occupying large properties. This effect was evident in the substantial reduction in the number of children enrolling in the Ringmer Primary School and an increasing dependence of the very successful Ringmer Community College on students imported from outside the village.

The Ringmer Village Plan seeks to redress this population imbalance, by making it possible and attractive for more young families to live in Ringmer. Ringmer's situation has proved far from unique, and there is now national recognition of this problem as affecting many village communities, especially in the South East. The [draft] South East Plan recognises the lack of affordable housing generally, and specifically a lack of affordable housing in rural communities,

as a widespread problem. It includes policies designed to address this, which in principle we welcome.

The 2003 Ringmer Village Plan adopted as its action point 4.1:

***“Ensure new housing development [in Ringmer] includes a mixture of housing types, especially affordable housing that remains affordable, with a predominance of 2 and 3 bedroom family houses and accommodation dedicated to workers in essential local public services. No further development on Ringmer greenfield sites.”***

In the last two years Ringmer has seen some significant changes in the desired direction, as evidenced by increased enrolment at the village Primary School. This may owe more to natural population dynamics than to an immediate impact of the Ringmer Village Plan or other policy. A beneficial factor may be the rise of private buy-to-let activity coupled with the availability of Family Credit and Housing Benefit.

## **2. A historical perspective**

The 20th century saw four main periods of residential development that between them account for the great majority of Ringmer’s current housing stock.

### **2.1 1920-1939**

Chailey Rural District Council built its first council houses at the Broyleside, while the Glyndebourne Estate built semi-detached houses for rent that extended Rushey Green along Harrisons Lane, Mill Path and Mill Mead. The council housing replaced sub-standard village cottages, while the Glyndebourne Estate’s affordable housing was primarily for employees of its enterprises such as the Ringmer Building Works. The Estate also developed some houses on large individual plots along Gote Lane and the section of the Lewes Road between the village and Paygate. There was some private sector ribbon development, especially along the south side of Laughton Road.

### **2.2 1940-1959**

Chailey R.D.C. built additional council houses at Green Close and Rushey Close in 1948. The Green Close houses were of an experimental non-standard construction with a design life span that will expire during the Plan period. Prefab developments were erected at Mill Road and Broyle Close. There was little market sector development in this period.

### **2.3 1960-1979**

Ringmer was identified for substantial residential expansion in three main areas:

- (a) the farmland bounded by Lewes Road, Harrisons Lane, Gote Lane and New Road;
- (b) Delves House and its fields, bounded by The Green, Bishops Lane and Church Hill;
- (c) a group of small fields north of the Broyleside on the east side of Broyle Lane.

Development was primarily of market sector terraced, semi-detached and small detached houses and bungalows, at what was then considered a comparatively high housing density. Also included were substantial Chailey R.D.C. council housing developments at Anchor Field, Fairlight Field & Shelley Road, and at Broyle Close and a medium-sized development at Mill Road/Mill Close. The prefabs at the two latter sites were replaced.

A major change with continuing impact was that the new housing was mainly occupied by commuters who moved to live in Ringmer but continued to work in Lewes and Brighton. The

new housing was provided with garaging for the cars required by the new commuters, either within property curtilages or in nearby garage courts.

## **2.4 1980-2000**

Housing development continued but at a slower pace, largely within the planning boundaries defined in the 1960s. The last major development, the western part of Sadlers Way, was of large executive houses and detached bungalows. Elsewhere both redundant agricultural accommodation and 20th century estate houses were up-graded and extended. The majority of council houses and many Glyndebourne Estate houses passed into private ownership, and were also up-graded.

