

Reg 14 Responses Roundup

| Respondee | Comment | Policy | NP Response |
|------------------------------------|--|--------|--|
| SDNPA | Plan Preparation process It would be helpful to acknowledge in the process summary that the WCNDP has been through two pre-submission consultations. West Chiltington is partially within the SDNP. As the main settlement is outside the SDNP, Horsham District Council is the lead authority for the neighbourhood plan. The WCNDP will need to be submitted to Horsham DC for independent examination. | 1.2 | Agree |
| Horsham DC | The Plan stipulates that there are "no fewer than 69 listed buildings". It is questioned whether this figure includes individual buildings or whether some are group listings. It would be helpful to make this clarification. | 3.2 | There are 69 individual listings and one group value listing |
| Horsham DC | It is suggested that this should read character instead of setting of the parish at the end of the paragraph. | 3.6 | Agree |
| Ms Kirby | Community Facilities and Wellbeing" states that the nearest police station is at Horsham. However, Sussex Police also list a police station at Pulborough, which is open for appointments. I believe that Pulborough is currently being used to police the protests outside the UKOG well site. Even Horsham police station is only open for limited hours. | 3.8 | Pulborough no reporting desk |
| DMH Stallard on behalf of Croudace | The HDPF, at Policy 15, requires that neighbourhood plans deliver 1500 homes in the period 2011-2031. The WCNDP must be drafted with this in mind. Furthermore, Policy 3 of the HDPF states that West Chiltington Village and Common is a 3 rd tier settlement (out of 5 tiers); 3 rd tier settlements, or 'medium villages' are described as being of a moderate level of services and facilities. As such, it would be expected that the WCNDP provides for housing to meet the strategic objectives of Policy 15 as well as identified local housing needs. We submit that in its present form, the WCNDP fails to adhere to the strategic objectives of the HDPF. It would be appropriate to expect that a 3 rd tier settlement allocate housing to assist in meeting the 1500 dwellings set out in Policy 15 of the HDPF. Whilst the WCNDP allocates 2 sites, the delivery of the 'Moto Di Marino' garage is questionable (see later submission), additionally as this site is allocated for sheltered housing, it does not contribute towards the housing target set out in the HDPF. The failure of the WCNDP to deliver a proportionate level of housing to assist in meeting the 1500 dwellings set out in Policy 15 of the HDPF, is not justified or set out in evidence. It could not be said to be in general conformity with Policy 15 or Policy 3 of the HDPF. The parish council should prepare a local assessment of housing need and review the identified sites for inclusion within the neighbourhood plan to assist in meeting the districts housing needs. Until such an assessment has been carried out, as directed by HDC, the WCNDP cannot meet the required tests. | | See Housing justification documents. Can find nothing in the HDC Plan to indicate that Sheltered housing does not contribute to the target for housing. The Plan has very clearly reviewed all sites in the Parish as can be found in the evidence base. |
| DMH Stallard on behalf of Croudace | HDC's strategic housing needs assessment is available for all parish councils and neighbourhood planning groups through its website. However, we are also aware that HDC has advised neighbourhood groups to prepare individual housing needs assessments to determine the appropriate level of housing provision within their areas. Whilst it is acknowledged that the WCNDP evidence base includes a Housing Needs Survey (2014) by AiRS, this is out of date (by virtue of preceding the NPPF and HDPF) but importantly only deals with the matter of affordable housing. Therefore there is no local assessment of full housing needs and therefore the plan does not meet basic conditions as set out clearly within the NPPG. | | Work is ongoing |
| DMH Stallard on behalf of Croudace | The WCNDP plan period does not reflect that of the HDPF. It should be amended to accord with the HDPF plan period (ie. up to 2031). | Amend | |
| SDNPA | Local Plan policy While only a small area of West Chiltington is within the SDNP, the emerging Local Plan of the SDNPA will be the Development Plan for that part of West Chiltington and is therefore of importance. In particular, a small area of the SSSI site of Hurstin Warren (Monkmead Woods) is within the neighbourhood area. The emerging South Downs Local Plan has specific policy on Biodiversity and Geodiversity which covers SSSI. | 2.1.2 | Agree |
| DMH Stallard on behalf of Croudace | As set out in paragraphs 2.3-2.7 above, neighbourhood plans are required to meet certain criteria, in particular they must be in accordance with the NPPF, however, they must also be in accordance with the HDPF, which is the strategic development plan for the district. The WCNDP and Section 2.1.1 in particular, refers to compliance with the NPPF but fails to refer to compliance with the HDPF. In order to meet the basic conditions, the WCNDP must accord with the HDPF and the strategic principles of the plan. | | |
| DMH Stallard on behalf of Croudace | It would be helpful for the WCNDP to be tabulated so that all paragraphs are numbered to allow for easy reference | 2.8 | Noted |
| Mr Mrs Scott | Natural environment Suggest an opening sentence to say "One of the special features of the parish is its broad range of wildlife habitats, connected by a network of corridors. These habitats include lowland heath SSSI to the south, streams, ponds and wetlands, hedgerows and mature trees (especially veteran oaks) leading to drier, acid sandstone ridges on the higher altitudes" | 3.4.2 | Agree |
| DMH Stallard on behalf of Croudace | Section 4.2 sets out core objectives, one of which is to meet identified local housing needs. However, the WCNDP cannot have met basic conditions or its own core objectives, as it is not based on any evidence of local housing needs. HDC have requested that all neighbourhood plan forums undertake a parish based housing needs assessment to inform neighbourhood plan housing targets. Furthermore, the HDPF requires neighbourhood plans to cumulatively deliver 1500 units in the plan period. The WCNDP only seeks to provide for 15 homes against this requirement, of which 14 are affordable. This is wholly inadequate in respect of Policy 15 of the HDPF and more critically is not based on any evidence of local housing needs. | 4.2 | Work ongoing |
| Horsham DC | This policy asks for a 'deliverable and viable business plan' for proposal for new commercial development. This is not within the remit of land use planning and cannot be required to support a planning application. This reference should therefore be deleted. The comment regarding Harwoods should be removed from the plan as it has no relation to the neighbourhood plan and is instead commentary on a separate planning application already ongoing in the plan. | EE2 | Agree |

| Respondee | Comment | Policy | NP Response |
|-----------------------------------|--|--------|---|
| Billingshurst PC | Policy EE2 supports new commercial development, and as an example refers to the proposal by Harwood Motor Group (HMG) to relocate to land adjacent to the A29 opposite Brinsbury College. The WCNP acknowledges HMG has already made an application (DC/17/0177) to develop land, an application that BPC strongly objected to for reasons detailed when responding to Horsham District Council. BPC is mindful that should this site be developed, the impact would be felt most keenly and adversely by residents of Adversane, which is in Billingshurst parish. Should future development proposals come forward that could impact Billingshurst parish residents, BPC will expect to be offered opportunity to comment on those proposals as regards the interests of its residents. | EE2 | Noted |
| Horsham DC | Minor comment: EE4.2 does not link with the actual policy and should perhaps be included as a 'community aim' rather than a policy. The initiative could come forward through the parish and funded through CIL as monies are passed over to the parishes as part of the 'neighbourhood plan contribution of 25% of all CIL receipts in an area with a made neighbourhood plan'. | EE4 | Prefer to make the narrative relate to the type of signs that could be used. |
| Thakeham PC | Policy EE6 refers to conversion of rural buildings to business uses, but the authors could consider extending this policy, or having a additional policy, relating to the conversion of agricultural buildings to dwellings. | EE6 | Noted |
| Horsham DC | No further comment. It is noted the supporting text goes on to stipulated project which require substantial work will not be supported which contradicts the main body of Policy EE6. This will cause confusion and further clarification is required. | EE6 | This section is intended to stop the re-use of buildings where a very limited amount still exists. Policy has been agreed by Examiners elsewhere. |
| Nyetimber Ltd (Strutt and Parker) | <p>Policy EE6</p> <p>We also write to object to Policy EE6 (Rural Buildings) as it does not recognise or support the conversion of rural businesses into residential use, particularly where residential uses are tied to rural businesses.</p> <p>Policy EE6 states that "The re-use, conversion and adaptation of rural buildings for small businesses, recreation, or tourism purposes will be supported subject to the following criteria: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> The building is structurally sound and capable of conversion without substantial reconstruction; <input type="checkbox"/> The use proposed is appropriate to a rural location; <input type="checkbox"/> The conversion/adaptation works respect the local character of the surrounding area and/or buildings; <input type="checkbox"/> The use proposed will not have an adverse impact on any archaeological, architectural, historic or environmental features; and <input type="checkbox"/> The local road system is capable of accommodating the traffic generated by the proposed new use and adequate parking can be accommodated within the site. <p>There are a number of farms within the area with buildings which could be suitable for a variety of uses which would be appropriate to a rural location. These could include the following: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Small businesses - craft or artisan related workshops, studios and small shops, farm shops, micro- breweries; <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation - health or exercise studios, rural educational centres, artist studios; and <input type="checkbox"/> Tourism - niche market holiday accommodation, specialist interest holiday bases. <p>Whilst seeking to reuse existing buildings, it is important to retain and protect the existing character of buildings and to ensure that the development is compatible with its countryside location and designed to minimise potential impact on the countryside. Proposals where substantial re-building works are required will not be supported as these can often intrude on a landscape where there has been no significant structural presence for many years."</p> <p>We note that the Horsham District Development Framework contains a similar policy (Policy 10), which has been adopted and therefore tested at Examination. The approach to the re-use of rural buildings set out in Policy 10 is similar to Policy EE6 of the Neighbourhood Plan, in that it identifies a preference for conversions for business and commercial uses. Policy 10 does, however, state that such uses would "be considered favourably over residential in the first instance" [our emphasis]. This is important as it provides an alternative use for redundant rural buildings where commercial or business uses are not appropriate or viable. Neighbourhood Plan Policy EE6 does not provide this fall-back option which we believe to be important for the continued use and maintenance of attractive rural buildings, particularly where they make a positive contribution to the landscape and where their conversion would provide an enhancement to their setting.</p> <p>Policy EE6 (Rural Buildings) should be amended to include reference to the re-use of rural buildings for residential use, setting out the criteria for when such a use would be acceptable. A residential use that is tied to a business should be considered as favourably as a business, recreation or tourism use, whereas we accept that an unrestricted residential use may be the least preferred option.</p> | EE6 | Revise the policy |
| Mrs Goddard | Policy EH12 - The wording is repeated twice with only a minor difference in the initial sentence. | EH 12 | Agree |
| Horsham DC | As worded this policy is not in conformity with policy 26 of the HDPF, and is more restrictive than the HDPF policy. As worded the policy should be deleted as it would be covered by the provisions in the HDPF | EH1 | Don't agree. The policy makes it clear that the other policies within the NP must be complied with. It is not more onerous that Policy 26 as it supports that policy. It would be very rare to find a NP without a policy about the BUAB. Indeed a recent Inspectors decision failed to uphold a NP policy because they had not set a BUAB. |

| Respondee | Comment | Policy | NP Response |
|------------------------------------|--|--------|---|
| SDNPA | <p>Built Up Area Boundary (BUAB)</p> <p>We note the built-up boundary defined in Map A. The Western boundary of West Chilington Common includes large gardens to the rear of properties on Monkmead Lane. The settlement boundary also includes land to the south of properties on Sunset Lane. Gardens are an important part of the setting and attractiveness of settlements, softening the transition at the settlement edge, marking the edge of settlements in what is generally an attractive way, softening the appearance of built-up areas from the countryside and containing vegetation which shields development. For these reasons the SDNPA excludes large and long gardens from settlement boundaries and would recommend that West Chilington NDP does likewise. This will not affect permitted development rights or the planning status held by gardens as land ancillary to residential use. It is recommended that the settlement boundary runs 10m behind the relevant rear or side wall of the main dwelling house.</p> | EH1 | Discuss with HDC as it is their boundary |
| Horsham DC | Wells Houses do not carry any formal heritage designation or additional protection above normal planning legislation and while the buildings are distinctive, further evidence is required to make the policy effective from any potential challenge. It is noted there is mention of limiting PD rights to this group of houses but again there is the requirement to collate evidence in order for the removal of PD rights in distinctive areas. | EH10 | There is extensive evidence online and indeed a full request made to the LPA in 2004 to have the area made a CA was not carried out because the LPA stated that it did not have time to deal with the matter. Since that time the area has suffered from the use of PD rights to remove significant features. |
| Roundabout Road Fund Cttee | Letter provides good history to the Wells Houses - Full support for the policies | EH10 | Use wording in the evidence |
| Horsham DC | Map C is missing from the main body of the plan. Further evidence must be presented on how such features are valued and contribute to the character of the area. Background evidence is required. In addition, it is considered that further consultation will need to be undertaken on this map before progressing to submission, as at the current time the location of these lanes are not formally identified and does not enable consultees to meaningfully set out their views on the impact of this policy. | EH11 | The lanes are all covered by Policy EH3 so have been consulted upon at Reg 14. A list is now in the Plan. |
| Mr Mrs Scott | EH 11.4. Conservation of the character of the leafy sunken lanes and the water and wetland quality in Stream lane, in the Parish..." | EH11 | Agree |
| Mr Frost | <p>Many thanks for the extensive work that you have undertaken in preparing this Plan, it is obvious in the detail of the work. However, I do have reservations about the plan, especially as it does not seem to go far enough. In some cases (detailed below) it highlights issues only, whilst proposing no way of dealing with them, mainly relating to the existing Parish Infrastructure.</p> <p>To start with, I approve completely of the points in EH11 (pp32) as I feel that the Sunken Roads are a real feature of the Parish.</p> | EH11 | Noted |
| DMH Stallard on behalf of Croudace | Policy EH11 refers to the loss of sunken lanes and Stream Lane, as shown on Map C. It is not possible to comment on Policy EH11 as Map C is not available as part of the pre-submission WCNDP. Croudace Portland reserve the right to make submissions on this policy at a later date, once Map C has been published. | EH11 | Noted |
| Horsham DC | This is considered to be a minerals issues and in the control of WSCC and not within the scope of the Neighbourhood Planning. West Sussex Mineral Plan is only mentioned in the justification and not in the main body of the text. | EH12 | It is accepted that it is a County matter but the policy merely seeks to allow the PC to input into issues of noise etc. To leave the policy out will almost certainly damage the ability to get the Plan through referendum as this is such a key issue for residents. |
| J Fryer | <p>Page 53 Schedule C - Non-designated heritage assets - The Telephone Boxes at East Street, should be "The Hollow"</p> <p>In light of more information having come forward re Mineral and Hydro-carbon Extraction, should EH12 read 'Development proposals involving conventional mineral extraction will NOT be supported, unless it is proven that:'?</p> | EH12 | <p>Correct the error.</p> <p>Review policy EH12</p> |

