

Southbourne Neighbourhood Plan Regulation 16 Consultation Responses

Summary of representations received by Chichester District Council (CDC) as part of Regulation 16 publication and submitted to the independent examiner pursuant to paragraph 9 of Schedule 4B to the 1990 Act

Parish Name: Southbourne Parish Council

Consultation Date: 4 September to 16 October 2014

Please note: CDC comments are submitted as separate documents (rep reference 004).

All the original representation documents are included, in full, as part of the examination pack. The table below may be a summary of the representations received so may not always be a verbatim report.

Name and Reference	Date received	Method of submission	Summary of representation
Alice Smith (001)	22.9.14	Rep form by email	Support. Plan provides development in areas that have been identified by residents as less problematic than others. Avoids further congestion at train gates; more public opens space. Also for pedestrian crossings over train line. All great things. Green space is scarce in parish. Would like to see developments providing or funding free public open space plus equipment for children, teenagers, older residents.
Brian Donnelly (002)	13.10.14	Rep form	Support paras 3.1 and 3.2 Request notification under Reg 19.
Caroline Salisbury (003)	13.10.14	Rep form	Support
<i>Chichester District Council (see separate document) (004)</i>			

Charles Hayter (005)	9.10.14	Rep form	Support plan. Emphasis should be put on building developments being south of railway as would stop traffic problems getting worse. Developing north of railway would push traffic through narrow country lanes to north.
Christopher Poliszczuk (006)	9.10.14	Rep form	Support. Containing development south of railway plan addresses priority of avoiding traffic congestion in vicinity of railway crossing on Stein Road. Such congestion would raise serious health issues (pollution, from stationary, idling car engines) and safety issues especially in consideration of large number of school children also attend primary and secondary school, and who use station and level crossing.
Clare Cooper (007)	8.10.14	Rep form	Object to all building sites being to south of railway; will not improve traffic problems on A259. Extra residents for leisure centre, Bourne school, Downs Village. Cooks Lane development would enable people to walk to schools, surgery, chemist etc. No parking or road widening proposed. Infant and Junior school traffic is major problem. If school fil was opened at the Lodgebury Close a section of said field could easily be made over to some parking. Also no provision for road widening eg Cooks Lane to safeguard pedestrians eg Mainly school children. mums and toddlers to and from nursery schools in Priors Lease Lane.
David Leal (008)	8.10.14	Rep form	Support. All development must be south of railway to address issues such as traffic congestion,, ecology, sewage/drainage, flood risk, infrastructure, establishing green ring.
Donald Kent (009)	2.10.14	Rep form	Paras 1.37 and 1.38. Strongly agree development in AONB in land south of Kings Court would be disastrous. Pleased plan recognises key issues such as: important strategic gap; serious issue of flooding in this heavily waterlogged area of meadows; inappropriateness of housing when considered alongside issues such as road traffic on to A259; impact on Thorney Road from road safety an parking perspective.
Eileen Leal (010)	8.10.14	Rep form	Support; refer to plan summary.
Elizabeth Bond (011)	15.10.14	Rep form	Support. Building should be south of railway crossing; at a later date a bridge should be constructed to take increased traffic through Alfrey Close. Railway hates cause constant bottleneck with traffic building up as afar as Tesco stores.
Elizabeth Medler (012)	16.9.14	Rep form	Support with modifications. Foreword: I much commend 'Minimise environmental impact'. Also 'sustainable development' important. p.17 (2.28) Environmentally designated areas need to be retained but also enhanced and maintained. p.18 (2.33) Yes wildlife of international importance in the Southern part of the Parish, but <i>please don't forget to the North of the railway line</i> . There is plenty of wildlife there that needs to be

