

## **1. Consultation and Engagement**

**I note the details in the Consultation Statement about the way in which the Parish Council engaged with local people, statutory bodies, and landowners as the Plan was being prepared.**

**Several of the representations make comment about the extent of the processes used. It would be helpful if the Parish Council responded to those comments.**

The NP was subject to extensive consultation. The Parish Council understands from its NP Administrator who has undertaken 18 NPs, that the level of consultation was greater than on any of their other Plans. The PC distributed leaflets to every home twice, placed banners and posters all over the Parish, held public meetings, tabled the topic on agendas with public question times, created an online survey, maintained a website which was regularly updated and placed advertisements in local magazines.

The initial Reg14 consultation elicited over 700 responses which were used to strengthen the policies and make the Plan more easily readable.

Full details of the consultation can be found in the Consultation Statement.

## **2. Policy H1**

**This is a good policy which sets a spatial strategy for the parish.**

**The fifth criterion reads out of context to the other four criteria. I am minded to recommend that it is repositioned so that it forms a separate element of the policy. Does the Parish Council have any comments on this proposition?**

The Parish Council agrees with this proposition.

## **3. Policy H2**

**The criteria in the policy are commendable.**

**I am minded to recommend that the opening element is modified so that the policy can be applied in a proportionate way. This will acknowledge that infill development will naturally be of a small scale. Does the Parish Council have any comments on this proposition?**

The Parish Council would prefer that the opening element is not modified as it wishes to see this policy apply to all development of whatever scale and its removal could compromise other policies in the Plan. The Parish Council also wishes to ensure that all housing is built to the highest possible standard.

#### **4. Policy H2a**

**I noted the position of the proposed housing allocation to the overall village during the visit.**

**The criteria in the policy restrict the development of the 4ha site to 15 homes. To what extent has the Parish Council assessed this resulting density against national policy as set out in Section 11 of the NPPF?**

**Is the Parish Council satisfied that access can be secured into the site, and that development can proceed within the Plan period?**

Horsham District Council housing land report for West Chiltington Parish, the SHELAA, dated December 2018 (see Appendix 1) made an assessment of this land, which is referenced SA066, as having the potential for residential development for 15 dwellings, within an estimated period of 6 to 10 years. This information was originally provided by the County Council in the call for development sites. A subsequent update from Horsham District Council in its Regulation 19 Local Plan site assessment report (see Appendices 2a and 2b) confirmed this housing number as deliverable. This density also works with the parish's Design Statement in that it fits with the desired design and character of housing within the village.

The County Council have confirmed that they have full title to all the land that could enable a housing development, also that the land's widest dimension is immediately adjoining the adopted public highway Broadford Bridge Road. We are attaching the WSCC e-mail correspondence on this matter which confirms that access is available (see Appendix 3).

#### **5. Policy H2b**

**I note that planning permission has now been granted for the residential development of the site.**

**In this context I am minded to recommend that the policy is retained in the Plan and that the supporting text is modified to provide a context for any revised planning applications on the site. Does the Parish Council have any comments on this proposition?**

The Parish Council agrees with this proposition.

#### **6. Policy H3**

**This is an excellent policy which is underpinned by the Design Guide. In the round, it is a very good local response to Section 12 of the NPPF.**

Comments noted.

#### **7. Policy H4**

**The overall approach taken in the policy is very robust. Plainly the yield of any site will be determined by its size. However, is there a specific justification for the cap of five homes?**

The cap of five homes is not justified, and the policy wording would be more relevant if changed to read - Proposals for residential development on infill and redevelopment sites

within the BUA .... We will happily make this change.

#### **8. Policy EH1**

**The first part of the policy clearly applies to the development management process. Is the second part of the policy simply a statement or does it require that development proposals within an identified corridor should deliver the measures identified in the six criteria?**

The second part of the policy is also intended to be a requirement within the corridors.