| Respondee | Comment | Policy | NP Response |
|--------------|---|--------|--------------------|
| Ms Peel | <p>Thank you for a wonderful Neighbourhood Plan. So much work has gone into it and I find it very accurate. The points I would like to dispute are regarding the extraction of hydrocarbons which I do not support under any circumstance.</p> <p><i>Residents' surveys show that local people are very in touch with the environment around them, noting varied wildlife and flora. All want to see the environment and heritage protected and enhanced.'</i></p> <p>Then we must take precautions and object to the threat to our environment and heritage.</p> <p>Throughout the NP under Environment it states...</p> <p><i>'Minimise the impact from mineral, oil and gas exploration'.</i></p> <p>This is almost impossible to say...we cannot see what happens to the air. We know that the flares contain carbon monoxide, methane and up to 60 different types of chemicals. We will be breathing this in without knowing.</p> <p>It is highly likely there will be some kind of incident, whether that is a spill from oil, acid, chemicals or hazardous waste or dangerous levels of carbon monoxide (Please see the pamphlet UK Onshore Oil and Gas Incidents January 2013 to June 2016 where 1,768 reported spills, leaks and unintended releases of oil gas and chemicals were recorded).</p> <p>This is what we may find out above ground, below ground, underneath the village and houses how can we tell what is actually happening?</p> <p>SO to say 'minimize the impact' I don't think is accurate. It's a nice idea though.</p> <p><i>Facilitating the sustainable use of minerals'.</i></p> <p>What is sustainable use? When they are gone they are gone.</p> <p><i>Proposals for energy generating infrastructure on land in current agricultural production or on 'best and most versatile' agricultural land will not be supported unless it is utilising the product of farming operations.</i></p> <p>What about encouraging solar on farm outbuildings?</p> <p><i>EH12 Mineral and Hydro-carbon Extraction</i></p> <p><i>Development proposals involving conventional mineral extraction will be supported provided that :</i></p> <p><i>The siting, scale, design and impact is minimised and does not compromise public safety and allows continued safe use of public rights of way;</i></p> <p>Sadly we cannot ensure this. This is a high risk activity and by nature compromises public safety.</p> <p><i>Adjoining uses are not adversely impacted in terms of environmental pollution from noise, light, toxic materials, traffic or vibration;</i></p> <p>Again by the nature of the business there will be noise, light, traffic and environmental pollution.</p> <p><i>The impact on biodiversity meets the requirements of Policy EH3;</i></p> <p>Bats are always casualties due to the gas flare which is one of the reasons the Sussex Wildlife Trust object. Birds in Balcombe were recorded to leave the area during exploration.</p> <p><i>Unconventional hydro-carbon extraction is a major concern to residents due to the potential impact on the water course and public safety.</i></p> <p>I think we could also add the burning of fossil fuels and the extraction of oil and methane exasperates climate change.</p> <p>As a local resident and Earth citizen I feel it is imperative to object due to overwhelming scientific evidence that climate change is primarily caused from the burning of fossil fuels and the Earths forests. For this reason I propose West Chiltington Parish to be a Fossil Free Zone which does not support the extraction of hydrocarbons.</p> | EH12 | Review policy EH12 |
| SDNPA | <p>Mineral and Hydro-carbon Extraction</p> <p>This policy covers development involving conventional mineral extraction and proposals for conventional hydro-carbon extraction. It is our understanding that this is 'excluded development' as minerals are a county matter and therefore cannot be covered by the NDP.</p> | EH12 | |
| Mr Mrs Scott | <p>EH12 Development proposals for conventional hydrocarbon extraction – Additional bullet point “Provided that there is no additional demand on water resources”</p> | EH12 | Agree |

| Respondee | Comment | Policy | NP Response |
|------------------------------------|--|--------|--|
| Ms Kirby | <p>Policy EH12. In the previous NP consultation I did not object to the policy because, like many, I did not understand the issues. I am now gaining an understanding of the issues and therefore I object strongly to both conventional and unconventional hydrocarbon extraction. My reasons are:</p> <p>(i) The definition of conventional and unconventional under National Planning Practice Guidance appears to be oversimplistic, unscientific and unsound.</p> <p>(ii) In this country it appears that there is currently no definition of acidisation, which is a technique being used in what is claimed to be conventional hydrocarbon extraction, yet acidisation uses a higher concentration of chemicals than hydraulic fracturing and has many of the same adverse environmental effects as hydraulic fracturing, such as potential drinking water contamination.</p> <p>(iii) Under the regulatory framework for hydrocarbon extraction, there is too much emphasis on self-monitoring. Presumably this is due to lack of resources within the Environment Agency.</p> <p>(iv) If the operators are insubstantial, there is a risk that they will be unable to meet their obligations to carry out site restitution or pay compensation to the local community in the event of water contamination.</p> <p>I believe that a more precautionary approach should be adopted and that no further hydrocarbon extraction should be supported until such time as there is further evidence on the potential impact on the environment. As a country we have climate change commitments and these will also be undermined by continued promotion of hydrocarbon extraction.</p> <p>2nd bullet point under "Development proposals for conventional hydro-carbon extraction...." I do not understand the brackets after the word "light". It implies that the only light pollution is from unshrouded flares, but my understanding is that the lighting of the site and the rig also gives rise to extensive light pollution in what would otherwise be a dark sky. Do you mean "(including unguarded flares)"?</p> <p>The NP does not mention that under the Conservative manifesto it is proposed that planning permission would not be required for conventional hydrocarbon extraction. I believe that this is an important point to note.</p> <p>d. Policy EH 12.1. The wording suggests that the light pollution is solely due to an unshrouded flare, which is incorrect (see point c above). The wording also suggests that noise pollution is due to an unshrouded flare. I recommend that the relevant part of the second sentence be rewritten.</p> <p>e. Policy EH12.1. According to page 63 of the Waste Management Plan submitted by KOGI in connection with its environmental permit variation application, the flare appears to be a shrouded flare, not an unshrouded flare as stated here. I recommend that this be checked with the parish council's contacts at UKOG.</p> <p>f. Policy EH 12.3. I believe that it is the impact on watercourses (rather than "the water course") that is the major concern.</p> | EH12 | |
| Billingshurst PC | <p>Policy EH12 supports, subject to terms as detailed, development of sites for mineral extraction and conventional hydro-carbon extraction. Billingshurst Parish Council (BPC) would like to see acknowledged, should such development proceed, that additional and potentially significant vehicle traffic may be generated through Billingshurst parish. Whilst appreciating West Chiltington Parish Council will want to learn of and approve the intended route for this traffic, BPC will itself expect to be offered opportunity to review and approve any route that could impact on its residents.</p> | EH12 | Noted |
| Horsham DC | <p>Map F: It would have been useful to have photographs relating to each significant view to demonstrate its value to the Examiner. Each view should be numbered and it is assumed that each significant view is taken from a public vantage point. This should be placed in a background evidence document to support the plan.</p> | EH13 | Done |
| DMH Stallard on behalf of Croudace | <p>Policy EH13 can be supported insofar as it seeks to protect significant views, as shown on Map F. However, the policy as currently worded also seeks the protection of 'open field aspects', this part of the policy should be deleted as it is not specific and would appear to restrict the development of any green field. Development of land east of Hatches House would not have an impact on significant views, as shown on Map F. Furthermore, the appeal decision highlights that it could be delivered without significant harm to the local landscape, other than that which is inevitable when developing a green field. Development in this location could be delivered in accordance with local housing needs and Policy 15 of the HDPF whilst also protecting significant views.</p> | EH13 | Noted |
| Horsham DC | <p>The need for a settlement separation zone will need to be supported by background evidence to justify the need for this policy in addition to policy 27 of the HDPF. The statement 'or where the benefits outweigh the harm' is potentially ambiguous and it is suggested the identification of specific criteria would be more helpful.</p> | EH2 | Increase evidence base. The zone was first allocated as a Local Gap in the HDC Local Plan 2007 |
| Mr & Mrs Price | <p>We are very pleased that the Settlement Separation Zone has been clearly identified in the Plan with its protection coming under Policy EH2. This is a crucial issue which must be adhered to when considering any future planning applications for development or infrastructure works.</p> | EH2 | Noted |
| SDNPA | <p>Green Infrastructure and Ecosystem Services</p> <p>We support the identification and protection of Biodiversity Corridors in this policy.</p> | EH3 | Noted |
| Horsham DC | <p>At the current time this policy is not locally specific - it would be helpful to identify key areas of green infrastructure in the parish that should be protected or enhanced in addition to biodiversity corridors.</p> | EH3 | This has been done in Policy EN7 Local Green Spaces. These are linked to the corridors |
| Mr Mrs Scott | <p>EH 3.1 "provide important connections between the south downs and the Weald.."</p> <p>EH 3.2 - "...ensure effective long-term management and enhancement of key features within the biodiversity corridors"</p> | EH3 | Agree |
| DMH Stallard on behalf of Croudace | <p>Policy EH3 seeks to restrict development within, or immediately adjacent, to the 'Biodiversity Corridors' identified on Map E. However, there is no evidence for the identification of these corridors as having habitats or species worthy of protection. In the absence of evidence to justify Policy EH3, it does not meet the basic conditions.</p> | EH3 | Don't agree |
| Mr Mrs Scott | <p>b) "...make appropriate provision for accommodating the surface water, through SUDS (sustainable Drainage systems) wherever possible for accommodating.."</p> | EH4 | Agree |
| Ms Pickett | <p>We support the current version of the plan. The terms of reference and objectives are explained well. We strongly agree with the stance on unconventional hydro-carbon extraction. Our only other thoughts were: - should there be mention of the nearest fire/ambulance provision? -- Policy EH4 - Surface Water Management- the map shows the watercourses, but there is also an Environment Agency map available highlighting surface water flood risk areas which is different and might be a useful addition - one of the "significant views" listed is about to be blighted by the construction of a very large agricultural building at Moralees Farm, Haglands Lane.</p> | EH4 | SW flood map downloaded - add to evidence base |

| Respondee | Comment | Policy | NP Response |
|------------------------------------|---|-----------------|--|
| Mr Frost | <p>Policy EH4 (pp28/29) looks at surface water management. Has there been any review of the existing sewerage facilities in the parish?</p> <p>Once again, my compliments for producing this plan, if there is a specific reason why it has not been taken further I would be very interested in hearing it.</p> <p>Unfortunately, the plan itself is like starting to renovate a house on the first floor, whilst ignoring the fact that the front door is too small for the people to get in...!</p> <p>I have circulated the details of the Neighbourhood Plan to my Neighbourhood watch group, replies were all complimentary, and they have no additional comments to make at this time, therefore the above are my personal feelings.</p> | EH4 | Noted |
| DMH Stallard on behalf of Croudace | EH4 is supported, if 'areas at risk from flooding' is meant to be those areas highlighted on the EA flood risk map. It should not be taken to mean, roads liable to flooding at times of heavy rain or snow, as set out on page 15 of the WCNDP. | EH4 | Noted |
| Mr Mrs Scott | <p>"Development proposals, where appropriate must be designed to incorporate and enhance biodiversity..."</p> <p>3rd Paragraph ... "demonstrate how they will be maintained and enhanced and damage mitigated against"</p> | EH5 | Agree |
| DMH Stallard on behalf of Croudace | <p>Policy EH5 could, subject to amendments, satisfactorily seek the protection of green infrastructure and ecology. Policy EH5 seems to duplicate EH3 in that it seeks the protection of trees and hedgerows. As set out above, there is no justification for the protection of identified 'green infrastructure' or 'ecosystems' as identified on Map E. The protection of hedgerows and trees could be sought, however, this is already a requirement of development through Policy 33 of the HDPF. Policy EH5, as worded, is overly restrictive, requiring that the loss of trees and hedgerows will only be permitted where the benefits of development outweighs the loss.</p> <p>To meet the basic conditions, Policy EH5 should be reworded to require the presumption in favour of retention of important features such as trees and hedgerows. Where the loss of such features is unavoidable, mitigation should be sought. This would accord with the HDPF.</p> | EH5 | Don't agree |
| Thakeham PC | Although the first objective of the Environment and Heritage section is 'protecting high quality agricultural land' the Plan could be more specific around this. For instance, although Policy EH6 addresses the specific alternative use of land for solar 'farms', there is no policy line relating to potential issues with sub-division of fields leading to the creation of 'shanty' smallholdings, or the different issues raised by proposals to deliberately 'rewild' areas. | EH6 | Policy added |
| Horsham DC | Please remove reference to Micro-Generation Certification Scheme from actual policy as it is not related to land use planning. It is recommend reference is made of Micro-Generation Certificate Scheme in the supporting text. | EH6 | Policy wording has been agreed by four previous Examiners |
| Historic England | We welcome Policies EH7, EH8 and EH10 as conforming with the National Planning Practice Guidance, which advises neighbourhood plans to include policies to "put broader strategic heritage policies from the local plan into action at a neighbourhood scale". We also welcome Policies EH13 (EH13.1) and EE6 (for its protection of archaeological, architectural or historic features). | EH7 EH8 EH10 | Noted |
| Horsham DC | The Policy should read 'preserve or enhance. Please delete 'preserve and enhance' | EH8 | Agree |
| SDNPA | <p>'Unlit village' status</p> <p>We support this policy which seeks to protect the unlit environment of the Parish. The dark night skies are a special quality of the SDNP which is recognised by its International Dark Sky Reserve status.</p> | EH9 | Noted |
| Horsham DC | <p>Please see comment Policy H8. While Paragraph 125 of the NPPF goes on to stipulate:</p> <p>"By encouraging good design, planning policies and decisions should limit the impact of light pollution from artificial light on local amenity, intrinsically dark landscapes and nature conservation."</p> <p>There is no requirement here for dark skies without the support of evidence and it may be open to challenge. In addition there is no further stipulation of what is required in terms of what is acceptable illumination? Further guidance would help the policy and how this may be applied. From public (streetlighting) to domestic lighting to consideration of different areas of the parish (village centre/edge of village/rural/commercial) and consideration of safety issues. It is accepted SDNPA does encroach into the Parish (South West boundary of the parish) but the dark skies policy in the SDNPA Local Plan does not include blanket coverage of the whole parish. What is needed is to demonstrate such a policy can be applied successful with more detailed required. Are there different zones which are more sensitive? What level of lighting would be acceptable? While it is accepted the Parish may want unlit skies it would benefit the policy if further clarification is provided on what is acceptable and where.</p> | EH9 | Policy wording agreed by three previous Examiners - also existing position in the parish and local support |
| DMH Stallard on behalf of Croudace | <p>The general principles of Policy GA1 are supported, development should be in locations that promote non-car modes of transport, such as those in sustainable locations. The land east of Hatches House is in such a location, close to public transport links, the post office and primary school. It performs well in the Parish Council's site assessment and the Inspector in relation to the planning appeal also notes the sustainability attributes of the site.</p> <p>However, the first bullet point of Policy GA1 seeks to burden development with financial contributions towards walking or cycling routes. This would not be compliant with the CIL Regulations as such contributions can only be necessary where they are necessary to make the development acceptable.</p> | GA1 | Noted |
| A Kirby | <p>Policy GA2 Footpath, bridleways and cycle path network (or wherever appropriate)</p> <p>I believe that it should be made a condition of support for any development proposal affecting a public footpath or bridlepath (e.g. where the ROW forms part of the access to the development) that public access to the public footpath or bridlepath in question should not be impeded in any way as a result of the development, e.g. as a result of security concerns. This might help to avoid situations such as the one at the Knowe Top Farmpressing centre, where there was a planning application and where one footpath was diverted without permission and another has had a deterrent notice (warning of guard dogs) posted across it for many months and has also been blocked outside working hours for many months.</p> | GA2 | HDC enforcement issues. Concerns noted |