A consequence of the national increases in house prices, the types of new houses preferred by market sector developers, the up-grading of many once-affordable homes and the sale of most council houses was that young families found it increasingly difficult to afford Ringmer accommodation as this period progressed. The village population aged, the numbers of occupants per house fell and despite having more and larger houses, Ringmer's population barely maintained itself. The numbers of children enrolling each year in Ringmer Primary School fell to half the numbers of the 1970s, indeed below those when compulsory education was first introduced here in 1879. Most residents in employment remained car-borne commuters, but commuting distances of the more ambitious commuters lengthened considerably. A substantial proportion of those who could afford Ringmer houses relocated from Greater London and the inner Home Counties, often without changing employment. The increase in private car ownership led to car parking problems, especially in areas with pre-1939 affordable housing (where no parking provision was made) or in those later developments whose parking courts allowed for only one car per property.

An exception site at Elphick Road was developed in the 1980s for the benefit of local youngsters. However, no measures were devised to ensure that these houses remained affordable for subsequent occupiers, and this scheme cannot be counted a lasting success. A limited amount of new affordable housing was developed by the Kelsey Housing Association on the former Ringmer School site in the 1990s.

## **2.5 The first years of the 21st century**

The trends apparent in 1980-2000 have largely continued into the first years of the 21st century. National housing policies to require high building densities in the hope that this would produce smaller and thus cheaper housing have largely resulted in developers building large and expensive houses closer together with inadequate parking, as seen at Tilekiln and in the market sector housing at The Forges. While an emphasis on quality is commendable, this too reduces affordability.

The 2003 Lewes District Local Plan requires developers of larger sites to include 25% affordable houses within their development. This welcome policy has resulted in just over 20 additional affordable houses (of different categories) being included in the new 85-house development at The Forges.

## **3. Constraints to development in Ringmer**

There are some important constraints affecting housing development initiatives in this rural area. The most important are 3.1 and 3.2 below (transport infrastructure and landscape protection). Other significant constraints that could be met by conditions imposed on future development are 3.3 (the capacity of Ringmer Primary School), 3.5 (the requirement for improved health provision in Ringmer), 3.6 (the capacity of the Ringmer sewage works), 3.8 (the

availability of outdoor recreational space) and 3.10 (car parking). The availability of some utilities (3.6) and flood risk (3.9) are important constraints for some areas of the parish.

**3.1 Inadequate transport infrastructure.** The Sussex Coastal sub-region has very poor road and overloaded rail communications, rendering it unattractive to organisations for whom good access to national and international transport routes is a priority. This applies with particular force to Ringmer, where a high proportion of all journeys are routed via the B2192 & A26 to Lewes (and railway access) or to the A27 and thus the national road network. This route has major traffic blackspots at Earwig Corner (B2192/A26 junction), Malling Hill (entry to Lewes) and the Southerham roundabout (A26/A27 junction). Each of these has very long delays during the morning rush hours and increasingly significant delays at other times of day. This route is currently operating at far above design capacity. There are plans for some improvements at the A26/A27 junction but quite extensive ESCC studies extended over a period of years have failed to produce any viable plan to improve traffic flows at Earwig Corner and Malling Hill. Current development plans for Uckfield will inevitably result in increased commuting between Uckfield and the A27 via the A26 that will necessarily aggravate this problem. A Ringmer-Lewes cycleway has been projected but the full route has not been agreed and it has not yet been constructed.

The [draft] South East Regional Plan notes that employment opportunities in the Sussex Coastal sub-region, in which Ringmer is included, are inadequate in both number and quality. This lack of local employment leads to excessive out-commuting throughout the sub-region that is particularly apparent in Lewes District and fully reflected in Ringmer. The Ringmer Village Plan Employment Strategy [adopted 2006] seeks to address this issue. However, there seems little prospect of Ringmer becoming self-sufficient in employment within the Plan period. Out-commuting from a rural area with poor public transport links such as Ringmer is predominantly by private car, contributing to the serious local transport problems above, with excessive delays and consequent pollution. Many out-commuters from and through Ringmer travel very considerable distances.

New market housing in Ringmer, especially high-cost executive housing, will inevitably attract additional commuters, for the reasons above. Even retired or locally employed residents will need to travel regularly to the nearest supermarkets in Lewes and Uckfield and for services not provided in the village. The 2003 Lewes Local Plan recognised the inadequate local road transport network as a major constraint on further residential development at Ringmer.

