

Representation Form

Lower Beeding Neighbourhood Plan 2019-2031

The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 (as amended) - Regulation 16

Lower Beeding Neighbourhood Development Plan

Horsham District Council has reviewed its protocols regarding the consultation process for neighbourhood plans. In order to continue to progress neighbourhood plans, we have made a decision to continue with the consultation process with measures we feel are in accordance to the government guidelines.

Lower Beeding Parish Council has prepared a Neighbourhood Development Plan (LBNP). The Plan sets out a vision for the future of the parish and planning policies which will be used to determine planning applications locally. In accordance with Regulation 16 of the Neighbourhood Planning Regulations 2012 (as amended), the LBNP and associated documents will go out to consultation from:

5pm 17 December to midnight 11 February 2021 for 8 weeks inviting representations on the draft submission plan, basic conditions statement, consultation statement, Habitat Regulations Assessment and the full Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA).

Copies of the LBNP Neighbourhood Plan and supporting documents are available to view on the Horsham District Council's website:

https://www.horsham.gov.uk/planningpolicy/planning-policy/currentconsultations

Documents will <u>not</u> be made available in deposit locations due to the current COVID-19 pandemic. If local residents have difficulty in engaging online we have provided a telephone number and email address below. Members of the public are encouraged to leave their details for an officer to contact them back if they need further information.

Email: neighbourhood.planning@horsham.gov.uk - SAS@southdowns.gov.uk

Telephone: 01403 215398

All comments must be received by midnight on 11 February 2021

There are a number of ways to make your comments:

- 1. Please click on the weblink above to view the plan and support documents;
- 2. Complete this form and email it to: neighbourhood.planning@horsham.gov.uk; or
- 3. Print this form and post it to: Neighbourhood Planning Officer, Horsham Council, Parkside, Chart Way, North Street, Horsham, RH12 1RL

All comments will be publicly available, and identifiable by name and (where applicable) organisation. Please note that any other personal information provided will be processed by

Horsham District Council in line the Data Protection Act 1998 and General Data Protection Regulations. Horsham District Council will process your details in relation to this preparation of this document only. For further information please see the Council's privacy policy: https://www.horsham.gov.uk/privacy-policy

How to use this form

Please complete Part A in full, in order for your representation to be taken into account at the Neighbourhood Plan examination.

Please complete Part B overleaf, identifying which paragraph your comment relates to by completing the appropriate box.

PART A	Your Details *
Full Name	
Address	
Postcode	
Telephone	
Email	
Organisation (if applicable)	
Position (if applicable)	
Date	6 th Feb 2021

PART B

To which part in the plan does your representation relate?

Paragraph Number: 1.12/1.13				Policy Reference:	Plan Preparation	Plan Preparation	
Do you su	pport, oppos	se, or wish to commen	t on this p	lan? (Please tick one	answer)		
Support Oppose	Oppose	Support with Have Comments			modifications		
Please giv	ve details of	your reasons for supp	ort/oppos	ition, or make other	comments here:		

This refers to information being available and refers to regular updates and the use of the dedicated Web page. The minutes of any meetings held which were not open to the public were completely lacking in detail and gave no indication of decisions being made. By their nature, minutes are supposed to inform of issues discussed, decisions made and actions resulting from these discussions to a level of detail whereby non attendees can have a full picture of what actually took place at the meeting.

In the Final Consultation Statement 3.6 for the Stakeholder process ... engage in a manner that is extensive, inclusive, fair, transparent and proportionate. The manner by which meetings were reported did not adhere to this.

The response from LBPC is that HDC have requested that all Parish Councils submit to a review however this lack of transparency does not support the development of a Neighbourhood Plan with the support of the Neighbourhood. This however does not rectify that the way in which the sites were selected was neither transparent or open to public review.

What improvements or modifications would you suggest?

