

WEST CHILTINGTON PARISH COUNCIL
Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group #27 Meeting
at 3.30pm on Thursday 26th April 2018
Venue: Parish Council Reading Room

Present: M Monks, S Davis, R Gustar, Maureen Chaffe, Process Matters, C Howe (HDC), N Kwan (HDC), Debbie Jarvie, Assistant Parish Clerk,

1. **Appoint Chairman for the meeting** - RGustar was appointed
 2. **Apologies for absence** - J Fryer
 3. **Declarations of interest** - The Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group Committee can only make proposals, not decisions on matters relating to the Neighbourhood Plan. Any such proposals will be referred to the parish council for decision.
- 4/6. **Discussion on Agenda Items** was extensive raising the following action points;

Action Raised	Actioned By
Steele Close - Not included in NP on a technicality from HDC. All paperwork submitting dates that the site was first introduced have been previously submitted. WCPC confirm that the site was put into the NP before any permissions had been given	HDC - to revisit previously submitted paperwork to clarify position and confirm that Steele Close can be included in NP. WCPC to be advised.
Separation Zone - HDC had not specifically recognised the zone in WC Parish. WCPC have already completed paperwork justifying the zones and concerned that HDC has omitted this important detail.	NK (HDC) - To go back through paperwork and look at evidence and the 2 appeal cases within the separation zone. WCPC to be advised of outcome
Builds of 3/4/5 Houses - Conversation referred to with Ivan (Locality) who advised small housing developments could be included in the NP.	NK (HDC) - To contact Ivan and discuss his email to us concerning smaller builds. Advise WCPC of outcome.
Consultation Document - Need document to show who we consulted	MC - To provide documentation
Hatches Estate / Hatches House - Confusion between the 2 sites from HDC response Reg 14 document, wrong information on the most recent document causing major concerns as inaccurate but posted for public to see.	NK (HDC) - To revisit comments and ensure clarity on the two sites. Retraction and amendments to be issued. WCPC to be advised when completed.
Concerns over inaccurate statements - WCPC to highlight and send to HDC	SD - To review HDC reply document and highlight areas of concern HDC - To retract statements made once consideration of the above has been made
AECOM report - Expected mid May	MC/WCPC - To review on receipt

5. **Date of next meeting**
Thursday 17th May 2018 3.30pm

Reg 14 Responses Roundup

Respondee	Comment	Policy	NP Response
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
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
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.
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.
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 than 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.
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.
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.

Respondee	Comment	Policy	NP Response
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.
Horsham DC	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.	EH13	Done
Horsham DC	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.	EH2	Increase evidence base. The zone was first allocated as a Local Gap in the HDC Local Plan 2007
Horsham DC	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.	EH3	This has been done in Policy EN7 Local Green Spaces. These are linked to the corridors
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
Horsham DC	The Policy should read 'preserve or enhance. Please delete 'preserve and enhance'	EH8	Agree
Horsham DC	Please see comment Policy H8. While Paragraph 125 of the NPPF goes on to stipulate: "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." 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.	EH9	Policy wording agreed by three previous Examiners - also existing position in the parish and local support
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.

Respondee	Comment	Policy	NP Response
Horsham DC	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	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.
Horsham DC	<p>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.</p>	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	<p>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.</p> <p>'And not overloading local services/infrastructure...'</p>	H4	Agree
Horsham DC	<p>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.</p>	H5	Change wording to read Policy HDPF 16.
Horsham DC	<p>It is noted that Policy H6 does stipulate if impacts from development can be mitigated through contributions.</p>	H6	Noted

Respondee	Comment	Policy	NP Response
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
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
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.

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 are 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 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>	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 no 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	Site 1 Land east of Hatches House 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.	Site Allocation Assessment	This would breach policy 10 and Policy 26. This is an agricultural business.
	Site 2 Steele Close 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 be 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.		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.
	Site 4 - Juggs Lane 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).		Not put forward and is not available.