**3.2 Landscape protection.** Ringmer lies directly below, and is very visible from, the northern scarp of the South Downs. The proposed boundary of the South Downs National Park runs up to the edge of Ringmer village. There are extensive views from and to Ringmer across the Weald. Care must be taken to avoid negative impact of development on this landscape.

**3.3 Schools.** In 1993 the infant and junior departments of Ringmer Primary School were combined on a single site. The Victorian Ringmer School was demolished and its site used for affordable housing. There was a significant reduction in primary school capacity at this time and its 220 places are now 95% full. Achievement of the Ringmer Village Plan objective to restore the population balance in favour of young families will require additional investment at the present Primary School site.

Only a minority of students at Ringmer Community College (which serves ages 11-16) come from Ringmer. This is a very successful school, which has seen recent expansion to accommodate additional students from outside the village. The great majority of students currently commute from Lewes, the Weald and further afield. Some travel substantial distances. The Community College does not lack capacity for local students. Ringmer does now have some 16 – 18 education [for the new diplomas] but if you want to take A levels, as most do, you still have to travel to schools and colleges in Lewes Brighton and Eastbourne.

**3.4 Shops.** Ringmer has a good range of village shops, including a convenience store with a post office, butcher, baker, greengrocer, off licence, pharmacist, hairdresser, pet shop, estate agent and bank. There are four pubs (one in the village and three by the A26 or B2192) and a fast food shop. These facilities serve Ringmer and, thanks to the provision of free and convenient car parking, attract custom from the surrounding rural area and a nearby market town where parking is challenging. While additional residents would bring additional custom, retail provision in Ringmer is already sustainable. There is a small supermarket in Ringmer, the nearest large supermarkets being at Lewes and Uckfield. It is unlikely that a large supermarket would prove viable here - three grocers' shops in the village have closed in recent years.

**3.5 Health service.** A new health centre opened in 2009 at Anchor Field. There is a dental surgery in Ringmer offering both NHS and private dentistry but there is a long waiting list for NHS patients. There are a range of privately provided ancillary health services.

**3.6 Utilities.** Ringmer village is supplied by mains electricity and gas, though gas is not available outside the developed areas of the parish. There is a telephone exchange with broadband available. Water is supplied by South East Water from their Barcombe Mills reservoir and treatment works, which is within the parish and supplies an extended area. There is mains drainage within the developed area operated by Southern Water, and a sewage treatment plant on Neaves Lane that discharges into Glynde Reach. This sewage works was substantially extended in the 1970s to serve an intended population of 4,600. The recent Forges development has taken Ringmer's population above that level for the first time.

**3.7 Employment.** As noted above, most Ringmer residents in employment commute outside the village to work. There has been a substantial increase in local employment in the last decade, and the Ringmer Village Plan Employment Strategy (2006) seeks to continue this trend. However, even the most optimistic projections are unlikely to have any substantial impact within the Plan period on the dependence of Ringmer residents of working age on commuting.

**3.8 Recreational space.** Ringmer has a valued Village Green and additional play areas and children's facilities suitable for young children. However a shortage of outdoor recreational space for older children and adults is recognised in the 2003 Lewes Local Plan. A large site on the village periphery adjoining Ringmer Community College was identified in the Lewes District Local Plan for this purpose, but it has not yet been possible to implement this plan.

**3.9 Community Facilities.** Community social facilities in Ringmer are under severe pressure, with Ringmer Village Hall increasingly inadequate and the Caburn Pavilion likely to close when Ringmer Football Club relocates from Caburn Field.