| Respondee | Comment | Policy | NP Response |
|-------------------------------|--|--------|--|
| Horsham DC | Please remove 'The loss of existing footpaths, bridle ways and cycle paths will be resisted from the policy. Loss is unlikely to happen but diversion is possible. Furthermore, it may be worth linking the policy to any infrastructure plan in the parish to improve local infrastructure such as pathways, bridleway and extend cycle networks. Please refer to the WSCC Public rights of Way team for any guidance they may be able to offer. | GA2 | Loss is a very definite possibility as is has happened in the Parish in the past year - do not agree. |
| Horsham DC | There is a requirement for further clarification on what is meant by 'standards adopted at the time' Standards are usually stipulated by WSCC's parking calculator. It is recommended that this link is clearly cited within the policy to provide necessary clarity for applicants. 'Proposal that would result in a [insert] 'net' loss of parking spaces either on or off street will resisted.' Again the supporting text is quite specific and could be contrary to prevailing standard as advocated by the text in bold (presumably the policy). This is not clear and leans towards a design code. Has WSCC agreed to the principles advocated in the plan? A record of communication would benefit the examiner in his/her understanding especially if County Highways are supported of the 'criterion' as stipulated in the plan. | GA3 | Wording agreed by previous Examiners. It gives the policy longevity. |
| WSCC | Policy GA3 Parking and new development – This policy seeks to set car parking standards for new residential development. The County Council's Guidance on Car Parking in Residential Developments and the Car Parking Demand Calculator should be referred to in the policy as the car parking standards, which can be accessed via the following link: https://www.westsussex.gov.uk/roads-and-travel/information-for-developers/pre-application-advice-for-roads-and-transport/ | GA3 | Noted policy will be amended |
| Ms Kirby | I support the allocation of the land at Moto Di Marino garage to meet housing need because it is well located in terms of facilities and infrastructure and avoids the need for greenfield development. | H1 | Noted |
| Historic England | We have assessed the two proposed housing sites against our records of designated heritage assets. The site at Steele Close is within the setting of the Grade II listed Naldrett's Farmhouse. Although we do not consider that this is a bar to the development of the site, we do consider that the northern boundary of the development needs to be considered carefully so as not to detract more than necessary from the significance and character of the farmhouse. We therefore consider that Policy H1 should contain a requirement to this effect. In addition, the Historic Environment Record should also be consulted for any records of archaeological finds on either of the proposed sites. | H1 | Planning permission has already been granted |
| Historic England | We welcome the references to the Horsham Landscape Character Assessment and Village Design Statement in Policy H1 as we consider that Neighbourhood Development Plans should be underpinned by a thorough understanding of the character and special qualities of the area covered by the Plan. Characterisation studies can also help inform locations and detailed design of proposed new development, identify possible townscape improvements and establish a baseline against which to measure change. | H1 | Character assessment work needs to be added |
| Horsham DC | Further evidence is required to demonstrate the emerging neighbourhood plan has a robust housing figure which contributes positively towards meeting a fair proportion of the 1500 dwellings as stipulated by Policy 15 of the HDPF. The plan must demonstrate all sites have been assessed objectively in order to meet this requirement. HDC considers the Housing Needs Survey (2014) does not reflect the wider needs of the community. The Housing Needs Survey (2014) is limited in scope, concentrating solely on the delivery of affordable housing. There is no assessment of other tenures of housing or meeting market signals in order to meet PPG requirements. The AirS study is also a snapshot in time which does not cover the whole plan period up to 2031. This does not meet the basic conditions. It will be necessary for the West Chiltington Neighbourhood Plan to provide evidence to support a viable, robust housing number which seeks to accommodate a fair proportion of the total of 1500 dwellings to be delivered through Neighbourhood Planning as set out in Policy 15 of the HDPF. It will be necessary for the Parish Council/Steering Group to undertake a Housing Needs Assessment to ascertain a robust housing number. Every endeavour must be made to accommodate this housing number with the sites available. Consequently all sites that have been suggested to the Steering group as a potential development site must be assessed objectively in order to meet this requirement. Assessment of sites must be supported by robust evidence either through communication with statutory consultees or technical evidence. (Please refer to the additional commentary in the Site Allocation Assessment section below). It should however be noted that public opinion from the local community cannot be the sole justification to reject a site. A developer may seek to challenge the plan if they can provide adequate mitigation against a negative impact whether it is a highways or a landscape/environmental issue. In addition, there is a lack of detail on the allocated sites identified in the plan as how they should be brought forward (access arrangements, overcoming landownership or availability issues, contamination, any mitigation required, any developer contributions sought). This is a significant omission and could lead to development coming forward which is very different to that which the community may have envisaged. | H1 | The NP Team accepts that HDC now require them to carry out a further review to justify housing numbers even though it believes this to be the function of the DC. However it does not agree that the evidence of appraisal of each housing site is insufficient. |
| Mr & Mrs Price | Allocation of land for development We are pleased to find that a site has been allocated for housing for the elderly at the Moto di Marino garage; this is in a highly accessible central location with easy access to village facilities and public transport and would not be detrimental to wildlife or the rural environment – thus making it a very sustainable site. We also agree with the decision not to include the Smock Alley/land by Haglands Lane site in the draft plan; this site was rejected twice for a variety of reasons by HDC planners and by the Planning Inspector on Appeal. | H1 | Noted |
| Storrington and Sullington PC | "Storrington & Sullington Parish Council notes that the West Chiltington Neighbourhood Plan allows for a maximum of 30 homes throughout its lifetime. This number is considered low in relation to the amount of land in the NP area. Members also note that whilst the WCNP provides support for the upgrade and extension of existing employment and retail units, there is no mention of support for new businesses." | H1 | Policy EE2 |

| Respondee | Comment | Policy | NP Response |
|------------------------------------|---|--------|---|
| Shaw Designs | <p>I mentioned that I had previously submitted various documentation and also given a pre-application presentation regarding a piece of land at 'Land to the South of the Pumping Station', Smock Alley, West Chiltington. This site has been promoted in the SHLAA process but had been considered to be Not Developable. Something I fundamentally dispute however the explanation by Horsham District Council Strategic Officer was that as no application had been submitted, they didn't see this site as coming forward within the 5 year housing land supply.</p> <p>After careful consideration, it was felt that it might be better to ask for this site to be considered under a Call for Sites and consequently I submitted some details and formally asked for this to be included. I would be very happy to provide these under a separate email but wished to respectfully enquire what happened to the site assessment and why are there only two sites of 15 units that are deemed suitable and then additionally that Hatches House suddenly got incorporated into the consultation process. I do recognise the possible implications by the Appeal Inspectors comments for Hatches House but in light of the site 'Land to the West of Smock Alley' I do find it strange that our request to the Steering Committee seems to have become completely overlooked and must therefore question whether the correct procedure has been followed, up to your own involvement.</p> <p>I am sure you will understand why I am raising this issue on behalf of the landowners of this site, which is available and deliverable. We were intending to formally submit a planning application to Horsham District Council but have concerns that they may simply defer this until such time as the Neighbourhood Plan is confirmed.</p> <p>Could you please advise me as to how we could ensure that this specific site is also included within the consultation process and similarly if you are unable to find our previous written request, I will forward our details for your own consideration accordingly.</p> | H1 | Site appraised along with all other sites and found to not meet criteria. See evidence base. |
| DMH Stallard on behalf of Croudace | <p>Policy H1 of the WCNDP does not meet the basic conditions required. As set out in previous paragraphs, the WCNDP fails to provide for a reasonable level of housing to assist in meeting the requirements of Policy 15 of the HDPF. West Chiltington is a 3rd tier settlement, out of 5 tiers, it is reasonable to assume that the villages would accommodate some of the district's housing need, particularly those of West Chiltington Parish. The village has a wide range of public facilities, including a primary school and shops in both West Chiltington and West Chiltington Common and development could come forwards within sustainable locations to assist in meeting housing needs. Policy H1 does not provide for this.</p> <p>Policy H1 is not based on evidence. There has been no assessment of local housing needs which justifies the level of housing proposed. Policy H1 refers to the AiRS Housing Needs Survey, however, this a survey of local affordable housing needs, it does not make any assessment of the true need for housing within the villages. The NPPG sets out clear guidance for the preparation of housing needs assessments and the AiRS report fails to meet any of the guidance.</p> <p>Policy H1 seems to allocate 2 sites for housing. The Steele Close site already benefits from planning permission. This permission was granted on the basis of a 'rural exception' policy as it provides for 14 affordable housing units. The second allocation at 'Moto di Marino' garage is for sheltered housing, sheltered housing does not contribute towards objectively assessment housing needs (OAHN) and therefore does not contribute towards Policy 15 of the HDPF. Policy H1 therefore only provides for 1 market dwelling in the plan period.</p> <p>It should also be highlighted that the 'Moto di Marino' garage allocation (also referred to as the Haglands Lane garage site) is made on the basis that the site could come forwards in the future. However, the evidence base (Site Assessment Report 2017) identifies that the site is not available for development, although the land owner has suggested that it 'could' be in the future. It is important that employment sites are retained within rural settlements to support rural economies and as the availability of the site is unknown, it should not be allocated for sheltered housing development. It should also be noted that the evidence (Site Assessment Report 2017) identifies that the site could be developed for 8 flats, but the final allocation is for 16, there is no evidence that the site could accommodate this level of development.</p> | H1 | See previous comments. The allocation at Moto di Marino is no different to any SHLAA allocation. The land may never come forward but the owner has indicated that it might. The site is unusual as it is a small family run business. It is an ideal location to meet an identified need for homes for the elderly. The number of flats is assessed by reference to a similar development across the road where the footprint is the same |
| Historic England | We welcome Policy H2 as according with paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework, which states "... neighbourhood plans should develop robust and comprehensive policies that set out the quality of development that will be expected for the area.....Such policies should be based on stated objectives for the future of the area and an understanding and evaluation of its defining characteristics." | H2 | Noted |
| Horsham DC | The village design statement is dated 2003 (pre – NPPF 2011) and adopted under the previous Planning Act as Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG). The validity of the document may be challenged because of its date and may negate its effectiveness when referenced to in Planning Policy. The document should be updated to reflect new legislation. Reference could be made in the plan to the intention to undertake such a review and ensure that any future documentation be considered. | H2 | Agree. However the design principles have not changed and character appraisals have been added. |
| Horsham DC | <p>As part of the government's housing and construction 'Red Tape Challenge' (2012), Lifetime Homes has move to consolidated standards into a national framework centred on the Building Regulations. Lifetime Homes is optional in the building regulations at the moment. Please refer to the Housing Standards Review. The policy should therefore make it clear that 25% of the optional accessibility standards as stipulated in Part M of the Building Regulations is supported but is not mandatory.</p> <p>In addition Planning Practice Guidance (paragraph 009) states that policies for wheelchair accessible homes should be applied only to those dwellings where the local authority is responsible for allocating or nominating a person to live in that dwelling. The Category 3 optional standard M4(3)(2)(b) may therefore only apply to social rented and affordable rented homes. The Category 2 optional standard M4(2) and Category 3 optional standard M4(3)(2)(a) can be applied irrespective of tenure because they relate to wheelchair adaptable dwellings.</p> <p>The Council has recently produced a housing mix study which stipulates there is shortage of 2/3 bedrooms in the district. The parish may wish to consider whether they wish to use this evidence to help support this policy in terms of the types of housing which are provided.</p> | H3 | Understood but the Plan makes it clear that it is only showing support for a higher allocation. A NP can and should reflect the wishes of the community. If a planning application come forward and provided more than the guidance states should be provided the PC would support it. |
| Horsham DC | Clarification is sought on the latter part of Policy H4 as it does not related to the first half of the policy. The Council considers an applicant can provide contributions for infrastructure to make development acceptable in planning terms thus negating the latter part of the policy. Please delete. 'And not overloading local services/infrastructure...' | H4 | Agree |
| Historic England | We also welcome Policy H4. | H4 | Noted |

| Respondee | Comment | Policy | NP Response |
|------------------------------------|---|----------------------|--|
| Horsham DC | Affordable Housing Policy should be in line with HDPF Policy 16. Please amend the policy to reflect this. The reference to the Horsham DC Housing Strategy 2013-2015 is out of date. Please also refer to our earlier comments on the need for housing need assessments. | H5 | Change wording to read Policy HDPF 16. |
| Mr Mrs Scott | iv Biodiversity, wildlife and its habitat and areas of connectivity must be conserved,,," | H6 | Agree |
| Thakeham PC | It is suggested that Policy H6 clause 1 might benefit from this addition: "The scale, design and density of the development is appropriate to the size and character of the settlement <i>and its locality</i> ." (Or similar - 'locality' being intended here to mean the <i>immediately adjacent</i> setting of the site.) | H6 | Agree |
| Ms Kirby | Policy H6. Line 2 after bullet points. There is a typo. The word "with" after "meet" should be deleted. | H6 | Agree |
| Horsham DC | It is noted that Policy H6 does stipulate if impacts from development can be mitigated through contributions. | H6 | Noted |
| Horsham DC | Outdoor Space Policy H7 - suggestion to replace 'adequate' with 'appropriate'. It is suggested that this policy is merged with H8 as a general development principals or design criteria policy, which will assist Development management officers in using the plan once it is made. | H7 | Agree |
| Horsham DC | A number of these requirements may not be possible as they are covered by permitted development rights. The effectiveness of the policy may be limited. It is suggested that areas over which there is no direct control are set out in a community aims section at the end of the document. Please note previous comment (Policy H2) regarding the Village Design Statement and conformity with current legislation. There is no dark skies policies in the HDPF nor at national level. The SDNPA has a dark sky policy but this is credited by International Dark Skies Reserve (IDSR) and is one of two areas afforded this designation in the UK. While some of the SDNPA does encroach into the parish at the south west boundary there is not the blanket dark skies designation across the Parish. Further evidence would be required to require this for all sites outside the national park. It may also be helpful to merge this section of the policy with EH9. | H8 | This policy has been allowed by five previous Examiners. The Dark Skies policy is a local requirements and surely the purpose of a NP |
| DMH Stallard on behalf of Croudace | Policy H8 is considered overly restrictive, onerous and unnecessary, it does not meet the basic conditions. It is appropriate to seek that new development reflects the Village Design Statement, however the details of criteria 1 – 6 are onerous and should be dealt with on a site by site basis. For example, criteria (1) requires that lighting complies with dark sky status, there is no justification of evidence to require such restriction, furthermore, this is already dealt with in Policy EH9 of the WCNDP. | H8 | Don't agree |
| Horsham DC | The development of an infrastructure delivery plan for the parish would have demonstrated to the examiner the intention of the parish to enhance community facilities in the Parish and set out intended investment priorities perhaps funded by CIL. | LC3 | Noted |
| Horsham DC | LC 4.2 refers to the loss of shops/services and perhaps belongs to another policy. The latter half of Policy LC4 may not be compatible with existing legislation regarding Assets of Community Value as it exceeds what powers are covered under the current arrangements. | LC4 | LC4.2 is merely stating the importance of the shops etc to the community |
| Horsham DC | The designation of local green space must meet the criteria set by Paragraph 77 of the NPPF. It will be for the examiner to decide if the LGS proposals do meet the requirements but evidence to demonstrate this would have greatly aided the examiner. Schedule B – Local Green Space – Policy LC5 a minor points on this topic Could the green spaces be numbered so it can be easily located on the map? | LC5 | Each allocation has been justified. Agree re numbering on the map |
| SDNPA | Designation of Local Green Space We note and support the designation of Monkmead Wood as LGS. | LC5 | Noted |
| Horsham DC | The policies maps are considered too small to be legible and are not at a scale where boundaries can be clearly defined. The legend on each map is also unclear at times. The Policies map should show all proposed designations (allocations, strategic gap, Local Green Space, BUBA amendments) in one place with an appropriate legend and at a resolution which is legible with boundaries which are clearly defined. | Maps | The maps are kept as small images for the purposes of the consultation otherwise the files are too big to move around. The more you show on one map the less legible it becomes. |
| DMH Stallard on behalf of Croudace | The WCNDP is published for consultation in the absence of 'Map C – Sunken Roads'. Comments cannot therefore be properly made in respect of policies relating to 'sunken roads' and should be allowed at a subsequent stage. | Map C | Noted |
| Mr Mrs Scott | Map E - The Biodiversity Corridors are excellent. – Could there be an additional corridors across the former golf course (now vineyard) east and south of Lower Jordan's Farm and connecting with Kings & Prices Farm, I'm accordance with the vineyard manager's stated desire at the public event in November 2016to restore habitat following removal of trees in winter 2016-17? | Map E | Discuss |
| Mrs Goddard | Map E The parish boundary is overlaid by bio-diversity corridors so that the former are unclear. TPOs do not appear to be shown on this map even though they are in the key. | Map E | Checked - this is an error the TPO's should be included |
| Mrs Goddard | p.10 Strengths. The beauty salon is a completely separate business from the hairdressers, so should be listed separately. Should the Roundabout Hotel also not be listed here? | Page 10 | Agree |
| | Paragraph 3 refers to the Village as being towards the North of the Parish and then refers to the northern agricultural section. On page 12 in para 3.2 the same point is made but this time the reference is to the Village being towards the South. I would question whether this issue needs to be addressed twice but in any event it needs to be accurate and consistent. | Page 10 Chapter 3 | North is open agricultural land then to the south there are two distinct settlements; the old village being slightly north of the The Common |
| | It was HDC that proposed that a map showing the three areas be included in the 2015 pre-sub plan. It has clearly been decided to drop it but might HDC suggest it be reinstated in due course? | Page 10 Chapter 3 | BUAB map shows the settlements |
| Mrs Goddard | p.10 Section 3 para 3. The old village of West Chiltoningon is definitely not towards the north of the Parish, so combine paras 3 and 4, and start by saying that the northern three-quarters of the parish is sparsely populated and agricultural etc. and then in the south are the old village separated by fields from WC Common with more recent development etc. | Page 10 Chapter 3 | Done |

