

Horsham District Council Local Planning Authority

Rusper Parish Neighbourhood Plan 2018-2031

FINAL DECISION STATEMENT

Date: 25 August 2020

1.0 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 Horsham District Council (“the Council”) has a statutory duty¹ to support Parish Councils and Qualifying Bodies in the preparation of Neighbourhood Development Plans (NDP’s) and Orders and to take NDP’s and Orders through a process of examination and referendum.
- 1.2 This decision statement relates to the Neighbourhood Plan produced by Rusper Parish Council (“RPC”). Under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended), (“the 1990 Act”) Horsham District Council (“the Council”) has a statutory duty to support Parish Councils and Qualifying Bodies in the preparation of Neighbourhood Development Plans (NDP’s) and Orders and to take NDP’s and Orders through a process of examination and referendum. The Localism Act 2011 (Part 6 chapter 3) sets out the responsibilities under Neighbourhood Planning
- 1.3 Following the Examination of the Rusper Neighbourhood Plan and the receipt of the Examiner’s Report. Horsham District Council is required to make a decision on the next steps. As set out in the Neighbourhood Planning Regulations these are:
- a) to decline to consider a plan proposal under paragraph 5 of Schedule 4B to the 1990 Act (as applied by section 38A of the 2004 Act) or a modification proposal under paragraph 5 of Schedule A2 to the 2004 Act;
 - b) to refuse a plan proposal under paragraph 6 of Schedule 4B to the 1990 Act (as applied by section 38A of the 2004 Act) or a modification proposal under paragraph 8 of Schedule A2 to the 2004 Act;
 - c) what action to take in response to the recommendations of an Examiner made in a report under paragraph 10 of Schedule 4B to the 1990 Act (as applied by section 38A of the 2004 Act) in relation to a neighbourhood development plan or under paragraph 13 of Schedule A2 to the 2004 Act in relation to a proposed modification of a neighbourhood development plan;

¹ The Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended)

- d) what modifications, if any, they are to make to the draft plan under paragraph 12(6) of Schedule 4B to the 1990 Act (as applied by section 38A of the 2004 Act) or paragraph 14(6) of Schedule A2 to the 2004 Act;
- e) whether to extend the area to which the referendum is (or referendums are) to take place; or
- f) that they are not satisfied with the plan proposal under paragraph 12(10) of Schedule 4B to the 1990 Act (as applied by section 38A of the 2004 Act) or the draft plan under paragraph 14(4) of Schedule A2 to the 2004 Act.

1.4 In accordance with the Regulations, this report forms the Council's Decision Statement (Regulation 18(2)) and sets out the Council's decision and the reasons for this.

2.0 BACKGROUND

2.1 The Ruser Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP) relates to the area that was designated by the Council as a neighbourhood area on 18 February 2016 (please refer to Plan A).

2.2 The Pre-Submission Ruser NDP underwent consultation in accordance with Regulation 14 from 2 September – 14 October 2019.

2.3 Ruser Parish Council then submitted the submission draft plan to the Council. The submission draft RNDP was publicised and representations were invited for nine weeks between 24 February until midnight on 27 April 2020.

2.4 David Hogger was appointed by Horsham District Council with the consent of RPC, as 'the Examiner' to undertake the examination of the Ruser NDP and to prepare a report of the independent examination.

2.5 The Examiner's report was received on the 24 August 2020. It concludes that the RNDP, subject to a number of recommended changes meets the basic conditions as set out in legislation and can proceed to referendum.

2.6 As has already been indicated in paragraph 1.3 of this report, Regulations 17A and 18 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 (as amended) requires the local planning authority to outline what action to take in response to the recommendations of an Examiner following the formal examination.

3.0 DECISION

3.1 Having considered the recommended modifications made by the Examiner's Report, and the reasons for them, Horsham District Council, with the consent of RPC has considered each of the recommendations and agreed the action to take in response to each recommendation. It was decided to accept all the modifications made to the draft plan by the Examiner under paragraph 12(2)(4) of Schedule 4B to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. The Examiner's proposed modifications are set out at Appendix A alongside the reason why the modification was accepted.

3.2 The Council is also in agreement with the Examiner that the screening was indeed correct in its outcome that the RNDP did not need to undertake a full SEA.