#### **9. Policy EH2**

**Does the policy bring any added value to national and local planning policies?**

It is accepted that it adds little to national policy however it is a topic which is extremely important to local people. The Parish has experienced flooding which has impacted transport and local businesses - for example last winter a main access road to the village was closed due to collapsed culverts for over four months. Parishioners expect this to be addressed through the Neighbourhood Plan so the Parish Council would prefer to retain the policy if possible.

#### **10. Policy EH3**

**I saw the importance of trees and hedges during the visit. The policy is commendably comprehensive.**

**Criterion 5 may not always be appropriate or practicable. I am minded to recommend modifications to address this matter. Does the Parish Council have any comments on this proposition?**

The Parish Council will happily accept modifications.

**Criterion 7 reads as a process/management issue rather than a land use planning matter. As such I am minded to recommend that it is relocated into the supporting text. Does the Parish Council have any comments on this proposition?**

The Parish Council wishes to ensure that maintenance contracts are in place to ensure new planting does not fail. Could the Examiner possibly suggest a way to retain the spirit of that ambition within the policy wording?

#### **11. Policy EH6**

**I am minded to recommend that the order of the first and second parts of the policy are reversed so that it has a positive rather than a negative focus.**

**The third part of the policy is supporting text rather than a land use policy. I am minded to recommend that it is repositioned into the supporting text.**

**Does the Parish Council have any comments on these propositions?**

The Parish Council agrees with this proposition.

### **12. Policy EH7**

**This is an excellent and locally distinctive policy.**

Comments noted

### **13. Policy EH10**

**I looked carefully at the land concerned and saw that the policy has a clear purpose. However, is there any reason why the policy comments about proposals which need planning permission?**

**Is the implication of the policy that uses which would retain the openness of the land concerned (such as sports pitches) would be supported?**

**I am minded to recommend the removal of the proposed housing allocation (Policy H2b) now that planning permission has been granted. Does the Parish Council have any comments on this proposition?**

The Parish Council understands that the wording was recommended by an Examiner of another NP as a neat way to make the distinction that issues which do not require planning consent cannot be controlled by the policy. The Parish Council is more than happy for the wording to be amended.

The intention of the policy is to retain the settlement gap. Its use for sports pitches would destroy the open rural aspect of the land which the Parish Council is seeking to preserve.

The removal of the housing allocation from the separation zone map is agreed and has been done (see Appendix 7).

### **14. Policy EH11**

**This is an excellent and locally-distinctive policy which addresses an important District wide issue insofar as it applies in the parish.**

Comments noted

### **15. Policy GA1**

**The policy has an appropriate focus. However, I am minded to recommend that it is modified so that it can be applied in a proportionate way and where it is practicable to do so. Does the Parish Council have any comments on this proposition?**

The Parish Council feels that in such a rural location with traffic issues and poor transport connections it is important that new developments provide the opportunity to connect to local facilities without the need to drive. Amendments to the wording which reflect this would be welcomed by the Parish Council.

#### **16. Policy GA3**

**Does the policy bring any added value to national and local planning policies?**

It is accepted that it adds little to national policy however it is another topic that is extremely important to local people, and they expect it to be addressed through the Neighbourhood Plan. The Parish Council would prefer to retain the policy if possible.

#### **17. Policy EE2**

**I am minded to recommend that the order of the policy is altered so that the second and third parts appear before the first. Does the Parish Council have any comments on this proposition?**

The Parish Council agrees with this proposition.

#### **18. Policy EE4**

**I am satisfied that the approach taken is entirely appropriate. However, for my clarity does the policy relate to individual signs on business premises (which are land use matters) or highway (brown) directional signs to specific businesses (which are a highways matter)?**

The policy relates to individual signs on or within local business sites. The Parish Council would be happy to add this wording if the Examiner feels it would help to clarify the policy.

#### **19. Policy EE6**

**Given that the Building Regulations now address digital connectivity for new buildings at a national level does the policy have any additional value?**

Agree. The policy may be removed. The lengthy process of making our Plan has been overtaken by national legislation.