| Respondee | Comment | Policy | NP Response |
|------------------------------------|---|--------------------|--|
| Historic England | We welcome the references to the conservation area and listed buildings on page 10 and the identification of “many beautiful old buildings” and “great history and culture” as strengths of the village on page 11. We also welcome the more detailed description of the historical development of the village on page 12 and sub-section 3.4.1 on page 14. However, we consider that it would be helpful to say a little more about the conservation area either here or on page 13; e.g. when was it designated ? Has the designation been reviewed ? What is its special interest (the reason for designation) ? Is there a character appraisal and/or a management plan for the conservation area ? | Page 12 | Agree- discuss |
| Mr Kirby | I would suggest eliminating the descriptive elements that are in the introduction to Chapter 3 and concentrating on the history. | Page 12 para 3.2 | Noted |
| Mr Kirby | Although there is a reference to Evidence Base 1 it might be helpful to show the 2011 Census as the source of the table. | Page 13 | Agree |
| Mr Kirby | It might be overstating things to say that “An extensive biodiversity survey was conducted across the Parish” as the report in the evidence base is clearly a desktop report with a health warning about the limitations of the data gathering. | Page 13 Para 3.4 | Agree |
| Mr Kirby | The reference here is to 67 listed buildings. Para 3.2 on page 12 and the Evidence Base shows 69. | Page 14 Para 3.4.1 | Agree |
| Mr Kirby | This section is a bit of a muddle. Why is The Juggs dealt with first followed by Steele Close and sundry other later developments only for the earlier 1920s development to be dealt with afterwards. I suspect that there is an intention to address the provision of “homes that had a social purpose” but as I say it is a muddle. The development of The Common in the second half of the 20 th century is not mentioned. The AiRS study as it is called was an official Housing Needs Survey in 2014 but its place in the Evidence Base is not referenced, nor is there any quantitative information about its findings that would be relevant in demonstrating in due course whether the policies were meeting the need. The SHELAA is potentially important in identifying what Horsham’s view of the housing need is but it is not addressed in any analytical way that can be referenced to the site evaluations and the eventual policies. The final sentence is part of the evaluation of the evidence and not a statement of the housing need that this paragraph is essentially addressing even though the point raised is undoubtedly true. The proper place for this comment is wherever it is explained why the plan is at variance with HDC policy. | Page 15 Para 3.5 | Re-drafted |
| DMH Stallard on behalf of Croudace | Section 3.5 identifies historic housing delivery within the parish, however, this refers to housing delivered in the period from 1920 – 1994, and identifies that 16 houses were subsequently delivered in 2014. This appears to identify a significant shortfall in housing delivery in the Parish and there has been no justification for a failure to deliver additional housing, against the 1500 set out in Policy 15 of the HDPF. Whilst this section does set out the historic growth of the villages, it should not be provided as justification of a failure to provide for future housing needs. | 3.5 | Additional evidence added |
| DMH Stallard on behalf of Croudace | The first paragraph, on page 15 of the WCNDP, refers to areas of flooding within the village(s), referencing that many roads are liable to flooding at times of heavy rain and snow. There is no evidence to validate this claim. The EA’s flood risk map is referred to and forms part of the evidence base Evidence Base 12), however this only identifies a small area at risk of flooding in the rural area to the north. Reference to the flooding of roads should be removed. | Page 15 | Don’t agree. Add evidence. Local people know more about localised flooding than external developers. |
| Thakeham PC | p.16 references to buses – note that the 74 Compass bus service is now further reduced; | Page 16 | Check |
| DMH Stallard on behalf of Croudace | The HDC SHELAA 2016 is referred to in Section 3.5. It suggests that only 1 of 12 sites was considered suitable for housing, this is not a true reflection of the assessment. The SHELAA 2016 included an assessment of land east of Hatches House (SA500); it was only disregarded on the basis that it was questionable whether the site could deliver 6 houses, the threshold for SHELAA assessment. The appeal decision in respect of the site concludes that there would be no harm arising from the development of the site for 3 houses, bar the inevitable development of a greenfield site. The Parish Council’s own assessment of the site is generally positive (Site Assessment Report 2017). | 3.5 | The PC has clearly assessed the site as evidenced. |
| Mr Kirby | Whilst rat runs and parking are important issues are they the essence of “getting around West Chiltington”? Why is this dealt with separately from Roads and Traffic later in the paragraph? There is a reference to finding additional land for parking but nowhere in the report is there any indication of how this proposal has been addressed and it would be a land use issue. A potential solution to be included in policies in section 5 would be to provide parking space on the Hatches Estate site that the HDC SHELAA identifies as suitable for housing subject to overcoming the civil engineering and topographical difficulties of the site. There is no evidence that this option has been considered although the housing development possibilities clearly were. This also raises the issue of a potential conflict between the HDC plan and the neighbourhood plan that might need to be resolved. | Page 16 Para 3.6 | Issue is only with the school. Good parking elsewhere |
| Mr Kirby | Bus route 7 needs a destination for the service | Page 16 Para 3.6 | Agree |
| Mr Kirby | The reference to street lighting and Evidence Base A does not lead immediately to an identifiable document out of 24 possibles. | Page 16 Para 3.6 | Check |
| Mr Kirby | There is a link to Evidence Base 15 but that is a summary only whereas the text refers to “surveys”. The questions need to be shown as does the 2014 Business Survey that was conducted alongside the 2014 Housing Needs Survey. | Page 17 Para 3.7 | Agree |
| Mrs Goddard | p.18. Is there not a police station at Pulborough? | Page 18 | Check |

| Respondee | Comment | Policy | NP Response |
|-----------|---|-------------------------|---|
| | <p>The objectives are important because they lead into the policies which can then be evaluated in terms of the extent to which they meet the objectives.</p> <p>Housing is clearly the most important consideration in a plan that is concerned with the use and development of land but the objective says nothing specific about what the housing need is, although there are some references in the previous chapters dealing with the background to the plan. I would suggest that for the objectives to be measurable when viewed against the policies some detail is required.</p> <p>The use of the words "housing will be designed" is confusing because what the objective really is is that land will be allocated to meet the housing needs which could be expressed as a priority for affordable housing rather than use "design" which is an ambiguous word at best meaning "intended" but is also indicative of the aesthetics of housing.</p> <p>Since the legislation requires a neighbourhood plan to set out policies "in relation to the development and use of land" it is essential that objectives and policies are exclusively concerned with the use and development of land in order to comply with the basic conditions although in practice non-statutory policies are generally accepted if they are separated so as not to form part of the statutory plan.</p> <p>The objectives in para 4.2 include a number of non land use issues eg:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Supporting local shops and businesses (ii) Ensure provision of a range of facilities for leisure and recreation (iii) Promote improvements to health and wellbeing provision. <p>although the policies have attempted to build these into exclusively land use policies. It remains to be seen whether this proves to be effective.</p> | Page 18 Para 4.2 | Objectives reflect broad aspirational issues- policies seek to provide support for the objectives within the framework of land use |
| Mr Frost | <p>On Page 19, shouldn't "improving the existing road network" be taken into account as part of point 4.2.3, not just cycleways and footpaths, and why just look at Communications Infrastructure on page 21? For example, the road leading into Storrington caters for a number of surrounding villages. All this leads into ONE single arterial road passing through Storrington, the A283. The traffic is horrendous currently, and the pollution levels in Storrington are way above what should be allowed. WCPC SHOULD WORK IN TANDEM WITH STORRINGTON PARISH COUNCIL WITH THE SOLE OBJECT TO RESOLVE THIS GRAVE TRAFFIC PROBLEM.</p> <p><i>In my opinion the Village School should be re-sited, as currently it really is extremely dangerous with the amount of traffic that currently exists, a serious accident waiting to happen as it is?.</i></p> | Page 19 | Noted |
| Mr Kirby | <p>Having used the form 2.1, 2.2 etc previously Chapter 5 appears to use 5a, b and c. Why the inconsistency?</p> <p>In general I get a sense that policies have been included that reflect all the planning issues in the NPPF even though there is no distinctive West Chilton element. This might not be acceptable to the examiner. Many examiners have excluded policies that simply repeat national or local development plan policies. I would suggest that a full review be carried out before the plan is finalised after the consultation period in order to address this risk.</p> | Page 20 Policies | Do not agree. Policies are only included if they are relevant directly to WC |
| Mr Kirby | <p>It is part of the Basic Conditions that the plan takes account of national policies so it is unnecessary to repeat a commitment to the principles of sustainable development and especially to repeat the planning features of the NPPF already set out in detail at the beginning of the plan.</p> | Page 21 Paras 5a and 5b | Don't agree. This is needed to cross reference the justification |
| Mr Kirby | <p>As a statement of policy the words "Permission will be granted" looks somewhat odd. They appear to relate to both allocations and thus imply that the Parish Council has a permission granting function. This is clearly not the case and the wording is either wrong, misleading or too loose to be sufficiently clear.</p> <p>As the planning application has already been granted there must be a question as to whether the neighbourhood plan can have a policy that merely supports a decision already made.</p> <p>It might be more appropriate to use this site as an adjustment to the housing need identified in 2014 Housing Needs Survey and adapt the policy to deal with the remaining need although it is not clear how the second allocation will do that in the absence of any clear statement of what the need is.</p> <p>In 20 above there is a proposal to address the Hatches Estate site in relation to parking. Depending on the outcome this might have an impact on this policy.</p> | Page 22 Policy H1 | Wording is normal and agreed by numerous Examiners. Hatches Estate will not ease the parking problems caused by the school. The matter has been discussed and explored fully. |
| Mr Kirby | <p>It is arguable that it is unnecessary to repeat as H1.3 demonstrates is an established HDC policy with which the plan has to be in general conformity anyway.</p> | Page 22 Policy H1 | Leave in as it helps the reader |
| Mr Kirby | <p>In its representations on the 2015 pre-sub plan HDC advised that it would be helpful to include site diagrams as part of the plan rather than just include a map. Has any thought been given to doing this for this version?</p> | Page 22 Policy H1 | Never been requested by any Examiner I have worked with. |
| WSCC | <p>H1 Steele Close - Access (both vehicular and non-vehicular) is a potential concern. Access would be achieved via The Juggs (public highway) and Steele Close (unadopted). As Steele Close does not form part of the adopted public highway, only advice can be provided as to the suitability. There are no issues with carriageway width or provision for pedestrians along the The Juggs. Along Steele Close, there are no provisions for pedestrians. This is not necessarily an issue in itself. However, the initial section of Steele Close is narrow along with there being an almost 90 degree bend with very limited forward visibility due to an existing fence.</p> <p>It is accepted that this will be a low speed situation, the additional dwellings will though increase vehicle and pedestrian activity. Ideally, the carriageway width would be widened to enable two way vehicle movements and forward visibility improved. Alternately, the surfacing could be changed to better highlight that this is a shared surface area with pedestrians and traffic sharing the same area. At the current time, it's unclear what improvements may be achievable.</p> <p>Should this site be allocated within the plan, a specific requirement must be included that requires improvements to Steele Close in order to achieve safe and convenient access to accommodate the increase in vehicular and pedestrians traffic.</p> | H1 | WSCC appears to have missed the point that the site has been granted planning permission. |

| Respondee | Comment | Policy | NP Response |
|------------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|--|
| WSCC | <p>Policy H1 Moto Di Marino Garage - The redevelopment of this site could enable a highway improvement in terms of providing a footway on the western Mill Road boundary. At present the existing footway on Mill Road terminates at the NW corner of the Garage site. Pedestrians then have to walk within the carriageway before the footways recommence at the Mill Road/Haglands Lane/Common Lane/The Common crossroads. The redevelopment of this site would enable a footway to be incorporated partly (so as also to be partly within the existing public highway) or entirely within the site. The provision of a footway would also potentially benefit visibility from the Haglands Lane junction northwards as it would then eliminate the potential for any obstructions against the back edge of the highway.</p> <p>The allocation of this site should require the provision of a length of footway on the Mill Road western boundary either entirely or partly within the development site.</p> | H1 | Noted with thanks. Comment re the footway will be added to the policy. |
| Mr Kirby | <p>It is difficult to see how these are anything more than a repetition of policies in the HDPF that the plan must be in general conformity with in any event.</p> <p>There is probably a better case for H6 remaining in order to ensure that the nature and character of the area is not harmed as many attempted infill proposals historically have been threatening to do.</p> | Page 23 Policies H3- H8 | Noted |
| Mr Kirby | <p>The Village Design Statement is dated 2003 and was considered extensively as part of the preparation of the 2015 pre-sub plan. Attempts were made to update it but these all failed to gain any traction. The conclusion was reached that the VDS was so out of date as to be of no current value. It is surprising therefore to see it included as a reference document for a modern policy of design.</p> <p>In any event it never did really address the issue of design other than by showing a few images of then current housing. It contains references to long superseded policies. Even though some of the descriptive elements remain valid they are reflected in the plan already and it remains difficult to see how it can be used as a meaningful document to aid a planning decision.</p> <p>Aside from the VDS the policy is insufficiently precise. There is already an HDPF policy on design that the parish would need to take account of and it is difficult to see what other policies there are in the plan that address design in ways which are not otherwise freestanding anyway.</p> | Page 23 Policy H2 | The Core Principals of the VDS do still apply. |
| DMH Stallard on behalf of Croudace | <p>Policy H5 (Affordable Housing) should be deleted. Policy H5 is onerous and does not give certainty. It requires that affordable housing is provided in accordance with HDC's Housing Strategy 2013 – 2015. This is out of date and would conflict with the strategic policies of the HDPF. An affordable housing policy is not necessary and is unjustified, as proposals would be required to meet the affordable housing provisions set out in Policy 16 of the HDPF. Policy H5 does not meet the basic conditions.</p> | H5 | HDC advice taken and wording changed. |
| WSCC | <p>Policy H8 Attention to detail– Point 1 refers to the bin stores needing to be agreed with WSCC. Details of the bin stores/collection arrangements would be agreed with Horsham District Council as the waste collection authority.</p> | H8 | Noted |
| Thakeham PC | <p>section numbering issue - p.26 ref. to '5b' should be '5d' – and similarly on p.36 (should be 5e), p.39 (should be 5f).</p> | Page 26 | Noted |
| Mr Kirby | <p>It is difficult to see how these are anything more than a repetition of policies in the HDPF that the plan must be in general conformity with in any event.</p> <p>There is probably a better case for H6 remaining in order to ensure that the nature and character of the area is not harmed as many attempted infill proposals historically have been threatening to do.</p> | Page 26 Policy EH1 | Noted |
| Mr Kirby | <p>How is this a distinctive policy? It is axiomatic that all development will meet whatever policies are in the plan. Development outside the BUAB is governed by HDPF policies anyway.</p> | Page 26 Policy EH1 | Look at issues raised elsewhere |
| Mr Kirby - here | <p>HDPF policy 25 already provides a policy for "maintaining" separation zones and there is evidence for how this policy has been recently applied to the parish. The distinctive neighbourhood policy should, therefore be limited to defining the boundaries of the separation zone to provide clarity for the future.</p> <p>A reference to HDPF Policy 25 in the justification might be appropriate.</p> | Page 26 Policy EH2 | Noted |
| Mr Kirby | <p>The box around the policy is misaligned.</p> <p>How is this different from the HDPF/NPPF policies?</p> | Page 29 Policy EH5 | Noted |
| WSCC | <p>Policy EH3 Green Infrastructure - This policy refers specifically to green infrastructure corridors but no reference to specific protection for the habitats / species / sites that the corridors connect. Wording should be reviewed to ensure that it is not only the biodiversity corridors that are protected but all identified green infrastructure assets in Map E. It may be considered beneficial to reference the SDNPA Green Infrastructure Framework: https://www.southdowns.gov.uk/planning/planning-advice/south-downs-green-infrastructure-framework-informal-consultation/</p> | EH3 | Noted the policy will be reviewed |
| WSCC | <p>Policy EH4 Surface Water Management – A difference approach is suggested for the following reasons;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The policy is a restatement of existing National Policy; it restates what is in: https://www.gov.uk/guidance/flood-risk-assessment-in-flood-zones-2-and-3 and the policy would be improved by referring to the NPPG. The content of EH4.3-EH4.5 is for the most part more effectively dealt with in other adopted policies, notably the adopted West Sussex County Council Policy for the Management of Surface Water: https://www.horsham.gov.uk/data/assets/pdf_file/0003/47667/West-Sussex-LLFA-Policy-for-the-Management-of-Surface-Water.pdf The danger of duplicating this evidence in the Neighbourhood Plan is that it will cover some aspects but not others; e.g. there is no reference to maintenance / enhancement of water quality for drainage associated with new development and no reference to brownfield betterment. Furthermore the Neighbourhood Plan policy will not benefit from the continual review that the adopted WSCC policy undergoes by the LLFA. We are in the process of updating the Surface Water Management Policy to more specifically address incremental development and this is expected to be completed in the spring 2018. EH4.4 is a dilution of existing policy; It states that: <i>Consideration should be given to the use of Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS)...</i> Whereas the House of Commons: Written Statement (HCWS161) mandates the use of sustainable drainage for developments of 10 dwellings or more <i>unless demonstrated to be inappropriate</i>. <p>If, as stated in EH4.1 and 4.2, there are areas in the parish at risk of flooding from any sources (fluvial / surface water or groundwater) then it would be better to include these locations in the neighbourhood plan policy and specifically point to the requirement for sequential and exception tests to be undertaken as a pre-requisite for development.</p> | EH4 | Discuss. WSCC - With regard to our comments on the surface water management policy it has been suggested, by colleagues who provided the comments, that it may be useful to look at the adopted Lavant Neighbourhood Plan. The Lavant Plan, while it could still merit some further improvements, is a lot closer to providing the local context and specificity that a flood risk policy for a neighbourhood plan can provide. One departure recommended from the Lavant neighbourhood plan is that if new development is proposed within the functional flood plain then it should be designed to be flood resilient . We would take issue with the construction of new development in the flood plain that is flood resistant because it reduces the capacity of flood storage within the functional flood plain and therefore potentially increases the risk of flooding to existing properties. |