4.0 THE REFERENDUM AREA

- 4.1 The Council is in agreement with the Examiner's recommendation that there is no policy or proposal significant enough to have an impact beyond the designated neighbourhood plan area, and that any referendum that takes place in due course be contiguous with the boundary of the designated neighbourhood plan area (Please refer to Plan A).

5.0 CONCLUSION


- 5.1 The Council is of the view that the draft submission Rusper Neighbourhood Plan as modified in Appendix A: Examiner's Proposed Modifications to the Rusper Neighbourhood Plan 2018-2031, complies with the legal requirement and may now proceed to Referendum.
- 5.2 The COVID-19 pandemic has resulted in mandatory restrictions on movement since March 2020 to prevent transmission of the virus and protect vulnerable groups. [The Local Government and Police and Crime Commissioner \(Coronavirus\) \(Postponement of Elections and Referendums\) \(England and Wales\) Regulation 2020](#) prevents any referendum on neighbourhood plans being held until 5 May 2021 at the earliest. It follows that the referendum for the Rusper Neighbourhood Development Plan is suspended until further notice and a referendum can be undertaken safely. Upon the issue of the decision statement, 'significant weight' can be applied to the plan by the decision maker when considering planning applications.

Signed:



Glen Chipp
Chief Executive
Horsham District Council
Date: 25 August 2020

Plan A: Rusper Neighbourhood Plan Area



Appendix A: Examiner's Proposed Modifications to the Rusper Neighbourhood Plan

Policies	Examiner's Modifications (insertion <u>underline</u> , omission as strikethrough)	Decision and Justification	Action Taken and Revised Modification
Foreword	<p><i>Foreword</i></p> <p><i>Paragraph 5:</i> As part of this plan, you will see that In Rusper pParish is providing there are significant areas of land allocated for housing that will help to meet both Crawley and Horsham's needs. The Maples in Ifield, along with Kilnwood Vale and North Horsham, have a real impact on the environment of Rusper, but they also provide for the housing and other needs of our own local communities. However, when these housing developments are completed the gap between the two towns will be significantly reduced. also lead to the physical coalescence of the two towns, which when all of the proposed housing and other development is complete will be a mere 2,000m apart along the A264. It is important therefore, to consider this for any future development, as even small scale development would lead to the two towns becoming one large urban sprawl. Further development, especially to the West of Ifield, will be harmful to both the communities and the environment.</p>	HDC agree with the Examiner's recommendation for additional text to provide clarification.	No further action required. Modification to be taken forward to the final plan.
Chapter 3. Planning Policy Context	<p><i>Chapter 3: Planning Policy Context: The Horsham District Planning Framework Review</i></p> <p><i>Paragraph 3.12:</i> The Local Plan Review (LPR) Issues and Options consultation in April 2018 proposed minor amendments to the Rusper BUAB and also proposes a 'secondary settlement' boundary at Ifield. The LPR also acknowledges the role of rural areas in contributing to the District's employment strategy by providing small scale local employment opportunities close to where people live.</p>	HDC agree with the Examiner's recommendation.	No further action required. Modification to be taken forward to the final plan.

Chapter 3. Planning Policy Context	<p><i>Chapter 3: Planning Policy Context: Other Plans & Programmes</i></p> <p><i>Paragraph 3.19:</i> <i>The UK Government declaration of a climate change emergency in May 2019 has still to filter through the planning process and this provides another degree of uncertainty as to where priorities will be placed. This plan tries to balance the conservation and enhancement of environment, through its specific policies, against the acceptance that another almost 1,000 houses will be built in the plan area as currently agreed. As set out in the Horsham District Planning Framework (add footnote)</i></p>	HDC agree with the Examiner’s recommendation for a footnote to be added to provide clarity.	No further action required. Modification to be taken forward to the final plan.
Chapter 4. Community Views	<p><i>Chapter 4: Community Views</i></p> <p><i>Paragraph 4.8:</i> <i>Throughout the Regulation 14 consultation period on the draft plan, presentations were given to local groups and input sought. All responses were then considered in producing the plan for submission to HDC. All responses are included in the submitted evidence. See Appendix J to this document and see Consultation Statement dated November 2019.</i></p>	HDC agree with the Examiner’s recommendation to reference the Consultation Statement in this section.	No further action required. Modification to be taken forward to the final plan.
Chapter 5. Vision & Objectives	<p><i>Chapter 5: Vision and Objectives</i></p> <p><i>Objectives, Paragraph 5.3:</i> <i>Looking at these principles objectives in more detail, achieving the vision means:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>I. Valuing our green spaces: Rusper must retain and maintain its open spaces and provide opportunities for them to be enjoyed by all and, if the opportunity arises, to increase the level of open space.</i> <i>II. Access to countryside: Rusper must seek to increase footways, cycle routes and bridleways. We need to reduce traffic impact, and</i> 	HDC agree with the Examiner’s recommendation	No further action required. Modification to be taken forward to the final plan.

