

Upper Beeding Parish Neighbourhood Development Plan

Examiner's Clarification Note

This Note sets out my initial comments on the submitted Plan. It also sets out areas where it would be helpful to have some further clarification. For the avoidance of any doubt matters of clarification are entirely normal at this early stage of the examination process.

Initial Comments

The Plan provides a clear vision for the neighbourhood area. It is thorough and comprehensive.

The presentation of the Plan is good. The difference between the policies and the supporting text is very clear. The maps are very effective. The use of colour is helpful to the layout of the Plan.

Points for Clarification

I have read the submitted documents and the representations made to the Plan. I have also visited the neighbourhood area. I am now in a position to raise issues for clarification with the Parish Council. There are also separate questions for Horsham District Council.

The comments made on the points in this Note will be used to assist in the preparation of my report and in recommending any modifications that may be necessary to the Plan to ensure that it meets the basic conditions. I set out specific policy clarification points below in the order in which they appear in the submitted Plan.

Questions for the Parish Council

Policy 2

I understand the role and purpose of the policy. However, the final paragraph reads more as supporting text rather than policy. I am minded to recommend that it becomes supporting text. Does the Parish Council have any comments on this proposition?

Does the Parish Council have any comments on the representation made by Highways England on the potential impact of the levels of development included in the Plan on the operation of the strategic highway network?

Paragraph 6.6 of the Plan comments about the AECOM study and its assertion that 213 dwellings are required in the Plan period. The schedule of documents on the HDC website includes the AECOM study. Its paragraph 20 comments that the need is for 189 dwellings. Please can the Parish Council advise on this difference?

Policy 3

I have read the various representations. Can the Parish Council advise on the current position with regard to liaison and joint working between the various landowners and potential developers?

Is the site capable of early delivery within the Plan period?

In criterion 7 how would a judgement be made about the need or otherwise for a secondary access? Similarly, how would a judgement be made about the extent to which any secondary access would not prejudice the comprehensive development of the site?

The policy and the text (paragraph 7.24) comment about supporting a comprehensive development of the site. Would it follow that the policy would not support the separate development of the component parts of the site?

Could the component parts of the site be developed separately within the context of an agreed/approved landscape-led masterplan?

Paragraph 7.23 comments about the potential capacities of the three component parts of the proposed site. How has an indicative figure of 70 dwellings been reached as included in the policy itself?

Policy 5

I acknowledge the current occupation of the site.

However, is criterion 3 necessary? Presumably the current owners will take a business judgement about relocation.

Does the policy anticipate the maintenance of the existing open, green street frontage?

Policy 7

Does the policy anticipate that any new development will be served through the existing principal access into the wider nursing home site?

Is criterion 4 necessary? Might some existing car parking spaces need to be lost/redeveloped to incorporate the new development and its own car parking requirements?

Policy 9

The first part of the policy is well-developed

However, should the second part be a community aspiration?

Policy 11

The Local Green Spaces Report is an excellent piece of work.

However, the policy itself goes beyond the matter-of-fact approach in the NPPF. Are the three identified 'very special circumstances' at the end of the policy necessary?

Questions for the District Council

In relation to land to the east of Pound Lane have any planning applications been submitted following the withdrawal of planning applications DC/18/2325 and 2318?

The Plan comments about a housing need of 213 dwellings (paragraph 6.6). Given the Plan's proposed delivery of 109 dwellings in the Plan period is the District Council satisfied that it is in general conformity with Policy 15 of the Local Development Framework?

Representations

Does the Parish Council wish to comment on any of the representations made to the Plan in general?

Does the Parish Council wish to comment on the representations made to the Plan by the National Park Authority, Highways England and the Environment Agency?

Protocol for responses

I would be grateful for responses and the information requested by 3 September 2019. Please let me know if this timetable may be challenging to achieve. It is intended to maintain the momentum of the examination.

In the event that certain responses are available before others I am happy to receive the information on a piecemeal basis. Irrespective of how the information is assembled please could it all come to me directly from the District Council. In addition, please can all responses make direct reference to the policy or the matter concerned.

Andrew Ashcroft

Independent Examiner

Upper Beeding Parish Neighbourhood Development Plan.

12 August 2019