| Respondee | Comment | Policy | NP Response |
|-------------|---|--|---|
| Mr Kirby | How is this different from the HDPF/NPPF policies? | Page 29 Policy EH6 | It is very different |
| Mr Kirby | How are these different from the HDPF/NPPF policies? | Page 30 Policy EH8- EH11 and Page 33 EH13 and Page 35 Policy GA3 | They are very different |
| WSCC | Policy EH9 'Unlit village' status - The wording "new lighting will be required to conform to the highest standard of light pollution restrictions at the time" is a bit open to interpretation and does not cover the requirement if the lighting was on highway and to be adopted by WSCC PFI contract. It is requested that the wording is changed to 'Any new adoptable highway lighting will need to conform to the West Sussex County Council Private Finance Initiative (PFI) street lighting specification' It is then requested that the link to the street lighting specification is added to supporting text in EH9.1 "The West Sussex County Council PFI street lighting specification is available from https://www.westsussex.gov.uk/roads-and-travel/information-for-developers/road-agreements/ under 'Lighting of developer promoted highway schemes'" It is also requested that additional wording is added to EH9.1 to identify the WSCC stance on lighting in this parish "West Sussex County Council also supports the initiative to keep lighting levels to a minimum and would not consider additional lighting that requires to be maintained under the PFI contract on the grounds of the area being close to the national park, our support for the dark skies initiative and energy/carbon usage." | EH9 | Noted policy will be amended |
| Mr Kirby | Mineral extraction is an excluded matter (The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 s38B), not to be addressed in Neighbourhood Plans although it could be addressed as a non statutory policy. | Page 32 Policy EH12 | Discuss |
| WSCC | EH12 Mineral and Hydro-carbon Extraction – This policy should be removed from the neighbourhood plan. The Localism Act (Schedule 9, 38B) sets out that "A neighbourhood development plan may not include provision about development that is excluded development". Excluded development includes "County Matters" which include minerals activities (as defined in Schedule 9, 61K). Therefore, the neighbourhood plan should not have specific policies on minerals matters. | EH12 | We are aware of this however this is such a big issue locally that to leave it out of the Plan would raise issues and may cause the Referendum to fail. The policy has been worded to merely show what stance the PC would take should an application come forward. |
| Mr Kirby | Change "permitted" in line 2 to "supported". The parish does not grant permissions. | Page 36 Policy EE2 | Examiners have changed the wording to read permitted in other Plans |
| Mr Kirby | How is this different from the HDPF/NPPF policies? | Page 37 Policies EE3-5 | Check |
| Mrs Goddard | I am in support of all the policies suggested and congratulate the team on producing this draft. My comments are relatively minor and are intended to simply improve the accuracy and comprehension of the plan. p4 Introduction - line 5. Would it be more accurate to call them 'sustainability constraints' rather than 'issues'? | Page 4 | Done |
| Mr Kirby | In line 1 replace the words "is being prepared" with "has been prepared". There are a number of references to the plan needing to be "in line with" other policies or pieces of legislation. Would it not be better to use the terms in the legislation in order to be absolutely clear what is required ie Plans are required to "have regard" to national policies and advice. Plans must be "in general conformity" to the local development plan. Plans must "be compatible with" EU obligations These are part of the Basic Conditions in paragraph 8(2) of Schedule 4B to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 | Page 4 Chapter 1 | Amend wording |
| Mr Kirby | The fifth bullet might be too much of a shorthand. Whilst environmental regulations are the most significant it is all EU obligations that are referred to in the legislation. The middle sentence of the last paragraph is a shorthand and incomplete repetition of the first paragraph. | Page 4 Chapter 1 | Check |
| Mr Kirby | It is a little odd to have Map B out of sequence in the Maps section. | Page 41 Policy LC5 | Possibly but it needs to be read in conjunction with Schedule B |
| Mr Kirby | In "Section 5.0" amend "is judged" to "will be judged". | Page 5 para 1.1 | Agree |
| Mr Kirby | In the first line the words "relevant body" are given the status of a technical term by being enclosed in quotations marks. The appropriate form of words is "qualifying body" according to Schedule 4B (1) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended). | Page 5 para 1.2 | Agree |
| Mr Kirby | It is not clear if this a generic statement of the NP process or a statement of the actual process as carried out in West Chiltington. If the former it is inaccurate in four respects: (i) A "State of the Parish Report" is not a universal element in Neighbourhood Plans (ii) The SEA screening process is only the first stage of a three part process which consists of screening, a scoping report and a SA/SEA report. (iii) The Submission Plan will go to Horsham District Council primarily as well as SDNPA. (iv) The final stage – the making of the plan – is omitted If the latter it fails to reflect the two stage process in the development of the plan and include a reference to the earlier pre-sub plan and Reg 14 consultation some documents from which are part of the evidence file. I suspect that it is meant to be the actual West Chiltington process rather than a generic one, in which case items (ii) to (iv) above remain relevant. The reference to Basic Conditions in the 10 th bullet will be meaningless to most readers. Is there an argument for including a footnote or glossary to explain it? | Page 5 para 1.2 | Noted |

| Respondee | Comment | Policy | NP Response |
|------------------------------------|---|------------------------|-------------|
| Mrs Goddard | p.5 1.2 10th bullet point. Closed bracket missing. | Page 5 para 1.2 | Noted |
| Mr Kirby | As written there might be an expectation that the Consultation Statement should be accessible to the reader now whereas it will not be prepared until after the consultation is concluded. It might be helpful to make this clear to avoid confusion. | Page 6 Para 1.3 | Noted |
| Mr Kirby | The first paragraph is subject to the same comment as at 3 above. The last paragraph repeats essentially the first | Page 6 Para 1.3 | Noted |
| Mr Kirby | I am not sure that this paragraph is accurate. Horsham had a standard policy that all neighbourhood plans should include a SA/SEA report and the appropriate Screening application did not therefore receive an indication that a SA/SEA was not required. Indeed the documents accompanying the plan include such a report. It is true that it was eventually agreed that a separate report under the Habitats Directive was not required but that is a separate issue. Incidentally is not the customary abbreviation for Horsham District Council – HDC? | Page 6 Para 1.4 | Noted |
| Historic England | On page 8 of the Draft Plan, it is stated that “At paragraph 17, the NPPF introduces 13 core planning principles” and then proceeds to list them. However, the list is of the 13 specific policy areas covered in the NPPF - paragraph 17 in fact introduces 12 core planning principles, which are different. | Page 8 | Noted |
| Mr Kirby | In line 1 of the second paragraph the word “direct” has no meaning. There is simply “a power” to make proposals. Those proposals are subject to scrutiny in various ways so the power, if that is what it is, is not unfettered. The reference in the second paragraph to “be in line with the strategic policies of the Local Plan” is affected by the same issue as in 3. above. The requirement is to be “in general conformity with the local plan”. Change the words and you potentially change the sense. There is a similar issue in the final paragraph where the appropriate form of words is to “have regard to”. | Page 8 Para 2.1.1 | Noted |
| DMH Stallard on behalf of Croudace | Section 2.1.1 refers to national guidance and sets out the NPPF requirements relating to neighbourhood plans. The WCNDP references paragraphs of the NPPF relevant to neighbourhood plans, however, it almost entirely focuses on paragraphs within Section 8 of the NPPF, “Promoting Healthy Communities”. It fails to set out the policy framework contained within other sections of the NPPF, for example Section 6, “Delivering a wide choice of high quality homes”. | 2.1.1 | Noted |
| Mr Kirby | In the first paragraph I would have thought that the key document was the HDPF 2015 and that should come first. I am not sure that the 2007 saved policies are relevant as the following document. http://plainview.co.uk/news/horsham-district-councils-local-plan-is-adopted-and-will-come-into-effect-on-27th-november-2015/ , states that the HDPF “will replace the outdated local planning documents saved from 2007”. I do not claim to be totally <i>au fait</i> with current policies but this issue might well need to be checked. | Page 9 para 2.1.2 | Agree |
| Nyetimber Ltd (Strutt and Parker) | Policy EE5 We write in specific support of draft Policy EE5 (Sustainable Recreational and Tourism Activities), as drafted in the Neighbourhood Plan. Policy EE5 states that “Development proposals that provide facilities for recreation and tourist activities will be supported provided that: - <input type="checkbox"/> the siting, scale and design respect the character of the surrounding area, including any historic and natural assets; <input type="checkbox"/> the local road network is capable of accommodating the additional traffic movements; <input type="checkbox"/> adequate parking is provided on the site; and <input type="checkbox"/> the proposal conforms with other policies of the development Plan.” The Neighbourhood Plan supports sustainable tourism, which is appropriate to the overall character of the village and will benefit the local economy in the Plan area. The Plan recognises the need to balance the amount of tourism generated by these activities, against the need to protect the existing character of the built environment, the rural landscape and biodiversity. Turning to our client’s interests, the Neighbourhood Plan accurately identifies Nyetimber Manor as an important ‘heritage asset’ and acknowledges the significance of Nyetimber’s vineyards at bringing visitors to the area. Indeed, Nyetimber Ltd. has produced award-winning English sparkling wines in the region for over thirty years, providing sustainable tourism and supporting the rural economy. Nyetimber Ltd. is a growing rural business, and has recently purchased additional land on which to grow vines to meet growing demand for their sparkling wine both nationally and internationally. This naturally means that additional buildings may be required in the future to support additional wine production, whilst continuing to attract tourists to the area for wine tasting events. Where buildings have been acquired along with new land acquisitions, there is the potential for them to be re-used for tourism uses which are related to the business. Policy EE5 provides the necessary support for such proposals. | Policy EE5 | Noted |
| Mr Kirby | Whilst the 2015 pre-sub plan and its associated Site Assessment Report are included in the evidence base the SA/SEA report that accompanied it is not even though the scoping report that led to it is included. | SA/SEA | Check |
| Mr Kirby | In spite of the text there are no proposals in the plan for monitoring. The words were taken from the 2015 pre-sub plan that did have a monitoring policy. | SA/SEA report para 9.1 | Check |

| Respondee | Comment | Policy | NP Response |
|------------------------------------|--|------------------|---|
| Historic England | <p>The National Planning Practice Guidance states "... where it is relevant, neighbourhood plans need to include enough information about local heritage to guide decisions and put broader strategic heritage policies from the local plan into action at a neighbourhood scale. ... In addition, and where relevant, neighbourhood plans need to include enough information about local non-designated heritage assets including sites of archaeological interest to guide decisions".</p> <p>Reference is made to the Wells Houses, but reference could also be made to the non-designated heritage assets set out in Schedule C. Non-designated heritage assets, such as locally important buildings, can make an important contribution to creating a sense of place and local identity and form an important part of the evidence base for the Plan. (We would, however, suggest that these assets are not referred to in Schedule C as "designated as non-designated assets", which is a contradiction in terms. It would also be helpful to set out the criteria by which locally important heritage assets are identified).</p> <p>Is the condition of heritage assets in the parish an issue? Although none of the heritage assets in the parish are currently on the Historic England Heritage at Risk Register the Register does not include grade II buildings outside London. Has there been a survey of grade II buildings in the parish to ascertain their condition and whether or not any are at risk from neglect, decay or other threats? Has there been any or is there any ongoing loss of character, particularly within the Conservation Area, through inappropriate development, inappropriate alterations to properties under permitted development rights, loss of vegetation, insensitive streetworks etc?</p> | Schedule C | Noted |
| Mr & Mrs Price | <p>Strengths and weaknesses (ref section 3 of the plan) We do not agree that 'Narrow but historically important access roads especially to the North and East' should be seen as a weakness of the village – in our opinion this is part of the character of the parish which should be preserved.</p> | Section 3 | Noted |
| Ms Kirby | There seems to be a typo in respect of the total area of the parish (42 acres and 17 hectares). According to Wikipedia, the total area is 100 times these figures. | Section 3 para 2 | Noted |
| Ms Kirby | I do not agree that there is a fourth access route that is <u>truly</u> capable of taking two lanes of traffic. In my experience each of the 4 access routes has pinch points, even if only due in some cases to parked cars, and the increase in the number of HGVs is a particular problem. This section is also inconsistent with the section on "Roads and Traffic" in section 3.6, which I feel is a more accurate description of the position. | Section 3 para 5 | Noted |
| Mrs Goddard | Section 3.3 The Community Profile needs a date and source - 2011 Census? The examiner will definitely pick up on this. Also the figures mean very little without a regional and national comparison. I see you have these in the evidence base, so the percentage comparisons need to be included in this summary table too. | Section 3.3 | Agree |
| Mrs Goddard | Section 3.4 1st sentence - it isn't clear what is of international importance. Is it the AONB? In the last sentence, 'southern regions' sounds a bit strange. Just say 'an SSSI in the south bordering the South Downs NP'. | Section 3.4 | Done |
| Mrs Goddard | p.15 3.5 Housing I was wondering why there was no mention of other housing developments such as Barkworth Way and Morris Way in the late 1980's and then I realised that perhaps the author is trying to detail just any alternative housing developments to the widespread detached houses in large plots. If this is the case, the section needs to be rewritten to emphasise this | Section 3.5 | Done |
| Mr Frost | I also find Section 3.6 (pp16/17) very interesting, as it at least addresses some of the issues. These issues are brought up as well in the Parish 'Weaknesses List' on page 11, showing that the Parish is aware of the problems, at least in part. This is shown more in depth in the GA Policies (pp34/35), especially in GA 3.1 "Parking in some parts of the Parish is a constant issue". The NISA shop needs specific signage, as well as limited stay parking outside the shop itself. People are also using Allotment Car Park as a long stay parking area. If there is an awareness of this problem, as well as the issues relating to roads and the existing infrastructure, why is this not being addressed at this stage, before any further construction commences? | Section 3.6 | Discuss |
| Ms Kirby | Throughout sections 1, 2 and 5 the document switches between the terms "Neighbourhood Plan" and "Neighbourhood Development Plan (WCNDP)". I have assumed that the two terms are meant to be referring to the same document, but this is confusing for residents who are not involved in the process. Could "Neighbourhood Development Plan" and "WCNDP" be defined as "Neighbourhood Plan" and "WCNP", respectively, to ensure consistency? | Sections 1, 2, 3 | Agree. Speed enforcement is being added to the parish to help with speeding issues. |
| DMH Stallard on behalf of Croudace | Section 5a sets out the principles of sustainable development. It states that the WCNDP supports the principles of sustainable development as set out in the NPPF. However, it fails to refer to the presumption in favour of sustainable development set out at paragraph 14 of the NPPF and Policy 1 of the HDPF; it fails therefore to meet the basic conditions. Furthermore, the final paragraph of section 5a states that policies within the WCNDP are assessed against the principle set out in the NPPF, it fails to make any reference to the HDPF. In order for the plan to meet the basic conditions, it must adhere to the strategic policies of the HDPF. | 5a | If it supports the principles set out in the NPPF it does not need to refer to them individually. |
| Historic England | We welcome the reference to historic buildings in the Vision although we feel that the Vision could be clarified – as drafted it reads as a Vision more for the Plan than for the parish. Is this the intention? Or is it intended that the Vision sets out how the community would like the parish of West Chilton to be at the end of the Plan period, or perhaps further into the future, with the Plan being a mechanism to help achieve that vision? | Vision | Happy with it as it is |
| Mo Mall | By and large I agree with the content of this document. Furthermore, I am very appreciative of the amount of work that has been done by a dedicated team in order to produce this plan. I would just like to express my opinion about the section: Vision and Core Objectives, Paragraph 3: Getting around (on page 19). I wish there had been some emphasis on encouraging and monitoring safe driving practice. Also on page 33 there was mention of traffic management, though nothing specific to indicate precisely what was the aim of that objective. In order to prevent a very nasty Road Traffic Accident I wish to report that I have seen some cars and motorbikes being driven through the village at speeds which appeared to be well above 30 mph. I have notified the Police about this matter on more than one occasion, but to my knowledge no action has been taken. | Vision | PC issues |
| K & G Gutsell | you are asking about the wild life at the allotment area we have seen plenty such as hedgehogs; badgers foxes; the bee hives are also there we want this to remain the same as it is important for the future of our next generation | | Add to evidence base |
| The Nicholsons | In Praise of our Recreation Ground. For those of us who are not so young and fit but still want to take a stroll in the fresh air the recreation ground is the perfect place. Flat ground, easy parking, away from traffic fumes. We are too constrained by arthritic knees for the rigours walking on uneven pathways so use the recreation ground for some gentle exercise. | | Add to evidence base |
| Mr Clare | Having just read the draft, I would like to congratulate those responsible for the hard work and reasoning that is contained within. However, in order to preserve our lovely village I make no apology for again stressing the importance of keeping the designated separation zone between WCV and WCC intact. Development should rightly be resisted if future pressure is forthcoming. This area enhances the local wild life and should remain for agricultural use and nothing else. No development should be allowed outside our current built-up boundaries. Where housing is allowed at suitable spaces, then generally the sentiments expressed in H4.1 should prevail i.e. it should reflect existing density and not be cramped. Thank you. | | Noted |