Respondee	Comment	Policy	NP Response
	<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 own its 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 Chilmington 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.
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

Consultation Statement

Key dates and events for inclusion in final document - this is a draft only

26th November 2016

Open Event held at the Village Hall Pavilion.

Topic Boards shown below were produced for the event and were made available on the web site in full to ensure full coverage.

Getting Around

We want your views on parking, speed, traffic calming and access issues.

[Topic Board](#)

[Issues Board](#)

[Public Rights of Way Map](#)

Employment and Tourism

We want your views on where you would locate additional employment land; how Broadband and connectivity issues affect you; whether you support the proposals from Harwoods and Nyetimber and whether you think we should improve our tourism offering.

[Topic Board](#)

[Issues Board](#)

[Display by Harwoods](#)

Leisure and Community

We want your views on which assets are important to the community and what facilities need improving/adding.

[Topic Board](#)

[Issues Board](#)

[Skate Park Ideas](#)

[Trim Trail Ideas](#)

Housing

We want your views on sites for housing; a strategic allocation of land at Hatches Estate and homes on land at Hatches House.

[Topic Board](#)

[Issues Board](#)

[Strategic Site](#) - SHLAA site

[Hatches House](#) - promoted by Croudace Ltd

Heritage

We need your help to identify Non Listed Heritage Assets and to carry out a character assessment where you live. We also want your views on whether the areas where the Wells Houses are located should be designated as a Conservation Area.

[Topic Board](#)

[Issues Board](#)

[Character Assessment Toolkit](#)

[Listed Buildings Map](#)

[Listed Buildings List](#)

[Existing Conservation Area](#)

Environment

Could you help us to collect data by recording wildlife sightings. Do you know of any special places that we can add to our biodiversity corridors? Which green spaces should be preserved?

[Topic Board](#)

[Issues Board](#)

[List of Tree Preservation Orders](#)

[Map of Ancient Woodland](#)

[Map of Traditional Orchards](#)

[Sussex Biodiversity Records Centre Parish Report](#)

[SSSI](#)

[Environment Agency Flood Risk Map](#)

Topic Board feedback

[The Plan](#)

[The Process](#)

[Business and Tourism](#)

[Harwoods](#)

[Community](#)

[Getting Around](#)

[Heritage](#)

[The Wells Houses](#)

[Letter 1 received at event](#)

[Letter 2 received at event](#)

[Email from Mr Shaw](#)

Housing Site Evaluation used SHLAA, sites from old call for sites plus sites identified by the NP team for review.

[Housing Site Assessment Report](#)

[Appendix A - WC Housing Sites Appraisal Initial trawl](#)

Appendix B - Housing Sites for further review appraised by HDC criteria

Reg 14 Consultation 10th May 2017 to June 21st 2017

Poster advertising the event

Event publicised by web site, posters, article in parish news

List of Consultees for Reg14 consultation by email:

South Downs National Park Authority

West Sussex County Council

Horsham District Council

Natural England

The Environment Agency

English Heritage

The Highways Agency

NHS Coastal West Sussex CCG

Southern Electric

British Gas

Southern Water

Sussex Police

CPRE

Historic England

Nyetimber Wines

Pulborough P C

Thakeham P C

Storrington and Sullington PC

Billingshurst PC

West Chiltington School

DMH Stallard

Shaw Design Services

All residents via the Parish web site and paper copies in key locations

Draft Pre-Submission Plan Responses

Billingshurst PC

DHM Stallard

Environment Agency

Horsham DC

Highways England

Historic England

Natural England

National Trust

South Downs NP

Southern Water

Storrington PC

Strutt & Parker on behalf of Nyetimber Ltd

Strutt & Parker re Hatches Estate

- Site Access
- Transport Statement
- Letter
- Site Layout
- Drainage Report
- Arboricultural Survey
- Arboriculture Impact Assessment

Thakeham PC

WSCC

West Chiltington PC response to Horsham DC

Reg 14 responses roundup as at Feb 18

Horsham DC letter dated 8th January 2018

WC letter to HDC 8th February 2018