**3.10 Flood risk.** The floods in Autumn 2000 that very badly affected Lewes and Uckfield also flooded several dozen houses in Ringmer. This flooding was primarily due to run-off from seasonal springs and roads at a rate too fast to be accommodated by the village drainage system. Some remedial action has been taken, but it should be noted that there have been long-standing and recurrent flood problems affecting part of the Broyleside and that several other areas of the parish are very low-lying. Fingers of the Glynde Reach flood plain run right up to the eastern edge of the Ringmer village planning boundary close to Ringmer Primary School and near the Southdown Hunt Kennels. The Ringmer sewage works is within this flood plain and little more than 5 metres above the present sea level.

**3.11 Car parking.** Current national policy, incorporated in the Lewes Local Plan, aims to restrict car parking at new developments in the belief that this will encourage residents from private car dependency onto public transport. There is ample evidence from Ringmer that this belief is ill-founded. Life in village locations such as Ringmer is inevitably car-dependent. Public transport does not meet local needs for accessing employment or social facilities and there is no prospect

of it doing so. All the evidence from developments built without parking before 1939, from developments built with only one parking place per house in the 1960s and 1970s and from developments built with restricted parking in the 21st century is that residents still acquire the cars they need and that inadequate parking provision simply results in unsightly and dangerous on-road parking and unneighbourly behaviour.

#### **4. Residential development policies for Ringmer, 2006-2026**

##### **Housing policy 1 (HOUS 1)                      Market housing**

There has been vigorous and sustained local opposition, including several large protest meetings in the past decade, to additional large scale housing development at Ringmer beyond the present village planning boundaries. That this is not just the view of a vociferous minority has been established by the surveys on which the 2003 Ringmer Village Plan and the 1988 Ringmer Village Appraisal were based. Both surveys were distributed to all residents, had high rates of return, and showed overwhelming opposition to further large scale development. The main reasons for this were:

- the importance of maintaining a “village feel” in this already large village;
- inadequate infrastructure, particularly Ringmer’s overstretched road links;
- support for the PPS3 policy that new housing should be sustainably located in towns;
- loss of valued countryside;
- site-specific reasons.

The prospect of additional executive housing was particularly unpopular. There was very strong local feeling that Ringmer was unfairly treated by Lewes District Council in its 2003 Lewes Local Plan, feelings that were made manifest in the May 2003 local elections.

It is recognised that sufficient and appropriate Lewes District sites for its share of the new housing to be built in the Sussex Coast sub-region during the 2006-2026 Plan period must be found, and that village opinion must be weighed against national needs and Plan priorities. New market housing in Ringmer would attract less opposition, and perhaps even some support, if it were on a village scale, subject to a design brief that ensured the development comprised only low cost 2-bed and small 3-bed houses and was targeted at attracting young families with children to the village in accordance with the Village Plan.

##### **Housing policy 2 (HOUS 2)                      Affordable housing**

It is widely recognised that there is a shortage of affordable housing in rural communities and the Ringmer Village Plan identifies that there is a shortage of such housing in Ringmer. There is a particular shortage of affordable housing to rent.

Such housing could be provided:

- (i) Through the affordable housing component on mixed developments;
- (ii) Through development of small sites identified for affordable housing only;
- (iii) Through identification and development of exception sites for affordable housing.

We support the proposal that all new developments or redevelopments of 5 or more units should include 40% affordable housing, including at least 25% housing units for rent at affordable rents.

Over the Plan period 2006-2026 Ringmer will seek to provide sites through the mechanisms above for new affordable houses of 5% of extant housing stock. This would mean that Ringmer would need to provide sites for about 90 new affordable houses from all sources over the 20 year period, an annual rate of 4-5 each year. This total would include the affordable element at Caburn Field or any other new development; improved densities on existing Lewes DC sites;

and any new small sites or exception sites approved. We hope that all rural communities in the District will adopt such policies.

### **Housing policy 3 (HOUS 3)                      Housing for the elderly**

Ringmer has market sector developments for the elderly at Delves House and Vicarage Close and similar council developments at Mill Close and Broyle Close. The Broyle Close development is on the periphery of the Broyleside and rather remote from village shops and services (though on a bus route). The other three developments are well located close to the village centre.