			<p>protected too (make reference to survey of Orchard at end of Breach Avenue).</p> <p>p.19 (2.33) Yes we need better traffic management. A resounding 'no' to superfast broadband. It is quite sufficient and repeatedly digging up streets to lay cables is very disruptive. The roads become an eyesore of patchwork quilted tarmac.</p> <p>p.19 (2.33) Yes we need strong protection from inappropriate development. (eg the houses built a few years back by Southbourne station are ugly with big pointed roofs.)</p> <p>2.37E14 – I commend.</p> <p>2.41 bullet point 3. Highly commend: 'Follow a socially responsible and more environmentally friendly way of life.' And last bullet: 'Feel a sense of community and feel empowered to shape it future.'</p> <p>p.21 – a big 'no' to penultimate paragraph: 'take advantage of new communication and information technologies'. We already have enough!</p> <p>p.23 (2.44) 'The village lacks major employment opportunities.' Southbourne is not a city. It is a 'village' – please leave major employment opportunities to towns like Chichester, Havant, Southampton. I want to retain a village atmosphere. Possibly, it would be nice to have small businesses, like a baker for instance, but not a mall of shops or industrial premises. The industrial estate is quite enough. Also noise periodically emanates from the industrial estate (see your notes on Morgan Furniture) and the prospect of more is not one to relish. Emsworth a good model for a vibrant community with specialist shops.</p> <p>'It will be important to avoid settlement 'coalescence', <i>north</i> of the railway as well as south. Also this is mentioned under p.24 (2.45)</p> <p>Commend 3.1 – highly commend para 2 and last para. 'appropriate infrastructure needs to be in place.'</p> <p>3.2 point 6. Concern about the term 'Affordable homes' – concern about what this means and whether corners will be cut in terms of design and aesthetics. Ugly houses attract ugly conditions.</p> <p>Commend 3.2: 1 but north of railway important too. As to points 2 and 3 – please can we have hidden spaces for wildlife rather than big football pitches. There is already enough space to play football. Pitches attract noise and light pollution. A village atmosphere is not conducive to football pitches.</p> <p>4,5,7,8 – please think carefully about light pollution, also rows of satellite dishes along road look extremely unsightly. Hedgerows /trees – yes please.</p> <p>10 – not too many.</p> <p>11 – employment can be gained in bigger nearby towns or invest in small local cottage industries.</p>
--	--	--	--

		<p>p.28 (4.7) A – yes commend. B –yes. C, commend 4.8 commend; 4.9 agree; 4.10 yes; 4.11 definitely Policy 2 -Also enhance, maintain wildlife. P.30 1 – permission for 157 dwellings has been lodged. Only 150 suggested which is already quite a large number. II: Yes but PROVIDED THAT, III Yes, but PROVIDED THAT, IV yes but PROVIDED THAT. p.31 416 – yes infrastructure and environmental constraints need massively to be taken into account. 4.17 Merit of design important. NB: aesthetics, placing of satellite dishes important. Setting and light pollution concerns. 4.18 – see my comments above about affordable housing 4.19,p.32 Also add, investment in wildlife habitat. This needs to be maintained and enhanced. 4.20 Real concern about the words ‘Long term growth of the village’ It is a village NOT a large conurbation. If you take this away, all its character will be lost. 4.22 p.33 – the Green Ring needs to be big enough with very sheltered spots and long grasses specifically for wildlife. No shelter, no wildlife. 4.27p.35 Screening vital as wildlife needs to be enhanced. 4.30 Yes Green Ring – enhance wildlife habitat. p.37 – policy 3 - Yes Green ring important, but please plenty of hidden areas for wildlife. 4.35 yes enhance biodiversity through quiet, hidden areas. Policy 4 - Housing design – yes to: aesthetics; in keeping; wildlife habitat; light – strict control, low level; satellite dishes – tuck away and make small; recycling rainwater – good 4.44 yes; 4.45 yes Policy 5 - We are a village not a town. Careful control. Possibly small cottage industries. Emsworth good model. 4.47 I too do not agree with a major allocation of employment land. Policy 6 - 4.51 Yes. Policy 7 - 4.55 – 4.57 – Greatly support of outstanding importance. I do not vote for ancillary buildings – this would be building up the area too much. 4.58 – do not agree. Imposes light and noise. 4.59 – do not agree – with the imposition of building, wildlife needs it a lot more. p.47 proposal 1 5.5 yes 5.6 yes 5.8 yes to tree planting and action for wildlife. Also new hedgerows need to be grown. See 2.44 above. Make Southbourne more of a village. Possibly cottage industries like people making bread, soap etc. ‘Small is beautiful’.</p>
--	--	---