	<p><i>encourage sustainable transport, and reduce the impact of school traffic.</i></p> <p>III. <i>Supporting business and enterprise:</i> <i>Rusper needs to retain its village shop and support businesses in the area. Rusper must support opportunities for increased employment within the rural economy, where these have minimal environmental impact on what is predominantly a rural area. It needs to encourage and support better online connections to help businesses thrive.</i></p> <p>IV. <i>Promote and support education and training opportunities:</i> <i>Rusper needs to support its local Primary School and ensure that all forms of education and training can flourish in the area. This should especially focus on those areas relating to the rural economy and management of the countryside.</i></p> <p>V. <i>Fostering a well ordered and vibrant community:</i> <i>The parish should retain its feeling of being well ordered and maintained and not cramped. The open aspect and countryside views should be protected. Rusper must retain its distinctive heritage and rural identity. Rusper has a heart and heritage in the main village, which is a community hub for residents. We also need to identify the distinct nature of other hamlets and settlement areas and protect their character: Lambs Green is a special area as the other key area within the parish.</i></p> <p>VI. <i>Housing:</i> <i>The housing provision within the Rusper Neighbourhood Plan area will more than double over the next twenty years, based on already identified developments. Given that the Housing Needs Assessment is met more than 5 times over by these already permitted developments, any further housing development should only be permitted if it meets some clear community need. This</i></p>		
--	---	--	--

	<p>may include improvements to brown field sites and where there is a specific benefit to the Parish.</p>		
<p>Policy RUS1: Spatial Plan</p>	<p><i>Policy RUS1: Spatial Plan</i></p> <p><i>The Neighbourhood Plan defines the built-up area boundary for Ruser, as shown on the Policies Map, for the purpose of applying Policy 4 of the Horsham District Planning Framework. Development proposals should conserve the open and tranquil character of the intervening landscape and its views at the following locations:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● <i>SP1: Kilnwood Vale, Crawley and Lambs Green</i> ● <i>SP2: Between Ifield and Ifieldwood</i> <p><i>Proposals which would either individually or cumulatively, unacceptably harm or detract from the distinct landscape character and separation of these areas, as defined in the Policy Map, will not be supported.</i></p> <p><i>Paragraph 6.5:</i> <i>Ifieldwood and Lambs Green are of a scale which does not justify the definition of a built-up area boundary and were not taken forward as 'secondary settlements' in the recent HDC consultation.. Nonetheless they play an important role in the neighbourhood area. Planning Practice Guidance Paragraph: 036 Reference ID: 8-036-20190721 states: "The National Planning Policy Framework is clear that plans should recognise the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside... Where landscapes have a particular local value, it is important for policies to identify their special characteristics and be supported by proportionate evidence." Appendix H – Landscape Character Assessment and Assessment Of Local Gaps In Plan Area describes the character and main features of SP1 and SP2 identified in the policy. The second part of the policy therefore seeks to ensure that the distinctive landscape character is protected and separation of Ifield and Ifieldwood; and Kilnwood Vale, Crawley and Lambs Green; is assured within the Plan</i></p>	<p>HDC agree with the Examiner's recommendation.</p>	<p>No further action required. Modification to be taken forward to the final plan.</p>