Demographic factors and social policies that encourage people to remain independent in their own homes for as long as possible may well increase the demand for similar facilities within the Plan period. Development of additional accommodation for the elderly in both sectors would enable local people to remain in the village for longer and also release under-occupied houses for family use. The Caburn Field site, already allocated for housing in the Lewes Local Plan, adjacent to the new health centre, and a very short level walk from village shops, is ideally situated for this purpose. The reallocation of some or all of this site from unspecified market housing to housing for the elderly would be supported. The number of units accommodated on the site could perhaps then be larger than currently envisaged.

### **Housing policy 4 (HOUS 4)                      Supported living**

In addition to care homes for those unable to live independently, Ringmer has, in Field Cottage in Harrisons Lane, a group of rooms and flats for supported living. Field Cottage has been a well run and valued facility in the village for more than 30 years, but may not have the capacity to meet local demand for this type of accommodation over the Plan period. An additional facility of similar nature and scale at an appropriate location in the village would be supported.

### **Housing policy 5 (HOUS 5)                      Location and form of new residential development**

The policies HOUS5(i) to HOUS 5(viii) below apply to the location and form of all new residential development in Ringmer, whether market sector or affordable housing.

**HOUS 5(i) Development scale.** All new developments within or extending the village planning boundaries should respect the village scale. In a large village of 1,800 houses well-designed and sited developments of up to 5 units normally attract little concern. Similarly appropriate developments of 10-20 units will often prove acceptable. It must be recognised that developments of 50 units will have a substantial impact on the village as a whole. Large monolithic development sites of 100 units or more are completely inappropriate in a village setting, and will be strongly opposed. If an area of land is identified for development that will accommodate more than 20 units, then it should be developed progressively as a series of smaller sites rather than as a single large estate-style development.

**HOUS 5(ii) Development design and layout.** The units on all new developments within or extending village planning boundaries should pay regard to the design and layout of traditional village housing. High density housing is often found in villages but buildings above two storeys will very rarely be acceptable. Design and materials should be compatible with extant village housing, and especially with neighbouring properties. Layout should provide a safe environment and be considerate to neighbours.

**HOUS 5 (iii) Priority to sites within the village planning boundaries.** Extension of the village planning boundaries for new housing should not be entertained if the housing required can be accommodated within the existing village planning boundaries.

**HOUS 5(iv) Site selection outside village planning boundaries.** If additional housing required in Ringmer necessitates extension of current village planning boundaries, residents and the Parish Council should be consulted about the options prior to decisions being made. Criteria for selection of one site in preference to another should include the following.

- (a) Sites should, when developed, have low landscape impact [see 5(vii) below].
- (b) Sites should be adjacent to, and should represent a natural extension of, an existing village planning boundary.
- (c) Sites should have high sustainability, assessed by short pedestrian distance and high pedestrian route quality to the Ringmer Core Retail Area, health centre and village schools to minimise unnecessary private car journeys. If the school route crosses a major road then a safe pedestrian crossing must be available or must be provided.
- (d) Sites should have good access to the local road network, to bus routes and to safe cycle routes [see 5(viii) below].
- (e) Sites should have low present and future flood risk. They should not have a known history of flooding and should be at least 15 metres above present sea level.
- (f) Sites should have access to mains services, including gas and sewerage.
- (g) Sites should have low environmental impact. Land accepted for the Country Stewardship Scheme or of special importance to wildlife should not be developed. Ancient trees and hedgerows should be protected.
- (h) Sites should not be on class A agricultural land.
- (i) Sites should not be required to meet other non-agricultural high priority village needs (e.g. churchyard extension; outdoor recreational space).

**HOUS 5 (v) Protection of the Conservation Area and Areas of Established Character.** All development within the Ringmer Conservation Area or the Areas of Established Character should respect and improve the qualities of these areas.