			<p>Please retain village atmosphere and build on this. Football pitches are not conducive to village atmosphere. We need to work on making Southbourne more of a village, a community. Emsworth is probably a good model.</p> <p>Do not want to see massive growth of Southbourne. It is large enough already and by making it bigger we are in danger of it ceasing to be a village. A village atmosphere will attract tourists – a faceless conurbation will not.</p> <p>Long grasses and shelter is very important for wildlife. Please think more about generating a rich biodiversity in keeping with the AONB. If you deplete this you not only alienate people, but tourists will not be so eager to visit.</p> <p>More tree planting, hedgerow planting and action for wildlife please</p>
English Heritage (013)	11.10.14	Letter	<p>Welcomes description of historical development of parish in paras 2.4-2.18 and list of designated heritage assets in para 2.29. Wish to see a little more about character of Southbourne and other settlements. List in para 2.29 would benefit from being shown on a map/maps. Also would welcome reference to proposed project to identify non-designated heritage assets.</p> <p>Para 2.30 refers to archaeological records but does not explain what these are or their significance. If there is a character appraisal/management plan for Prinsted CA then this could be mentioned.</p> <p>Welcome 'historic parish settlements and a number of quality historic buildings and Prinsted CA being key strengths of parish.</p> <p>List of saved CDC LP policies should include Policy BE3 (Archaeology); BE4 (Buildings of Historic or Architectural Merit; BE6 (Conservation Areas; BE5 (Alterations to Listed Buildings).</p> <p>Welcomes intention to safeguard distinct identities of villages that make up parish (para 3.1) but disappointed there is no mention of the historic environment. Suggest adding words and historic after 'natural' in final para of Vision, would lead logically to objectives 5 and 8 which are supported.</p> <p>Would welcome policy for conservation and enhancement of historic environment and heritage assets in parish, to provide guidance for assessment of planning applications. This omission fails to reflect key strengths of parish. If there is a Management Plan for the CA then the NP could perhaps include policies and proposals for implementation of recommendations in the management Plan.</p>

			<p>Housing allocations do not contain, nor are within the setting of, any designated heritage assets. Pleased to note that the Historic Environmental record has been consulted for records of non-designated assets, particularly archaeological remains.</p> <p><u>Policy 2:</u> However, in accordance with the findings of the Strategic Environmental Assessment, Policy 2 III and IV should include requirements for a Heritage Statement to be prepared and, where evidence points to potential presence of remains, mitigation (eg investigate trenching, watching brief, recovery and interpretation of remains, with the deposition of any finings in a public archive). Without these requirements consider Policy 2 fails to provide adequate safeguards for the potential archaeological interest of these sites. Therefore object to Policy 2 as drafted and consider plan fails to meet the basic condition of having regard to national polies (paras 128 and 141 of the National Planning Policy Framework.</p> <p>Policy 2 also fails to conform with currently adopted development plan as regards Policy BE3 of the CDC Local Plan 1999.</p> <p>Consider Policy 47 of the Chichester LP Key Policies is a strategic policy and contains insufficient guidance on how Council will assess planning applications that would affect heritage assets such as any archaeological remains that may be present on site. Do not therefore consider that the Key Policies provide adequate safeguards.</p> <p><u>Policy 4:</u> Welcome and support policy for reference to architectural and historic character and scale of surrounding buildings and landscape. Implementation of policy would be easier if there is a good understanding of what that scale and character is.</p> <p><u>Para 5.9</u> – welcome inclusion of ‘identifying non-designated Local Heritage Assets’ as project. Suggest link to EH’s advice on local heritage listing.</p> <p><u>Strategic Environmental Assessment:</u> Suggested specific objective of ‘conserve and enhance historic environment, heritage assets and their settings’. Welcome decision-making criterion 4c; could be broken down eg Would the policy or proposal:</p>
--	--	--	--

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conserve and/or enhance heritage assets and the historic environment? • Improve the quality of the historic environment? • Respect, maintain and strengthen local character and distinctiveness? • Provide for increased access to and enjoyment of the historic environment? • Provide for increased understanding and interpretation of the historic environment? <p>Agree with assessment on historic environment (section 4,4) Welcome indicators of historic environment (Table 5.2)</p>
Environment Agency (014)	9.10.14	Letter	<p><u>Policy 2:</u> Pleased to see that the proposed allocations have been directed to the areas at the lowest probability of flooding and that they are all located within Flood Zone 1. We note that paragraphs 4.33 and 4.45 discuss alternatives to Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS). We would highlight that in accordance with the NPPF priority should be given to the use of SuDS and we would expect these to be incorporated into developments where appropriate. We would query whether the proposals set out in paragraph 4.33 to lay a new drainage pipe would be consistent with this and Policy 42: Flood Risk of the pre-submission Chichester Local Plan. Please note that any proposals to divert flows from the Ham Brook will require Flood Defence Consent from the Environment Agency.</p> <p>Policy7: Support the inclusion of this Policy which requires development proposals to contribute to and enhance the natural environment.</p>
Frances Connell (015)	10.10.14	Rep form	Full support. Sets out well thought out and comprehensive strategy for the future development of Southbourne.
Geoff Talbot (016)	8.10.14	Rep form	<p>Reps made as resident although also volunteer head of Business and Economy Focus Group and member of NP steering group.</p> <p>Support approach adopted by strategy; sets out far sighted approach in the achievement of a framework where future development can take place to benefit community and it now addresses longstanding lack of approach.</p> <p>Strong support for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allocation of sufficient land for 350 dwellings in parish over plan period in line with emerging Chichester LP • Choice of sites in Policy 2 which provide 300 dwellings (Southbourne) plus 50 dwellings (Nutbourne West). This will avoid substantially increasing traffic congestion from rail crossings, highlighted as major issue. • Layout concepts in broad schematic layouts for land at Loveders Mobile Home Park, land north of Alfrey Close, Gosden Green and Nutbourne West (pages 33-34) – it is important