	<p>period. The gaps between these settlements will become all the more important in the context of the future growth of Crawley.</p> <p>Paragraph 6.6: The settlement of Rusper village is currently defined as a Small Village. The settlement of Lambs Green is unclassified in Policy 3 of the HDPF, but represents a small hamlet within the plan area. The settlement along the Rusper Road from Ifield in Crawley, is an unclassified, small part of the parish on the Crawley border. This small hamlet, identifies itself as part of Rusper, but is distinct in much the same way as Lambs Green. The settlement of Faygate is in an adjacent parish and also currently defined as an unclassified settlement. Horsham is defined as the main town and the strategic allocation at North Horsham, which extends into the parish of Rusper, forms part of the sustainable growth strategy for the district in Policy 2 of the HDPF.</p> <p>Paragraph 6.9: The purpose of maintaining the integrity of the areas between these settlements or hamlets, which serve as a visual break between each settlement and protect the character and rural setting of each, is therefore to provide additional protection to open land, or landscapes, that may be subject to development pressures.</p>		
<p>Policy RUS2: Rural Diversification</p>	<p><i>Policy RUS2: Rural Diversification</i></p> <p><i>Proposals for the development of new business, commercial, community uses and flexible start-up business accommodation outside the built-up area boundary of Rusper, for example as part of farm diversification, will be supported provided they adhere to other policies of the development plan.</i></p> <p><i>Development proposals that enhance the operational effectiveness and appearance of <u>such</u> existing employment sites and facilities, or to redevelop those sites to provide <u>appropriate</u></i></p>	<p>HDC agree with the Examiner’s recommendation.</p>	<p>No further action required. Modification to be taken forward to the final plan.</p>

	<p><i>modern commercial units and associated facilities, will be supported.</i></p> <p><i>Proposals <u>on such sites</u> that will result in the loss of employment floor-space will be resisted, unless it can be demonstrated that either there will be an increase in jobs as a result of the proposals enabling a higher employment density to be achieved, or the use is no longer viable.</i></p>		
Policy RUS3: Design	<p><i>Policy RUS3: Design</i></p> <p><i>Proposals for new development, including extensions to existing buildings, must be of the highest design standards, and will be required to reflect the character and scale of surrounding buildings. Proposals should have specific regard to <u>satisfactorily take into account</u>:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>I. Where appropriate, <u>The significance of the Rusper Conservation Area and its setting in defining the rural character of the Parish and how the <u>scheme proposal</u> will sustain and enhance that significance;</u></i> <i>II. <u>The significance of any heritage assets (as shown on the Policy Map) and their settings in the locality and how the <u>scheme proposal</u> will sustain and enhance that significance;</u></i> <i>III. Maintaining <u>The retention of</u> key views, particularly of the street scene and key buildings in the Rusper Conservation Area and out to the surrounding countryside;</i> <i>IV. Maintaining <u>The retention of</u> key views outside the Rusper Conservation Area out to the countryside, particularly views out from the playground to the east and from the Sports Field <u>(as shown on the Policy Map)</u>;</i> <i>V. Retaining <u>The retention of</u> the visual and amenity value of mature trees and hedgerows in the Parish, <u>where possible</u>;</i> 	HDC agree with the Examiner's recommendation.	No further action required. Modification to be taken forward to the final plan.

	<p>VI. Maximising the standards for <u>The achievement of current heat insulation standards;</u></p> <p>VII. Maximising the standards for <u>The achievement of current noise insulation standards;</u></p> <p>VIII. The provision of F<u>features (including renewable energy) that lead to low or zero carbon dioxide emissions, such as solar panels and air or ground source heat pumps; and</u></p> <p>IX. Retaining <u>The retention of</u> Rusper's dark skies status, in accordance with Policy RUS11 of the Neighbourhood <u>this Plan.</u></p> <p>Proposals will be expected to make the fullest contribution to minimising carbon dioxide emissions in accordance with the energy hierarchy and make efficient use of natural resources (including water), by making the most of natural systems to reduce vulnerability to climate change impacts over the lifetime of the development.</p> <p>Planning applications must demonstrate through a written statement how the delivery of sustainable design standards are integral to the development. As a minimum, development will be expected, subject to viability, to achieve the standards required by the National Model Design Code including space standards or subsequent national requirements.</p>		
<p>Policy RUS4: Local Heritage Assets</p>	<p>Policy RUS4: Local Heritage Assets</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Plan identifies the following buildings and structures as Local Heritage Assets by way of their local architectural or historic interest:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> I. Numbers 1 to 5 Church Cottages, High Street II. Numbers 1 to 8 Cottages to the South of East Street III. Numbers 1 to 4 Star Cottages, Horsham Road 	<p>HDC agree with the Examiner's recommendation and re-wording to provide clarity.</p>	<p>No further action required. Modification and deletion of policy to be taken forward to the final plan.</p>