**HOUS 5 (vi) Protection of Employment Sites, the Ringmer Core Retail Area and Health and Social Care sites.** The major employment sites in Ringmer, the Ringmer core retail area and sites presently used to provide health and social care should be protected against re-allocation to housing development in accordance with policies EMP 2, EMP 5 and EMP 9 of the Ringmer Village Plan Employment Strategy, which aims to preserve and increase employment opportunities and the provision of key services in the village, and thus improve sustainability.

**HOUS 5 (vii) Landscape protection.** Ringmer lies directly below, and is very visible from, the northern scarp of the South Downs. The proposed boundary of the South Downs National Park runs up to the edge of Ringmer village. There are extensive views from and to Ringmer across the Weald. Care must be taken to avoid negative impact of new housing development on this landscape. There are examples of this being successfully achieved either by location choice or screening, but unfortunately rather more extant sites, including the north-western aspect of the recently developed Forges site, that are unduly prominent negative landscape features. It should be recognised that there is an inherent conflict between landscape protection and the wishes of developers and residents, who will value extensive views from their properties. Thus conditions should be imposed wherever appropriate that will ensure that suitable screening is both created and maintained.

**HOUS 5 (viii) Access to the local road network.** Any new development must have good access to Ringmer's primary routes (A26, B2192 & B2124), and must avoid creating additional traffic on our single-track country lanes. Those lanes heavily used and highly valued for recreational purposes (Norlington Lane, Green Lane, the northern section of Broyle Lane, Potato Lane and Neaves Lane south of the sewage works) must be carefully protected, while other narrow lanes (Wellingham Lane, Barcombe Mills Lane, Harveys Lane and Moor Lane) should not suffer significantly increased traffic or additional HGV movements.

### **Housing Policy 6 (HOUS 6) Residential conversion of agricultural buildings.**

The Ringmer Village Plan Employment Strategy (2006) accepts the conversion of redundant agricultural buildings to alternative commercial uses (including tourist accommodation), subject to specified conditions [Policy EMP 4]. Conversion to residential use should be considered only if all of the conditions below are met.

(a) The buildings involved cannot be adapted to continued agricultural use.

(b) The buildings involved cannot be converted to an alternative commercial use within the conditions of policy EMP 4.

(c) The buildings involved are high quality permanent structures (e.g. listed buildings or buildings of listable quality), traditional in form, have useful remaining life and are of positive landscape value. Pastiche replacements of worn out, decrepit, rural buildings should not be permitted.

### **Housing policy 7 (HOUS 7) Contribution to educational provision**

Development of new market housing in Ringmer should be conditional on a contribution towards the capital cost of the provision of any additional educational provision necessary as a result of the development.

### **Housing policy 8 (HOUS 8) Requirement to health provision**

If at the time of development provision of NHS health and dental services in Ringmer is considered inadequate to support a development's residents, new market housing in Ringmer should be conditional on a contribution towards the capital cost of necessary additional health or dental service provision.

### **Housing policy 9 (HOUS 9) Community Facilities**

For so long as the provision of community facilities in Ringmer remains inadequate all development of new market housing in Ringmer should be conditional on a contribution towards the capital cost of the provision of additional community facilities in or near the village centre.

### **Housing policy 10 (HOUS 10) Drainage and sewerage**

Development of new market housing in Ringmer should be conditional on the provision of any additional drainage and sewerage, including provision of additional sewage works capacity, necessary as a result of the development.

### **Housing policy 11 (HOUS 11) Outdoor recreational space**

For so long as the provision of outdoor recreational space or facilities in Ringmer remain inadequate all development of new market housing in Ringmer should be conditional on a contribution towards the capital cost of the provision of additional outdoor recreational space & facilities.

### **Housing policy 12 (HOUS 12) Provision of car parking**

National and regional policy notwithstanding, all future housing development in Ringmer must recognise the dependence of village life on the private car and provide off-road parking spaces for occupiers at the following ratios:

1.3 parking spaces per 1 bed unit;

2 parking spaces per 2-3 bed unit;

2.3 parking spaces per larger unit.

**July 2009**