			<p>development is undertaken in accordance with principles of layout to achieve satisfactory access and provide future environment that respects/enhances existing features for benefit of existing and future residents.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concept and means of achieving Green Ring (Policy 3) – will help make good existing substantial shortfall of amenity and recreation space. May take time to achieve but policy provides the means. • Proactive approach to safeguarding future provision of elevated pedestrian and vehicular crossing of rail line (Policy 9) and supporting text. Approach demonstrates forward looking nature of Plan. • Methods and proposals as set out in implementation part of plan (Pages 47-50).
Gillian Gardiner (017)	13.10.14	Rep form	Support document in particular policies relating to site allocations, green ring, environment, community buildings and infrastructure projects.
Homes & Communities Agency (018)	13.10.14	Letter	Support principles contained in neighbourhood plans in relation to creation of successful places by increasing supply of housing and jobs and ensuring that these meet needs of local community and provision of high quality sustainable community.
Ian Salisbury (019)	13.10.14	Rep form	Support document.
Jack Moss (020)	14.10.14	Rep form	Support plan for development south of railway, will not cause additional congestion in Stein Road. Plan makes provision for dealing with future development by making provision for footbridge and possible road bridge. Incorporating green ring will be of benefit to community.
Jacqueline Hayter (021)	9.10.14	Rep form	Support Plan as feel new housing development should be south of railway crossing. Bad enough already and any development to north would cause even more problems with railway crossing and narrow lanes in Westbourne and Woodmancote.
James Hoar (022)	13.10.14	Rep form	<p>Policy 2 – Object.</p> <p>Alfrey Close/Gosden Green development would narrow the gap to the Hermitage from 450 to 270 metres. Will impact on surrounding landscape and coalescence with neighbouring settlements. Footbridge over railway from Loveders unviable as land across railway not included in structure plan owners will oppose. No provision for parking in plan. c</p> <p>Should be more development. Plan is very short term minded. CDC Local Plan Key Policies should increase housing allocation from 300 to 500 at Southbourne as suggested previously. Development of Cooks Lane could provide just over 100 of these; proposals would retain a wide viable gap to the next villages.</p>

Jan Goldson (023)	11.10.14	Rep form	Support paras 3.1 and 3.2 Having attended related meetings and supporting documentation, fully endorse proposals in plan.
Jane Charlton (024)	14.10.14	Rep form	Representations relate to proposed housing development at Loveders Caravan Park (14/02800/OUT) Objections relate to pressure on sewage system, extra cars on roads, pressure on amenities and parking
Jenny Denyer (025)	15.10.14	Rep form	Representations relate to proposed housing development at Loveders Caravan Park (14/02800/OUT) Objections relate to capacity of pump house, sewage system, extra traffic on to A 259, impact on overloaded infrastructure.
John Auric (026)	8.10.14	Rep form	Support Policy 3 My issues raised at pre-submission have been substantially met. Principles of green ring and opportunity it gives to create range of environmental assets will be of great value to present and future generations of local residents and visitors. Support aims and objectives of plan.
Karen & Ellen Morrison (027)	14.10.14	Rep form	Support the idea of the Greenway, concerns regarding its maintenance. Concerns on existing infrastructure such as doctors, dentist and schools. Do not support the proposal Land North of Alfrey Close or the proposal for a road bridge from Gosden Green. Support the proposal for a road bridge at Stein Road.
Chichester Harbour Conservancy (028)	16.10.14	Letter	Overall supportive of the aims and objectives of the Plan and is impressed with the degree of thought and work that has gone into the document. However have serious concerns with some of the proposed housing allocations due to their potentially detrimental impact on Chichester Harbour AONB, as set out below. We also have a number of comments on more minor issues such as the wording of supporting text or policies. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Paragraph 2.28 – we would suggest including the acronym ‘AONB’ in brackets after ‘Chichester Harbour Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty’, for the sake of fullness, as this is often used instead of the full title. • We are pleased to see Chichester Harbour AONB highlighted at paragraph 2.34, and in the section on the relevant Saved Chichester Local Plan Policies; however, Policy 43 (Chichester Harbour Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty) should be listed in the emerging Chichester Local Plan Policies at paragraph 2.43. • We support the objectives stated at paragraph 3.2, particularly 1 and 2 as they relate to protecting the landscape and nature conservation designations of Chichester Harbour;