	<p>Proposals affecting the significance of these a locally important buildings and structures will be assessed having regard to the scale of any harm to, or loss of, the architectural or historic interest of that building. and the significance of the locally important building or structure.</p>		
<p>Policy RUS5: Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity</p>	<p><i>Policy RUS5: Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity</i></p> <p><i>The Neighbourhood Plan will support proposals that protect, manage and enhance the rich natural features that are a key component of the Low Weald landscape which provide habitats for Rusper’s diverse species populations.</i></p> <p><i>Development proposals on land that lies within the broad location of the Green Infrastructure Network (<u>*as shown on Plans – and -</u>) will be required to demonstrate how they enhance habitat connectivity. The Green Infrastructure Network consists of House Copse Site of Special Scientific Interest, Local Wildlife Sites, notable road verges, and Section 41 habitats as defined on Map1, 2 and 4 in the Sussex Biodiversity Record Centre Ecological data search for Rusper Parish, attached as Appendix B. Development proposals must ensure their landscape schemes, layouts, access and public open space provision and other amenity requirements contribute to the connectivity, maintenance and improvement of the Network. Proposals should also consider the habitat connectivity provided for by footpaths and bridleways.</i></p> <p><i>Development proposals on land that lies within a Biodiversity Opportunity Area, Rusper Ridge and Ifield Brook (<u>*as shown on Plans – and -</u>) defined on the maps in the Sussex Biodiversity Partnership Rusper Ridge and Ifield Brook Biodiversity Opportunity Areas at Appendix C, should enhance biodiversity in accordance with the opportunities identified in Appendix C.</i></p>	<p>HDC agree with the Examiner’s recommendation.</p> <p>*A new plan (or plans) to be included in the referendum version of RNP, as an Appendix, which clearly identifies all the components of the Green Infrastructure Network. This will provide further clarification for all stakeholders. This has been agreed with the parish with appropriate formatting to be agreed.</p>	<p>No further action required. Modification to be taken forward to the final plan.</p>

	<p><i>All development proposals must demonstrate a biodiversity net gain for the Parish. Mitigation measures will be sought where any loss would be unavoidable and cause significant harm. Any development with the potential to impact, either individually or in combination, the integrity of any SPA or SAC will be required to undertake a Habitat Regulations Assessment including an Appropriate Assessment if required.</i></p>		
<p>Policy RUS6: Walking, Cycling and Equestrian Routes</p>	<p><i>Policy RUS6: Walking, Cycling and Equestrian Routes</i></p> <p><i>Development proposals will be supported, provided that, where appropriate to their location, they have regard to the following principles; and they accord with the other policies of the development plan:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>I. if <u>they proposal adjoins a public footpath or bridleway, the development must have regard to maintaining the functionality and rural character of the footpath or bridleway, unless this is unavoidable cannot satisfactorily be achieved, in which case the route must be diverted in a way that remains safe and convenient for users;</u></i> <i>II. if <u>they a proposal lies in a location that enables a new pedestrian, cycle link and/or bridleway to be created to join an existing public footpath or bridleway, that the layout and access arrangements of the scheme allow for such an improvement, provided they development avoids or minimise the loss of mature trees and hedgerows and use materials that are consistent with a rural location; and</u></i> <i>III. <u>access to the Parish by walking, cycling and riding can already be satisfactorily achieved. their location encourages walking, cycling and riding to access the Parish</u></i> 	<p>HDC agree with the Examiner’s recommendation.</p>	<p>No further action required. Modification to be taken forward to the final plan.</p>