If the NP is modified/ re done, care should be taken to ensure that accurate information is made available in a timely manner to keep interested Parties informed of what decisions have been taken and how they have been reached

(Continue on separate sheet if necessary)

Paragraph Number: 5.07 – 5.16	Policy Reference:	Housing
Do you support, oppose, or wish to comme	nt on this plan? (Please tick one a	nswer)
Support Oppose Oppose Support with Have Comments		modifications

Please give details of your reasons for support/opposition, or make other comments here:

The main issue relates to the number of new dwellings being considered for the NP. At the last public exhibition and subsequent public meeting on 28th June 2018, the number of dwellings on which site selection was based was 22-24. I have checked the limited information available in minutes of meetings after this date and no revised dwelling numbers were either mentioned or published.

The Draft NP on which comments are being sought is based on the assumption that 45 new dwellings, excluding windfall development, will be built. The residents of the Parish were asked to choose/ rank their preferable and least preferable development site locations based on the assumption that only 22-24 new dwellings would be built. I fail to see how those choices can now be used to allocate the provision of 45 dwellings. I would therefore suggest that the fundamental decision-making process on site allocation is flawed.

In the Final Consultation Statement 4.49 refers to the fact that prior to the meeting the NPWG identified 4 sites. This was prior to the Public Exhibition.

5.23 that local residents desire for small developments throughout the Parish to retain the rural nature. By taking sites based on a requirement for 22-24 units and scaling three of them up to meet the 45 dwellings will not meet this requirement.

The comment from LBPC increased from 22 to 45.	No changes to NP. N	No mention of when and	how the numbers were	
At the NP meeting 12 th Fel	2019, the following w	as noted:		
LB informed the group that preferential over Field A arwas taken regarding the acapproved.	nd a combination of bo	th. The team agreed witl	n the proposal. A vote	
This request was driven by Exhibitions. Nor is this ref	•			
What improvements or mod	ifications would you sug	ggest?		
The site selection should be i	o addroscod			
The site selection should be i	e-auuresseu.	(Continue on	separate sheet if necessary)	
Paragraph Number:		Policy Reference:	Housing Strategic	
5.1			Objectives	
Do you support, oppose, or w	ish to comment on this		<u></u>	
The state of the s	oport with ve Comments	mo	odifications	
Please give details of your re		osition, or make other com	ments here:	
Ensure housing densities a challenge this statement for Farm).	. 0	•	•	
No comment received from	LBPC			
What improvements or mode Ensure that each site selecte	•	ggest?		

				(0	Continu	e on separate she	et if necessary)
Paragrap Paragrap	h Number: oh 5.20			Policy Refe	rence:	Housing (S	ite Selection)
Do you su	pport, oppose, or	wish to comment o	on this p	lan? (Please t	tick one	e answer)	
Support Oppose	Oppose	Support with Have				modifications Comments	
	ve details of your	reasons for suppor	t/oppos	ition, or mak	e other	comments here:	
(Cedar C were no landown and agai	Cottage) at that si access issues ar er questioned ab in brings into que	ne 2018, it is reco tage was due to a nd legal agreemer out this perceived estion the validity of the defrom LBPC on t	ccess p nts cove I issue. of the de	oroblems. Tl ering access I would sug ecision-maki	his is 1 were a ggest t	00% inaccurate available. At no hat this was unfa	as there time was the
In the su	pporting docume	ent SA_July2020 f	or the fo	ollowing ass	essme	nt criteria,	
-		nhance Rural Cha ance Biodiversity,					
scored a	negative impact	sites, Land North while Cedar Cott ted even with tho	age ide	ntified within	the H	DC Landscape	Capacity
What im	provements or mo	difications would y	you sugg	est?			
<u> </u>		ing accurate inform					
				(0	Continu	e on separate she	et if necessary)
•	•	esentations feel f y labelled/ addres			ional p	ages. Please m	ake sure any
Neighbou		d of the local pla eral) Regulations	_	•		_	
Please tic	k here if you wis	h to be to be notif	ied:	х			