| Respondee | Comment | Policy | NP Response |
|-----------------|---|--------|--|
| Mr Kirby | <p>The pre-sub NP is welcome as the conclusion of a long exercise that began in 2013. At the time of writing it is clear that no actual development is planned other than that already given planning permission, subject to finalising s106 agreements and the potential for development of a single site and/or windfall developments should they become available.</p> <p>This is likely to be popular with residents and has presumably been subject to some consideration by Horsham District Council.</p> | | HDC comments awaited |
| | <p>It is possible that the consultation is technically flawed in the following respects:</p> <p>(i) The consultation period runs for exactly 6 weeks from 10 May. The legal requirement is for a minimum of six weeks from the date of initial publication. Whilst it might well be that the pre-sub plan was first published on 10 May by being placed on the website it might be argued that as Parish Council approval was only given the previous evening it is unlikely that many consultees would have been aware of it or in the case of statutory consultees received a copy for some days after 10 May and thus may not have a minimum of six weeks to consider it. The <i>Sussex Local</i> distribution for June which is the main notification to residents would not have been delivered before 21 May even supposing the deadline of 7 May, which would have been before parish council approval had been given was met. Three weeks into the consultation period I have not received it. The Parish Magazine with the alert was received by me 18 days into the consultation.</p> <p>(ii) The principal mechanism for commenting on the pre-sub plan is by email. Reg 15 of the 2012 regulations requires the Consultation Statement that will accompany the submitted plan to identify "details of the persons and bodies who were consulted". The reference to "details" has typically been interpreted as requiring respondents to the consultation to identify themselves by name and address and is customarily achieved by the provision of a response template that stresses the importance of including this personal information. An email address alone is unlikely to fulfill that requirement although if the "Contact Us" links are used they do at least provide a name field.</p> | | The Statutory consultees were all notified by email on the 10th May. Residents have been made aware through posters, banners, word of mouth and the web site. Comments were being received from residents within days of the start of the consultation so the publicity seemed to be working. The NP team will accept comments at any stage in the Plan. |
| Mrs Harrison | <p>Subject Land north of Finches Lane, Ref. SA014 . Message I have recently been in touch with Mr Mark Daley, Strategic Planning Officer at HDC to discuss the land north of Finches Lane in West Chiltington, ref SA014, which we own. The land is currently assessed as 'Not currently developable' on the SHLAA. The justification for this is as follows 'The site adjoins the edge of the built up area with the majority of the site covered by a TPO. Development here would have an impact on the surrounding rural countryside, but a small amount could be accommodated if the impact was reduced and the potential access issues were resolved. Whilst the site is under single ownership, it was not possible to contact the landowner, therefore availability is unknown. Due to this and other constraints, the site is assessed as not currently developable'. As the current owners, we are now exploring the possibility of building one small bungalow or house on the site to enable us to downsize from our home in Finches Lane. We believe that the impact of this on the surrounding area would be minimal and would not affect any trees covered by the TPO. As a result of our discussion Mr Daley has now noted the land as available in their database prior to the site being re-assessed later in the year. He also advised us to contact you to ask you to consider the site as available in the forthcoming Neighbourhood Plan. Our telephone number is 01989 817489 if you wish the contact us.</p> | | Land is outside the BUAB and would set a dangerous precedent |
| Strutt & Parker | <p>I am writing in my role as Planning Consultant on behalf of the landowner West Sussex County Council (WSSCC) in relation to Land at Hatches Estate which is situated to the east of Broadford Bridge Road. I am enquiring whether it would be possible to meet with the Parish Council (either in part or whole), during the public consultation period or upon its termination in order to present the development scheme on this site please? I would value the opportunity in describing how we have sought to overcome previously raised concerns set out within the Site Assessment in the draft Neighbourhood Plan under reference SA066 'Land at Hatches Estate' through survey work and the creation of a Masterplan. This matter is therefore related to promoting the site for development and for its inclusion within the Neighbourhood Plan going forward as forming a deliverable housing allocation.</p> | | |
| Southern Water | <p>Omission of policy- Provision of additional wastewater infrastructure.</p> <p>Southern Water is the statutory water and wastewater undertaker for West Chiltington and thus has a statutory duty to serve new development here.</p> <p>We are committed to ensuring that the right water and wastewater infrastructure is in the right place at the right time in collaboration with developers, the planning authority and the Parish Council. Although there are no current plans, over the life of the Neighbourhood Plan, it may be that we will need to provide new or improved infrastructure either to serve new development and/or to meet stricter environmental permits.</p> <p>It is important to have policy provision in the Neighbourhood Plan which seeks to ensure that the necessary infrastructure is in place to meet these requirements. We could find no policies to provide for new or improved infrastructure to support development. One of the Core Planning Principles contained in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) is to 'proactively drive and support sustainable economic development to deliver the homes, business and industrial units, infrastructure and thriving local places that the country needs'.</p> <p>Proposed amendment</p> <p>Support for essential infrastructure is required at all levels of the planning system. To ensure consistency with the NPPF and facilitate sustainable development, we propose an additional policy as follows:</p> <p>New and improved utility infrastructure will be encouraged and supported in order to meet the identified needs of the community subject to other policies in the plan'</p> | | It is considered that SW has all the statutory powers it needs should an issue arise. |
| Mr Mahoney | <p>The woods near Haglands Lane are an important resource for local people and always have something to offer the walker any time of the year. This May the bluebells were magnificent, something we need to protect for future generations as we have already lost many such woods across the UK.</p> <p>The natural beauty surrounding West Chiltington is being encroached on a bit more every year. The reckless destruction of our environment to meet short term Government targets cannot go unopposed.</p> | | Add to evidence base |
| Mr Marchant | <p>The allotments - it is very very important too keep our wildlife safe on our last safe place for wild life people must understand they need us as much as we need them1, bees serve us with pollination. 2birds are also needed carrying seedlings dropping of plants eating on waste 3 hedgehogs very important get rid of slugs etc good for our gardens.4 we also have badgers foxes snakes.slow worms as well there are lots more here at west chiltington please please for god sake save us people something in life which is needed for the good life of gardening please please I beg keep this space for a few gardeners but also the wildlife.</p> | | Add to evidence base |
| Mr Crawford | <p>You have described well what makes West Chiltington special to us that live here. Long may it last.</p> | | Noted |
| Mr Riddington | <p>Thank you for the invitation to comment. We consider the draft to be acceptable, and thanks for all the work. We are particularly pleased that development is restricted to the two nominated places, not Smock Alley or Threals Lane</p> | | Noted |
| Mr Constable | <p>Great piece of work from the Councillors. I agree with the plan, the proposed sites for development, the omission of Smock Alley as a development site which is consistent with the decision of two Inspectorates, and the priority given to the Separation Zone.</p> | | Noted |
| Highways Engand | <p>Having reviewed the published documentation, we do not have any comments on the West Chiltington Pre-Submission Neighbourhood Plan Reg 14 consultation; however, please continue to consult us.</p> | | Noted |

| Respondee | Comment | Policy | NP Response |
|------------------------|--|--------|-------------------|
| Ms Constable | After review of the draft plan I concur with the selection of the two sites. Steele's Close makes sense as it is close to the school, bus stops and one of the village shops. The Motorino site seems ideally suited for retirement type flats as there is already a similar property adjacent to the site. I am delighted that no large scale development is proposed, and that the Smock Alley/Haglands Lane site has been excluded altogether. The separation zone must be protected between the two settlements to preserve the natural rural landscape of this part of the village and again I am pleased to see the separation zone is heavily protected against any development. The addition of the biodiversity corridors adds protection for the wildlife and natural surroundings around the village which is very important to me. This looks like a robust plan and I hope the villagers recognise the importance of carrying this plan forward to completion in a timely manner. | | Noted |
| Mr Mrs Smith | We confirm that we have both read the draft Plan and agree its proposals with the exception of not liking the agreement for "normal" hydrocarbon exploration or extraction which we oppose. This is of course encouraged by current government rules, but might be rescinded if we somehow get a change of Govt, so perhaps the wording could be looked at to reflect any future bans on fossil fuel extraction. With Steeles Close and Moto Di Marino sites in the Plan we have the sites available for Affordable housing, so we do not need to look for any more. As we have had two Govt Planning appeals in recent times reject that type of proposal in Smock Alley, any other sites that may be suggested should be rejected as having no merit, especially if located in one of the biodiversity links as per Plan. This would include any other sites in the Smock Alley that would infill next to woodlands adjoining Threales Lane. These biodiversity corridors are very important to maintain. The points re protection of the Hollows are particularly pleasing. We also agree with the non development of the Separation Zone and the listing of the specified assets of community value such as the pubs and Hotel etc. We wish to thank all those who have helped draw up this Draught Plan which has been well thought out, to at least maintain the existing services and only allow such development that is appropriate. | | Noted |
| Mr Davis | After many years of hard work, effort and sometimes painful decisions in moving this plan forward, I have read the final draft plan with the great anticipation The plan seems to be well laid out, easy to read and follow One of the most important areas obviously involves planning and housing issues. I feel that this was previously subject to bias but has now been thoroughly revisited and reflects what, in my opinion, the village wants from a residents point of view. Existing residents who settled here many years ago have as much right to enjoy village life as those who wish to enjoy a more vibrant community and there needs to be restraint on building for buildings sake. I applaud the plan in its balanced approach to this subject Also I strongly support the policy providing green spaces and separation zones, which should help the village retain its identity. This has clearly been evidenced by refused appeals on green land outside of the built area and should be resisted wherever possible. It also is good reason to support valuable wildlife corridors, as once wildlife disappears it rarely returns. We have a huge variety of animals, birds, and insect life in the village once again supported by good evidence which needs to be properly managed and protected from decline One thing I believe we need to really look at with care is mineral extraction. With the current drilling beginning at Broadford Bridge I am mindful that as a village we hold very little sway in the outcome of these decisions. I suggest a policy should be introduced where a monetary bond is in place for the full cost of returning the land to original state prior to any drilling work commencing. This would ensure that any drilling company who uses our village as a point of entry to the world below ground would not be able to leave the village in a poorer condition, should they be subject to bankruptcy or other reason they may use to not carry out there responsibilities. I fully support the plan in its current state and trust the parish councilors to get it ratified | | Noted |
| Mr Parker | Over the past two months, my son Henry and I have spotted many birds in the six oaks that live at the far end of Church Street. I would like to ask whether a Tree Protection Order can be put on these trees and what I need to do. The list is as follows: Song thrush Wren Robin Goldfinches (4) Blue Tits Great Tits Coal Tit Nuthatch Woodpecker Jay Magpies Two owls (one barn, one tawny) heard only Bats (2) Wood pigeons Collared doves Blackbirds Sparrows Thrush Pied Wagtails Stag beetles (2) Cuckoo (heard only) Jackdaws Starlings | | Discuss |
| Ms Rodgers | Having read the draft plan, one point occurs to me in relation to public footpaths and bridleways. Would it be possible to require anyone creating new ones or maintaining existing ones to use sustainable surface covering that is suitable to all of walkers, dogs, horses, bikes and mobility aids as some of the coverings in the past have contained glass and large stones resulting in animal injuries and to provide gates at the end of the paths instead of stiles as stiles prevent use by those unable to climb easily or who have buggies. Otherwise I think the draft plan is fine. | | Done |
| Natural England | General We recognise the hard work being done by West Chiltonon Parish Council in developing such a detailed Neighbourhood Plan and we welcome being consulted on this pre-submission draft. West Chiltonon parish supports a rich and diverse natural environment. A small area of the Parish falls within the South Downs National Park and Hurston Warren SSSI lies within the Parish. These are designations of national importance. We welcome this comprehensive plan, and in particular the allocations of local green spaces, identification of biodiversity corridors and the settlement and housing design policies, aimed at steering new development to the most appropriate locations within this rich natural environment. | | Noted |
| Natural England | Biodiversity There is recognition in the draft Neighbourhood Plan of Priority Habitats, with policies to prevent the loss of trees, hedgerows, traditional orchards and ancient woodland with the aim of protecting and enhancing the overall biodiversity network within the area. Natural England welcomes the inclusion of these policies in the plan. Opportunities to incorporate features beneficial to wildlife into development such as green roofs, bird and bat boxes could also be considered as part of any new development and could be secured through the Neighbourhood Plan policies. | | Covered by para 2 |
| Natural England | Green Infrastructure & Ecosystem Services The important role of green infrastructure and ecosystem services in neighbourhood planning is highlighted. GI can perform a range of functions including improved flood risk management, provision of accessible green space, climate change adaptation and biodiversity enhancement. Additional evidence and case studies on green infrastructure, including the economic benefits of GI can be found on the Natural England Green Infrastructure web pages . | | Noted |
| Ms Gee | <u>Leisure facilities in the village</u> The comment about the golf course is now out of date. There is no mention of the new West Chiltonon Sports Pavilion. This caters not only for the village football, cricket and croquet clubs, but is also a venue for Pilates and many other leisure activities. It is well used and very much enjoyed by many residents and visitors. | | Check |