<p>Policy RUS7: Local Green Spaces</p>	<p><i>Policy RUS7: Local Green Spaces</i></p> <p><i>The Neighbourhood Plan designates Local Green Spaces in the locations shown on the Policies Map and listed below.</i></p> <p><i>I. The Recreational Ground, High Street</i> <i>II. Glebe Field</i> <i>III. Church Field</i> <i>IV. Ghyll Manor Field</i> <i>V. Cooks Mead Green</i> <i>VI. Land adjacent to Pucks Croft Cottage</i> <i>VII. Gardeners Green</i> <i>VIII. Behind Star Inn, Rusper Road</i> <i>IX. Kilnwood Copse</i> <i>X. Friday Street (by Friday Street bridge)</i> <i>* renumber accordingly</i></p> <p><i>Proposals for development on the designated land will not be supported unless they are ancillary to the use of the land for public recreational or community purposes, or are required for statutory utility infrastructure, or other very special circumstances can be demonstrated.</i></p>	<p>HDC agree with the Examiner’s recommendation to deletion of the LGS’.</p>	<p>No further action required. Modification to be taken forward to the final plan.</p>
<p>Policy RUS8: Landscape Character and Local Gaps:</p>	<p><i>Policy RUS8: Landscape Character and Local Gaps:</i></p> <p><i>All new development must protect and enhance the character and quality of the Low Weald landscape character area, including the setting of settlements and hamlets within the parish.</i></p> <p><i>The Neighbourhood Plan defines the following Local Gap for the purpose of preventing coalescence of the following settlements:</i></p> <p><i>● LG1: Between Rusper Village and Lambs Green</i></p>	<p>HDC agree with the deletion of this policy.</p>	<p>No further action required. Modification and deletion of policy to be taken forward to the final plan.</p>

	<p>Development proposals within the Local Gap should demonstrate how the character of the Low Weald landscape has been taken into consideration and how proposals preserve their separation and retain their individual identities.</p> <p>Paragraph 6.41: One of the key characteristics of the Low Weald landscape includes small towns and villages scattered among areas of woodland, permanent grassland and hedgerows, including its rural lanes and tracks with wide grass verges and ditches. The purpose of the policy is therefore to refine the principles of the Natural Environment strategic policies within the development plan.</p> <p>Paragraph 6.42: Additionally, the Local Gap defined in this policy seeks to prevent coalescence of the main settlement of Rusper Village and the hamlet of Lambs Green.</p> <p>Paragraph 6.43: Although the HDPF does not designate Strategic or Local Gaps, they are a common policy mechanism in development plans. The policy refines the generic countryside protection and settlement coalescence policies 26 and 27 of the HDPF, the first of which seeks to protect the key features and characteristics of the landscape and ‘patterns of woodlands, fields, hedgerows, trees waterbodies and other features’ and the second, to ‘protect the landscape from development which would result in the coalescence of settlements.’</p> <p>Paragraph 6.44: A full description of the area and justification for the local gap is included in Appendix H – Landscape Character Assessment and Assessment Of Local Gaps In Plan Area.</p>		
--	--	--	--

<p>Policy RUS9: Community Facilities</p>	<p><i>Policy RUS9: Community Facilities</i></p> <p><i>The Neighbourhood Plan identifies community facilities in the parish, as shown on the Policies Maps as follows:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>I. Rusper Village Hall</i> <i>II. Village Store and Post Office</i> <i>III. St Mary Magdalene Church</i> <i>IV. The Primary School</i> <i>V. Children’s Playground</i> <i>VI. The Sports Field</i> <i>VII. Ghyll Manor Hotel and Restaurant</i> <i>VIII. The Plough & Attic Rooms</i> <i>IX. The Star Inn</i> <i>X. The Lamb Inn</i> <i>XI. The Frog and Nightgown</i> <p><i>In addition to the provisions of relevant development plan policies, proposals that will result in the loss of a facility and its ancillary land (as shown on the Policy Map) will be resisted unless it can be clearly demonstrated that the existing use is no longer viable, the land is no longer suited to any other D1 community use or that the use can be satisfactorily re-located for the ongoing benefit of the local community.</i></p> <p><i>Proposals to improve the viability of an established community use of the buildings and ancillary land by way of its extension or partial redevelopment will be supported, provided they are consistent with the relevant policies of the development plan.</i></p>	<p>HDC agree with the Examiner’s recommendation.</p>	<p>No further action required. Modification to be taken forward to the final plan.</p>
<p>Policy RUS10: Rusper Primary School</p>	<p><i>Policy RUS10: Rusper Primary School</i></p> <p><i>Proposals for the development of permanent extra classrooms at Rusper Primary School, as shown on the Policies Map, will be supported. Proposals to create additional classrooms, space for play and/or car parking on the site will also be supported,</i></p>	<p>HDC agree with the Examiner’s recommendation and re-wording of this policy.</p>	<p>No further action required. Modification to be taken forward to the final plan.</p>