#### **20. Policy LC5**

**I looked at the proposed Local Green Spaces during the visit. The policy is impressively underpinned by the details in Appendix 5.**

**It would be helpful if the Parish Council advised about the mapping issue relating to Monkmead.**

**I would also be grateful if the Parish Council commented about the extent to which it assessed the extent to which a local green space designation for Monkmead Wood is necessary given the site's location in the National Park (in accordance with Planning practice guidance - ID: 37-011-20140306).**

**The policy wording goes well beyond the matter-of-fact approach in paragraph 107 of the NPPF. Is there a specific reason why the Parish Council has pursued such an approach?**

Monkmead Wood – the boundary shown in the Plan is incorrect. There is an area of land to the north which should be excluded as it is part of the SSSI at Hurston Warren. The remainder of Monkmead Wood is not in the SSSI. A revised map has been created (see Appendix 4).

The Parish Council recognises the importance of Local Green Spaces to the health and wellbeing of residents. It undertook a significant review to ensure that the evidence base fully supported the proposed allocations. Please see our Local Green Space paper (May 2024) from the Plan's Reg 15 submission.

NB: There is a drafting error at LC5 point 2. The lettering has changed and should read sites a,b,c,d.

### ***Representations***

**Does the Parish Council wish to comment on any of the representations made to the Plan? I would find it helpful if the Parish Council commented on the representations made by:**

- Southern Water (HDC Reference 9);
- South Downs National Park Authority (HDC Reference 10); and
- West Sussex County Council (HDC Reference 13).

**The District Council proposes a series of revisions to certain policies and the supporting text in the Plan. It would be very helpful if the Parish Council commented on the suggested revisions.**

## **21. WSCC HDC Ref 13**

Agree to amendment to Policy H2 to make reference to Policy M9.

H2a criterion 3 – the PC believes that the policy makes it clear all of the requirements must be met but would agree to the addition of ...all of the following requirements...

H2a criterion 3f – the policy already states 'wherever possible' which makes allowance for works required for splays. The PC does not see a need for amendment.

H2b criterion 3 - the PC believes that the policy makes it clear all of the requirements must be met but would agree to the addition of ...all of the following requirements...

H2b criterion 3e – the policy already states 'wherever possible' which makes allowance for works required for splays. The PC does not see a need for amendment.

H3 add H3.5 to read to ensure the standards for storage and collection of waste specified in para 6.8.9 of Manual for Street (2007) are adhered to.

H4 1e – The PC do not agree. See comments above relating to policy H4.

H4 1g The PC do not agree to this amendment. The policy clearly states that it relates only to development with a significant traffic impact.

GA1 See above

GA3 Add “WSCC Guidance on Parking at New Developments (Sept 20)” at the end of GA3.3

Appendix 7 4.2 – The wording is a statement of fact.

## **22. South Downs National Park HDC Ref 10**

The term ‘secondary’ is used to indicate that the primary role in the NP is undertaken by HDC as only a very small section of land is in the SDNP.

Accepted that the BUAB is within the setting of the SDNP however do not feel there is a need to amend the BUAB policy.

The designated Neighbourhood Plan Area includes a small area in the south-west which is located within the SDNP. The designated areas is set by HDC the PC has no power to amend it.

Monkmead Wood – the boundary shown in the Plan is incorrect. It has now been corrected.

The other helpful suggested amendments made by the SDNPA are accepted.

## **23. Southern Water HDC Ref 9**

EH2 and EH2a and EH2b - If the Examiner is minded to retain this policy the PC would be happy for the recommendations made by SW to be included.

Policy LC5 , H2, H3, EH1, EH10, EH2 – the comments are all useful additions to the Plan.

## **24 Horsham DC**

The maps have been enlarged and online interactive versions created.

The comments made largely reflect those made by the Examiner. The PC accepts these amendments.