| Respondee | Comment | Policy | NP Response |
|------------------|--|--------|---|
| Ms Gee | <p><u>Comments relating to the Summary of Planning Guidance Recommendations.</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I agree that the rural aspect of the village should be retained 2. We are so privileged to have a SSSI and SNCI in the village and I agree these areas enhance the village character and diversity and biodiversity and should be treasured and maintained. 3. I agree that in any development hedges, ditches and trees should be retained, created, reinstated and protected especially if they are native species. 4. I agree that Leylandii should be discouraged and native species planted instead 5. I agree that any housing development should be in character of the village and to suit local needs. We are fortunate to have many Swifts nesting in the village - the older buildings often provide good nest sites. 6. I agree that new dwellings need to be considered carefully to assess impact on local infrastructure. Our smaller roads and characteristic well loved lanes are already busy with traffic which can be hazardous for pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders. Parking and traffic near the school at drop off and pick up times is frustrating and dangerous to local residents. 7. I agree that the green spaces and open spaces give the village much character and are important for biodiversity, and that the separation area should be retained and protected. In 3 different open spaces in the village over the years I have heard Nightingales, but I have heard none this year in these places. The wonderful variety of gardens there are in our village add tremendously to the biodiversity especially when they are adjacent to green or open spaces. 8. I agree I have concern about danger to pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders from increased and speeding traffic. 9. We already have a wonderful network of public paths but I agree that footpaths and bridleways should be improved where necessary and maintained fit for purpose and if possible permissive paths and bridleways sought and built to improve links between existing paths. This could help pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders use roads less. 10. I agree that roadside verges, ditches and hedges should be maintained and road surfaces improved where necessary. | | Noted |
| Thakeham PC | <p>Thakeham Parish Council's general view is that the draft WCNP is a good piece of work which has its support. The following comments/suggestions are offered as potential refinements: WCPC may wish to consider including definitions of some key terms/phrases. Those terms to be decided by the authors but suggestions would include 'windfall sites' (which could be explicitly restricted to sites <i>within the BUAB</i>) and descriptions of agricultural land as 'best and most versatile' and 'high quality' (which could usefully be linked to the Agricultural Land Classification grading system).</p> | | Agree. Include |
| Historic England | In addition, we would welcome further reference to the archaeological interest of the parish. What information is available from the West Sussex Historic Environment Record and Historic Landscape Character Assessment ? | | Checked. Apart from the areas near the church there is nothing listed |
| Historic England | We welcome the objective for housing to "complement the character, local distinctiveness and cultural heritage of the village, but are disappointed not to see a specific objective for the conservation and enhancement of the historic environment, particularly as this is considered a strength of the village and local residents apparently value their historic environment. | | HDC policy 34 seems to cover this |
| Ms Adams | Looked at the plan for West Chiltington, looks like it has been well thought out, meeting the needs of the Village, the flats at the centre with facilities nearby for residents needs, the area of separation left for natural habitat.. I think the parish Council have worked hard to deliver a sensible plan to compliment the Village and meeting the Governments requirements... | | Noted |
| Ms Fox | I am a resident of Haglands Lane in West Chiltington. I have read the draft West Chiltington NP and wish to give my support to the document as it stands. The proposed Steeles Close development will provide family homes and and Moto di Marino garage sites will provide much needed smaller flats for elderly people. The proposed separation zone between the Old Village and the Common will prevent settlement merging and and, together with the proposed biodiversity corridors, will give local wildlife essential protection. I am very pleased to see that the Smock Alley site has not been proposed for future development. It is a completely unsuitable and unsustainable site for housing as has been demonstrated by the rejection of various development bids in the recent past. Please be kind enough to register my comments with the appropriate council department. | | Noted |
| Mr & Mrs Price | The environment and biodiversity We are pleased to see that great emphasis has been placed in the plan on preserving the character of the village, including the identification of the biodiversity corridors, the settlement separation zone and the 'significant views'. Having lived in the village for nearly 30 years we can testify to the fact that the rural character has largely been maintained, and we feel that the policies contained in this plan will help immensely in this regard. In the Smock Alley/Southlands Lane/Threals Wood and Threals Lane part of the village, we regularly see Buzzards and more recently Red Kite, as well as Kestrels and Sparrow Hawks, all of which thrive on the diverse countryside. We hear the Cuckoo every year and some years the Nightingale. We have a number of bat species and in Haglands Woods there's evidence of the protected and rare Hazel Dormouse. | | Noted |
| Mr & Mrs Price | Public Rights of Way Many people walk, cycle and ride horses around this village and surrounding area. It is therefore vital that public rights of way are well maintained as well as speed limits for traffic enforced to protect the people who use the narrow lanes to link up with footpaths and bridleways. | | Noted |
| Mr & Mrs Price | Overall we are very pleased with the content of the Plan, particularly in the ways that it identifies and shows how the special character of the Parish will be protected and enhanced during the life of the plan and beyond. | | Noted |
| Ms Shanks | The Draft Pre-Submission Neighbourhood Plan is a very well-written and comprehensive document. I believe it will be very valuable in ensuring that the character of the village is conserved for future generations. I would like to express my thanks to all those who have given their time to develop the plan. | | Noted |

| Respondee | Comment | Policy | NP Response |
|-------------|---|--------|-------------|
| Dr Pike | <p>Firstly thank you for your time and effort in putting together this Neighbourhood Plan, and also recognising the importance and trying to preserve and safeguard the character of the Lanes and the Wells Cottages. I am writing to request two additional paragraphs to be added to the Neighbourhood Plan as a result of an important precedent decision made by the Planning Inspectorate in rejecting an appeal submitted to build a separate dwelling house to the rear of a property in Sunset Lane (DC/15/0630). I am sure that you are aware of the concern to the residents of the South Lanes of Sunset Lane, Spinney Lane, Westwood Lane, and Heather Lane of planning applications by developers to develop in the gardens and land to the south of Sunset Lane and Spinney Lane and the recurrent fight by residents to prevent this (please see the extraordinary response by residents, walkers and the British Horse Society, to both the original application and the appeal on the HDC planning website) I enclose as an attachment the full decision but the most relevant paragraphs are as follows: Appeal Decision APP/Z3825/W/15/3134147 (Cherry Tree Cottage, Sunset Lane, West Chilton DC/15/0630)</p> <p>6. Policy 3 of the HDPF sets out a development hierarchy and categorises West Chilton as a 'medium village'. The supporting text for the policy states that within the built-up areas, development is accepted in principle. It adds that the priority will be to locate appropriate development, including infilling, within the built-up areas. The policy states that any infilling or redevelopment should be of an appropriate nature and scale to maintain the characteristics of the settlement.</p> <p>7. Policy 32 of the HDPF relates to the quality of new development and states that it shall be expected, amongst other things, to be attractive, complement local distinctiveness, contribute to a sense of place, optimise the potential of a site to accommodate development. Policy 33 relates to the natural and built environment and requires development to: make efficient use of land but respecting constraints; ensure that scale massing and appearance relates sympathetically to its surroundings; be locally distinctive in character, respecting the character of the surrounding area.</p> <p>8. The appeal relates to part of the plot and garden area of Cherry Tree Cottage, which is a sizeable detached house set within a generous plot. The surrounding area consists of predominantly detached houses set within large and maturely landscaped plots. The properties front onto generally narrow lanes, with no footpaths, which enhance the rural qualities of the area. The properties along this side of Sunset Lane and the adjacent section of Spinney Lane back onto open land; the generous rear gardens blend with the open land beyond the built-up area boundary and enhance the rural character of the area. From what I was able to observe and from the information before me, it seems that where the houses back onto open land here, the characteristic is that a single house which fronts onto the lane is present, with its large rear garden providing the interface.</p> <p>9. The proposal would provide a detached house to the rear of Cherry Tree Cottage, which would also be behind 'Pansala' and 'Burwood', both on Spinney Lane. Although the proposal would have its access from Sunset Lane, it would not front onto the lane and it would be seen as having no frontage and would be seen as a form of development which is at the rear of the adjacent houses. I consider that this would be contrary to the strong prevailing character of the area that I have set out, wherein there is a single 'line' of houses fronting the lanes which then back onto the open land beyond the built-up boundary. Notwithstanding the fact that some of these houses have outbuildings, I consider that the presence of the proposed substantial detached house placed significantly rearwards of the other houses on Sunset Lane and Spinney Lane, would be out of character and would unacceptably erode the interface with the rural landscape to the rear. At my site visit I observed numerous properties and sites, including ones referred to by the appellants but I conclude that none share the same set of circumstances wherein they would have the same effect that I envisage arising from the proposal; they either have a road frontage, or they do not back onto the open land, or both.</p> <p>10. I have given careful attention to the Council's policies and the advice set out in the National Planning Policy Framework which encourages the efficient use of land and may accept development in principle in this broad location. However, I recognise that there is a distinct character and pattern to development here that warrants consideration. In this particular case, I consider that the harm that would arise in relation to local character outweighs the benefits of supplying an additional home, and the fulfilment of the more efficient use of land. Therefore, the proposal is in conflict with Policies 3, 32 and 33 of the HDPF.</p> <p>Unfortunately, even in failed applications such as this, irreparable damage to the environment and biodiversity of the area is caused by the removal and clearance of the site of trees, shrubs, and overgrown areas in 'preparation' for the application because of the potential impact on a planning application of the presence of protected species including bats, slow-worms, and crested newts. It is important that precedent decisions by the Planning Inspectorate such as this one are highlighted to deter further applications.</p> <p>The two main points to be considered for inclusion in the Neighbourhood Plan as a result of the Planning Inspectorate decision APP/Z3825/W/15/3134147 are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Development that is at the rear of adjacent properties in the Lanes is considered to be contrary to the strong prevailing character of the area. 2. Development south of Sunset Lane and Spinney Lane would unacceptably erode the interface with the rural landscape to the rear of the existing properties in Sunset Lane and Spinney Lane. Please could you consider adding these two paragraphs to the section on the Lanes in the Neighbourhood Plan. | | |
| Mr Russell | <p>I have reviewed the Draft Pre-Submission Neighbourhood Plan. The plan is well-thought through and comprehensive; I am happy to give it my support.</p> <p>I would like to thank all those who have given of their time and effort to develop the plan.</p> | | Noted |
| Mr Mrs Lane | <p>We have been here for 3 years in this lovely village and are pleased with the points and views raised in your plan. We have had to fight since we came to stop green field site building in Smock Alley and feel this must be kept as such as the gap and for wildlife. It is important the lanes are kept as lanes as that is why we like it here, not to be widened and have lorries thundering through. The building to be done where the garage is makes sense as it is a brownfield site. I am so pleased that there is to be refurbishment for the finger post signs. I love them and they are so rustic and part of this lovely area. Also as we walk a lot we were very pleased at the new path laid through to the windmill, using the old Tarmac what good planning. Thank you for all your hard work.</p> | | Noted |
| Mrs Monks | <p>I have read with great interest the West Chilton Neighbourhood Plan and found it to be an extremely coherent document on both vision and strategy. Here are just some important points that I was particularly pleased to see in the Plan Policies. Policy H1 1. The allocation of land for 14 affordable houses at Steele Close. H1.2. The garage site 'Mato Di Marino' for 16 one and two bed flats for the elderly to downsize to. This is an excellent site particularly close to the shops and transport. Policy H4 Housing Density Policy EH2 The Separation Zone which is vital to protect the rural nature of the two settlements. Policy EH3 Identification of the Biodiversity corridors to protect local wildlife/habitats. I was also pleased to see that there was no mention of the unsustainable proposed development site at Smock Alley/Haglands Lane which went to Appeal and was dismissed twice. I am sure that this document with all its Policies will become an asset to the community in future land use planning and look forward to this Plan being approved. I would like to thank all involved in the preparation of the Neighbourhood Plan for all their hard work and time given voluntarily to preparing this excellent document.</p> | | Noted |

| Respondee | Comment | Policy | NP Response |
|---|--|--------|---|
| Environment Agency | <p>We are pleased to see that the proposed allocations have been directed to the areas at the lowest probability of flooding and that they are all located within Flood Zone 1.</p> <p>We are also particularly pleased to see the comprehensive policy you have included on surface water management. This seems to give good consideration of flood risk and ensuring that risk of flooding both on and off site and downstream is not increased.</p> | | Noted |
| Ms Kirby | Is there a reason why there is no specific policy on watercourses in the NP? Watercourses could be damaged by development proposals and are important for biodiversity. | | Discuss |
| Mr Long | <p>First of all I would like to congratulate all of you on an excellent plan. I wholeheartedly agree with all the points made.</p> <p>My main concern is that we keep the look and feel of the village intact. That we do not allow any further encroachment into the separation zones and maintain the agricultural environment that surrounds us. We should also make certain that we do not allow the change of use of agricultural buildings to commercial as this could easily change the nature of the rural landscape and bring traffic and noise into our peace and quiet. Whilst I agree that we should support the local economy, a lot of thought should go into where such development would be best suited, possibly by co-locating similar types of enterprise as for example the small commercial complex on Southlands Lane.</p> <p>As regards housing, again I feel strongly that any development should be in keeping with the nature of West Chiltington. Definitely no high density housing estates along the lines of the ghastly development that was planned for Smock Alley! The proposed development in Haglands Lane where the garage is presently sited would be a real benefit so long as it is built sympathetically. A little extra money spent on such a development could make the difference between an eyesore and a real improvement to that location. The Kensington Close blocks with their bright florescent lights at night would be an example of what to avoid. Hopefully a compromise between maximum profit for the site and an aesthetically pleasing plan can be found.</p> <p>Footpaths are an important feature of our village. They are used extensively for dog walking, children going to school, leisure walkers and groups of rambles. It has to be remembered that we have quite a population of elderly people in the village and these paths provide a great opportunity for them to get out and go for a safe walk getting bit of exercise on the way. Unfortunately many paths are not easy to walk along either due to being overgrown in the Summer or not level and therefore a slipping hazard in the Winter. Also we have a few unnecessary styles which are impossible for the elderly, and mothers with pushchairs, to navigate and appear to be in positions where the only possible explanation for their presence is to dissuade people from using the path at all.</p> | | Noted |
| Nyetimber Ltd (Strutt and Parker) | The main objectives of these representations are threefold. First, to write in general support for the preparation of the plan, second, to support the Parish Council's approach in Policy EE5 and the Plan's recognition of vineyards and the importance these have in attracting visitors to the local area, and lastly to object to Policy EE6 in relation to residential conversions in rural areas. | | Noted |
| DMH Stallard on behalf of Croudace | See the document which contains plans for the development of the site. | | See Housing Sites assessment |
| Strutt & Parker | Land at Hatches Estate - consider the proposal submitted | | Full review of documents provided by Strutt and Parker to be undertaken |
| Mr Mrs Hudson | Unable to copy text into table- residents very cross that their garden has been dissected by the Separation Zone. | | Discuss |
| Mr Matson | <p>1. Speeding cars are a problem in West Chiltington. I walk and cycle a lot and see local residents are often the offenders. Traffic control and enforcement must be improved.</p> <p>2. Traffic control, particularly around the school must be improved or there will be a significant injury or fatality. Eg. At school pick up times: 10mph speed limits, No through road, no parking areas, etc. The corner at the post office is a particular pinch point.</p> <p>3. Dog fouling is a particularly bad along the footpaths of West Chiltington. I asked Horsham Council how many people have been prosecuted or fined in the Horsham area for dog fouling in the last 10 years; the answer was ZERO! There are innovative solutions we could pursue to solve this problem. Eg. DNA dog fouling companies could provide services at no cost to the Parish.</p> | | Discuss |
| T Clare | Having just read the draft, I would like to congratulate those responsible for the hard work and reasoning that is contained within. However, in order to preserve our lovely village I make no apology for again stressing the importance of keeping the designated separation zone between WCV and WCC intact. Development should rightly be resisted if future pressure is forthcoming. This area enhances the local wild life and should remain for agricultural use and nothing else. No development should be allowed outside our current built-up boundaries. Where housing is allowed at suitable spaces, then generally the sentiments expressed in H4.1 should prevail i.e. it should reflect existing density and not be cramped. | | Noted |
| Mrs Harrison | I have recently been in touch with Mr Mark Daley, Strategic Planning Officer at HDC to discuss the land north of Finches Lane in West Chiltington, ref SAO14, which we own. The land is currently assessed as 'Not currently developable' on the SHLAA. The justification for this is as follows 'The site adjoins the edge of the built up area with the majority of the site covered by a TPO. Development here would have an impact on the surrounding rural countryside, but a small amount could be accommodated if the impact was reduced and the potential access issues were resolved. Whilst the site is under single ownership, it was not possible to contact the landowner, therefore availability is unknown. Due to this and other constraints, the site is assessed as not currently developable'. As the current owners, we are now exploring the possibility of building one small bungalow or house on the site to enable us to downsize from our home in Finches Lane. We believe that the impact of this on the surrounding area would be minimal and would not affect any trees covered by the TPO. As a result of our discussion Mr Daley has now noted the land as available in their database prior to the site being re-assessed later in the year. He also advised us to contact you to ask you to consider the site as available in the forthcoming Neighbourhood Plan. Our telephone number is 01989 817489 if you wish the contact us. | | Land is outside the BUAB and would set a dangerous precedent |