	<p><i>provided the proposals do not harm the amenity of residents living near the school or create additional <u>significant</u> highway safety concerns.</i></p> <p><i>Any proposals to extend the school should include a plan to promote sustainable travel measures to support an increase in the size of the school population and to minimise the volume of vehicle traffic to and from the school.</i></p> <p><i>Proposals for development on the site, as shown on the Policies Map, will not be supported unless Rusper Primary School and Rusper Village Hall have <u>has</u> ceased to operate on their current sites or have moved to <u>an</u> alternative sites such that the site is no longer deemed to be a viable location for these facilities.</i></p>		
<p>Policy RUS11: Dark Night Skies</p>	<p><i>Policy RUS11: Dark Night Skies</i></p> <p><i>All development proposals should be designed to minimise the occurrence of light pollution. The Parish Council will expect such schemes to employ energy-efficient forms of lighting that also reduce light scatter and comply with current guidelines established for rural areas by the Institute of Lighting Professionals (ILP).</i></p> <p><i>The requirement for any external lighting should be restricted to areas of specific concern and may include:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>I. Road safety in areas where there is a very specific risk to pedestrians and cyclists</i> <i>II. Deterring criminal activity</i> <i>III. Lighting entrances to buildings used after dark</i> <i>IV. Lighting for evening sporting or recreational activities</i> <i>V. Supporting the night-time economy, including lighting for farmers needing to work at night</i> 	<p>No change</p>	<p>No further action required</p>

	<i>Proposals for all development will be expected to demonstrate how it is intended to prevent light pollution. Information on these measures must be submitted with applications, and where a development would potentially impact on light levels in the area, an appropriate lighting scheme will be secured by planning condition.</i>		
Policy RUS12: Promoting Sustainable Development	<p><i>Policy RUS12: Promoting Sustainable Development</i></p> <p><i>All new developments should ensure safe access to existing cycle and pedestrian routes that, in turn, directly serve the Movement Routes, as shown on the Policies Map. Where possible, schemes should take available opportunities to improve and extend the footpath and cycle network in order to provide better connectivity throughout the parish.</i></p> <p><i>Where new developments may severely impact upon Movement Routes appropriate mitigation measures towards the mitigation of traffic volumes and speed through the Parish will be expected, providing they do not introduce urbanising highways infrastructure into the street-scene, and they accord with other policies of the development plan.</i></p>	No change	No further action required
Policy RUS13: Developer Contributions	<p><i>Policy RUS13: Developer Contributions</i></p> <p><i>Where appropriate and directly related to new development, enhancement of identified Movement Routes, as shown on the Policies Maps, will be required, in accordance with Section 6 of this plan, and agreed with the Parish Council. The enhancement of the identified Movement Routes will be required where such work is necessary to make development acceptable, where it is directly related to the development and it is reasonably related in scale to the development. Such enhancements are to be agreed with the Parish Council.</i></p>	HDC agree with the Examiner's recommendation and re-wording of this policy.	No further action required. Modification to be taken forward to the final plan.

	<i>These will be secured by way of planning conditions, Section 106 contributions or Community Infrastructure Levy contributions as appropriate.</i>		
Chapter7. Implementation	<p><i>*To be added under paragraph 7.5 'Other Non-Planning Matters as paragraph 7.6'</i></p> <p><u>Monitoring</u> <u>7.6 Rusper Parish Council will monitor the effectiveness of the policies against planning decisions regularly through its monthly planning meetings and will frequently review the content of the RNP at those meetings. This approach will assist the Parish Council in its formal review of the RNP (working in partnership with Horsham District Council) which is currently programmed to commence in 2021.</u></p>	HDC agree with the Examiner's additional Monitoring section to be added to the plan, in regards to the review of the RNP.	No further action required. Addition to be taken forward to the final plan.