| Respondee | Comment | Policy | NP Response |
|---|--|------------------------|-------------|
| Southern Water | <p>Omission of policy- Provision of additional wastewater infrastructure</p> <p>Southern Water is the statutory water and wastewater undertaker for West Chilton and thus has a statutory duty to serve new development here.</p> <p>We are committed to ensuring that the right water and wastewater infrastructure is in the right place at the right time in collaboration with developers, the planning authority and the Parish Council. Although there are no current plans, over the life of the Neighbourhood Plan, it may be that we will need to provide new or improved infrastructure either to serve new development and/or to meet stricter environmental permits.</p> <p>It is important to have policy provision in the Neighbourhood Plan which seeks to ensure that the necessary infrastructure is in place to meet these requirements.</p> <p>We could find no policies to provide for new or improved infrastructure to support development. One of the Core Planning Principles contained in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) is to 'proactively drive and support sustainable economic development to deliver the homes, business and industrial units, infrastructure and thriving local places that the country needs'.</p> <p>Proposed amendment</p> <p>Support for essential infrastructure is required at all levels of the planning system. To ensure consistency with the NPPF and facilitate sustainable development, we propose an additional policy as follows:</p> <p>New and improved utility infrastructure will be encouraged and supported in order to meet the identified needs of the community subject to other policies in the plan'</p> | | Discuss |
| DMH Stallard on behalf of Croudace | <p>The Site Assessment Report seeks to make further assessment of those sites promoted through the neighbourhood plan process. It supports the HDC SHELAA and informs the allocation of land within the WCNDP.</p> <p>Site 1: The land east of Hatches House</p> <p>The site assessment should be updated to reflect the findings of the Inspector in relation to the recent appeal (Appendix B).</p> <p>The description of the site is given as having a 'rural aspect'. However, the appeal decision relating to the development of the site for 3 dwellings states (paragraph 14) that the site is well contained by boundary hedgerows and would therefore be visually well contained. It is noted that the development of the site would not extend the settlement boundary further north or east than nearby development, nor would it be dissimilar to the existing housing to the west.</p> <p>Reference to the 'rural aspect' of the plot should be removed. There is no evidence to justify reference to a rural aspect and the appeal decision relating to the site would suggest otherwise. Whilst it is accepted that development would have some impact on the visual character of the site, this is true of any greenfield site.</p> <p>The site is identified as providing some opportunity for small dwellings and affordable housing. However, this would conflict with other policies within the WCNDP which seek to protect the character of the area. The appeal decision relating to the site, notes that the scheme for 3 dwellings would reflect the form and character of the area.</p> <p>Parking is referred to as a constraint of development, however, this is not based on sound evidence. The planning application and appeal relating to the site was not objected to on these grounds and sufficient parking was provided within the site, therefore ensuring that there was no burden on the road for parking.</p> <p>It is noted that an access point would increase visibility into the site, but that this would not be significant, this is referred to in the Inspectors Report relating to the appeal, where it is concluded that this impact is not significant.</p> <p>Table 1: Overview assessment</p> <p>Site 1 – the land at east of Hatches House, performs well in the site assessment. It is one of only 3 available sites and is sustainably located, 1 of the other available sites is allocated and has planning permission (Steele Close), the other (Johnsons Farm) is within the separation zone, where the WCNDP restricts development to prevent coalescence.</p> <p>The site is referred to as being poorly located in relation to community facilities, whilst being very well located to schools and village shops. It is considered that being poorly located in relation to any secondary community facilities should not be viewed negatively (as these are generally not provided for in tier 3 settlements).</p> <p>The Summary</p> <p>The summary to the Site Assessment Report 2017 is unjustified and seeks to support a lower allocation of housing. Site 1 performs well within the assessment and is one of only 3 available sites. The conclusion refers to Site 12 as a 'possible site' but excludes it on the basis of needing to meet local needs. Local needs are not defined, however, the need to deliver local housing needs is a priority set out in the NPPF and is supported by Policy 15 of the HDPF. Furthermore, in the absence of any evidence on local housing needs, the summary cannot be sound.</p> <p>As the site could assist in meeting local housing needs, on an otherwise unconstrained site (as set out in the recent appeal decision), it should be allocated for housing in accordance with other policies within the WCNDP.</p> | Site Assessment | |

| Respondee | Comment | Policy | NP Response |
|------------|---|--------|-----------------|
| Horsham DC | <p>Comments of the Sustainability Appraisal/Strategic Environmental Assessment</p> <p>Overview</p> <p>One of the basic conditions that a Neighbourhood Plan must meet is that it must conform to the requirements of EU legislation. In terms of this Neighbourhood Plan the relevant legislation is the European Directive 2001/42/EC on the strategic assessment of plans and programmes (this has been transposed into UK law via the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2014). The starting point for this review is, therefore, is to consider if the Sustainability Appraisal/Strategic Environmental Assessment adheres to all of the requirements of this Directive. Throughout this review a number of refinements to the SA are identified to ensure that this legal test can be met.</p> <p>A Screening Opinion from Horsham District Council determined that a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) was required because the plan was likely to allocate land for development. This is the standard approach being adopted by the council to all Neighbourhood Plans. The West Chiltington Neighbourhood Plan Council (WCNPC) then determined that the SEA should be broadened to provide a Sustainability Appraisal (SA). This will give a systematic demonstration of how the plan will contribute to the sustainable development of the plan area which is another basic condition that such plans must adhere to.</p> <p>The SA/SEA is, therefore, forms an important part of the evidence base for the plan and this review is intended to ensure that this part of the process complies with the Regulations and is as strong as possible. There is a need to be proportional in terms of the area covered by the Neighbourhood Plan and the number of issues it seeks to address. However, as Neighbourhood Plans form part of the development plan such plans and their associated evidence base must be robust. The SA/SEA that has been produced to date has followed the correct procedures. A Scoping Opinion has been provided and the early stages of producing an SA/SEA have been followed and included in a Scoping Report. The latter was then subject to consultation with the relevant consultees. A draft SA/SEA has been produced which will sit alongside the Pre Submission Draft of the West Chiltington Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>Note – paragraph 1.4 of the WCNP indicates that a Screening Opinion indicated that an SEA was not required this needs to be amended.</p> <p>12</p> <p>Comments on the baseline information</p> <p>This should include any plans, policies and programmes that are relevant to the area in terms of sustainable development. In this instance this is included in the Scoping Report. It is appreciated that comments have been given by the council on the latter document when it was originally produced. However, in the meantime the approach to Neighbourhood Plans has moved on from a light touch approach and Examiners are giving greater scrutiny to the evidence base. Furthermore, there is a need to update the information as the Scoping Report was produced in 2015.</p> <p>Plans and policies</p> <p>Reference should be made to the South Downs National Park Local Plan – Preferred Options (September 2015) due to the presence of the National Park partly within and adjacent to the parish. Although little of the parish falls within the National Park views into and out of this designated area are important considerations when reviewing allocated sites. This is not an adopted Local Plan but it does demonstrate a direction of travel.</p> <p>It would also be useful to make reference to any Neighbourhood Plans adjacent to the parish that are being developed. This would give an indication of any issues that might affect West Chiltington parish; including any allocated sites that could impact on the plan area. The latter is particularly relevant given the traffic issues that affect the parish.</p> <p>Baseline data</p> <p>The SEA Directive lists the environmental issues that should be included in the assessment. Not all of these have been included in the baseline information. Information on archaeology (including non-designated heritage assets) and soil (which in this case would be agricultural land quality) have been omitted.</p> <p>There are also socio-economic issues that should be included in the baseline information. Although there is a cross reference to the Housing Needs Study it would be helpful to include the main outcomes of this Study within the SA; particularly as the provision of affordable homes is such a significant issue for the plan. In addition, a justification for the number of houses being allocated in the plan should be included in the SA. As traffic has a negative effect on the parish, information on this would be useful; such as car ownership and usage.</p> <p>Finally, as the objectives of the plan mentions the need for housing to complement the character and local distinctiveness of the area it would be useful if there was some information on this in the baseline information. What are the particular characteristics that are important to the plan area? This is likely to be a combination of landscape and the built environment. The Village Design Statement will be a useful source of information in relation to the latter.</p> <p>It is noted that much more baseline information has been included in the Neighbourhood Plan itself. It would be preferable if this was included in the SA/SEA as this clearly demonstrates the environmental and socio-economic issues that are relevant to the area. At the very least the SA should cross refer to this information. Without this background it is not clear how the key sustainability issues have been identified and which ones maybe effected by the plan.</p> <p>If there are instances where information is not available this can be indicated in the SA/SEA as this demonstrates that there is a gap in the evidence base.</p> <p>Consultation</p> <p>It would helpful to include the dates for the consultation on the Scoping Report and the comments that were received. It would then be advisable to set out how the information in the SA/SEA was updated as a result of these comments.</p> <p>The SA/SEA</p> <p>The format of this document follows the list of the requirements of the SEA Directive. However, this means that in places it does not follow a logical sequence. For example, the social, economic and environmental issue without the WCNP are in section 4 and, therefore, is before the appraisal has been carried out. This could form a reasonable alternative to the current policies in the plan (the do nothing option) and should, therefore, appear later in the document. The rest of this review contains comments on each of the sections of the SA/SEA.</p> <p>Section 1</p> <p>This should indicate that a Scoping Report has been produced and some of the relevant information is contained in the report (this is</p> | SEA | Amendments made |

| Respondee | Comment | Policy | NP Response |
|------------|---|----------------------------|---|
| Horsham DC | As set out above, the assessment of all sites must be supported by robust evidence. Whilst it is noted that the Parish has undertaken this process, the Council is concerned that the work that has been undertaken to date is insufficiently robust to meet the basic conditions. For example limited information is available on proximity to existing services and facilities, the proximity to nature conservation designations on a consistent basis. The Council has distributed guidance on the site assessment process following the Neighbourhood Planning Conference held in January 2017, and it is strongly recommended that this approach is followed. We are happy to discuss this process with you in more detail. The site assessment report will also need to provide more detail than is currently available on the alternative sites than is currently available. | | The guidance has been followed and each site assessed on the table provided by the LPA. Most of the sites were not put forward for development, the team simply looked at all land. To assess sites with no hope more rigorously to find out the exact position of services is not realistic or necessary. |
| | In particular the Parish should look further at the Haglands site. It is stated that this site is not currently available. However, there has been a recent appeal decision on this site which suggests otherwise. In the appeal, outline permission was sought for 19 dwellings (DC/15/1389). This was dismissed on the principle of development and landscape impact but there may be ways in which this could be mitigated. In addition to these general remarks, we also set out some further detailed commentary on the specific sites below: | | The PC is appalled at this comment which it feels must have been made by someone who had not looked at the planning history of the site. This site has been refused by the LPA on two separate occasions and upheld at appeal both times. It lies outside the BUA boundary and is contrary to the LPA's policies 2,3 4, 25 and 26 as identified by the appeal Inspector. The LPA should withdraw their comments on this site. |
| Horsham DC | <p>Site 1 Land east of Hatches House</p> <p>Reference is made to the land at Hatches Estate in the Site Assessment Report. This is identified in the 2016 SHLAA as land currently developable within 6-10 years. The site abuts the boundary of the existing settlement and is controlled by WSCC who have expressed an interest in developing this site. The adjacent Grade II listed building (Naldrett) is not referred to in the assessment. The plan states that residents were largely unhappy with this site for development due to poor access and the impact of additional traffic on local roads / lanes. It is felt that further consideration should be given to this site. It could however be the case that the site could be accessed appropriately following discussion with the highways authority. Whilst it is noted that the scheme may result in a significant landscape impact if not appropriately designed this could potentially be overcome. At this stage it is considered further work is required as to the suitability of this site. The current rejection based on local opinion conjecture alone cannot be supported.</p> | Site Allocation Assessment | This would breach policy 10 and Policy 26. This is an agricultural business. |
| | <p>Site 2 Steele Close</p> <p>Strong justification will be required to justify the allocation of this site given that it already has planning permission – it could perhaps address what could come forward if the permission is not implemented. The site is already included in the Council's housing trajectory and will not count towards the contribution of 1500 homes through neighbourhood planning. The site assessment does not make reference should be made to the planning application reference for this site which should be included (DC/15/2810) which allowed 14 affordable homes and one market unit. No reference is made in the site assessment to the impact on the nearby listed building.</p> | | This site has been allocated through the NP process and the LPA are fully aware of that. To suggest that it has been counted towards the Council's housing trajectory is not acceptable. The PC wishes to have a full retraction of this comment. |
| | <p>Site 4 - Juggs Lane</p> <p>It is unclear on the extent of land being offered for consideration. A red line around the proposed land is required. Has the landowner demonstrate access arrangements? What grade is the agricultural land? The conclusion is unclear regarding availability (the assumption is the land has been offered for consideration).</p> | | Not put forward and is not available. |
| | <p>Site 5 - Crossway</p> <p>It is unclear why this site was considered when the conclusion indicated the site is not available for development. If this is not the case, further detail required regarding the existing building i.e. is it considered a non-designated heritage asset?</p> | | Reviewed because we could not get hold of the landowner but when we did we discovered it was not available |
| | <p>Site 6 Old Boundary Lane</p> <p>More work is required to justify why this site is unsuitable. It is noted reference is made to Character Area 53 (Local Landscape Character Area) and while there is no no/low capacity for large scale development (100 dwellings proposed) the landscape may be able to accommodate more modest development. This is not clear in the report. The Landscape Capacity Assessment is a high level document, and smaller areas within the overall character zones must be assessed on their own merits. Reference should be made to archaeological notification area located on the south west boundary of the site.</p> | | Land was not put forward we looked at it. The land owner has not indicated that it is available. |
| | <p>Site 17 Johnsons Farm</p> <p>The site should be assessed against Policy 27 of the HDPF in terms of coalescence. While there are mature trees onsite they are not TPOs and there is possible mitigation which can overcome this. It is not clear from the map the extent of the traditional orchard and what if any implications this has.</p> | | Not put forward and in the SSZ |
| | <p>Site 29 West Chiltington Road</p> <p>Reference should be made to the adjacent Grade II listed building and what impact this may have on the potential development.</p> | | A LB does not have an impact on development if the LPA determine that good design, siting and appearance are insisted upon |
| | <p>Site 34 Chilton</p> <p>If this site is considered a windfall it should be screened out from the process and not considered as an allocation.</p> | | Not relevant. Read the criteria upon which we created the reports. |
| | <p>Site 38 Moto Di Marino Garage</p> <p>Moto Di Marino garage site, the Site Assessment Report stipulates the site maybe suitable for 16 one and two bed flats for the elderly. Reference should be made as to how the site would be secured for the elderly. The delivery of the site is uncertain and further commitment from the landowner is required for it to be allocated in the plan.</p> | | Sect 106 possible. There is a tried and tested approach to delivering sheltered accommodation through S106 agreements. Owner has confirmed his acceptance to the site being put forward. |

| Respondee | Comment | Policy | NP Response |
|------------|--|--------|-------------|
| Horsham DC | <p>In terms of the presentation of the policies, it is considered that it is unclear which the policy wording is and what is supporting text, as each policy area is set out in a single box. It is presumed text in bold is policy and text not in bold is considered supporting text. This approach is not applied consistently and there are instances where some of the text that is not in bold could be interpreted as part of the policy (criterion) while other text can be construed as supporting guidance or a statement. The document should be updated to ensure that the distinction between policy from supporting text is clear.</p> <p>In addition it is requested that policy criteria are numbered rather than using bullet points. This greatly assists planning officers when writing committee reports on specific planning applications, where they need to make reference to specific policies / sub-sections of policies.</p> | | Noted |