			<p>however, we would suggest that the wording 'conserve and enhance' rather than 'protect' is used at point 1, to accord with the primary purpose of AONBs and emerging Policy 43 of the Chichester Local Plan.</p> <p>POLICY 1: SPATIAL STRATEGY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• We support the thrust of Policy 1: Spatial Strategy in terms of guiding development to within the revised settlement boundaries. However, we do not entirely support the proposed revised settlement boundaries, for reasons which we will give below under the proposed housing allocations.• We note that at paragraph 4.7 (a) a 'designated 400m buffer zone' from Chichester Harbour SPA is mentioned, and we are not sure where this is derived from? (it is not in either Policy RE7 of the 1999 Local Plan or NPPF paragraph 118 as suggested). Whilst we are supportive of the principle of a 'buffer zone', we are not convinced that one as small as 400m is appropriate, in this regard we would refer to the 'most sensitive 1km zone' which was referred to in the previous version of Chichester District Council's Interim Policy Statement on Development and Disturbance of Birds (this was based on Natural England advice regarding the distance people are generally prepared to walk).• We would question the conclusion that all development should be located south of the railway line in order to minimize traffic congestion. Whilst we can appreciate the arguments made here, we have serious concerns regarding this approach, as it will mean that new development will have a greater impact on Chichester Harbour AONB due to its close proximity. This approach will also mean that development will have a greater impact on Chichester Harbour SPA through increased recreational disturbance, as new residents will have closer and therefore easier access to the Harbour footpaths.• Paragraph 4.12 states that Policy 1 accords with saved Local Plan Policies RE4 and RE6 in respect of Chichester Harbour Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and Strategic Gaps. We would disagree with this statement, as several of the proposed housing allocations are potentially harmful to both the integrity of the Strategic Gap, and the rural setting of the AONB. We explain this in more detail under Policy 2 below.
--	--	--	--

			<p>POLICY 2: HOUSING SITE ALLOCATIONS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Our concern regarding the decision to allocate all housing sites south of the railway line is strengthened by the specific housing allocations proposed:<ul style="list-style-type: none">• <u>Site 2i: 150 dwellings on land at Loveders Mobile Home Park</u> Whilst the majority of this site is set back from the A259, part of the site adjoins the AONB boundary and the proposed settlement boundary extension here appears to incorporate further ribbon development to the east. We are concerned that the result would be significant encroachment into the Strategic Gap, the perceived coalescence of Southbourne with Nutbourne, and harm to the rural setting of the AONB in this location. Furthermore, this scale of development so close to Chichester Harbour SPA is likely to significantly increase recreational disturbance and would therefore require a significant and effective mitigation package including financial contributions towards the Solent-wide strategic mitigation package.• <u>Site 2ii: 125 dwellings on land north of Alfrey Close</u> This site would have less impact on the AONB due to its location set behind existing development as viewed from the AONB and therefore we are supportive in principle; however, again, due to the scale of development proposed and its proximity to Chichester Harbour SPA, a significant and effective mitigation package including financial contributions towards the Solent-wide strategic mitigation package should be required as part of any development. In this respect, I would draw attention to the fact that the approved development on the southern part of this site was permitted on the basis that the housing would include a covenant to prevent dog ownership, in order to minimize increase recreational disturbance resulting from the development.• <u>Site 2iii: 25 dwellings on land at Gosden Green</u> We object outright to the inclusion of this site for housing, as this rural site would clearly present an encroachment into the Strategic Gap between Southbourne and Hermitage, and would be harmful to the rural setting of the AONB. In this respect, our objection to the recent application for housing (reference SB/14/02326/FUL) is relevant. Supporting our concerns with this site is the conclusion of the Chichester District Council's Landscape Capacity Assessment (2009) that character area 79, within which the site falls, has 'low' capacity for development ('development would
--	--	--	--

			<p>have a significant and detrimental effect on the character of the landscape as a whole and, or, on the setting to existing settlement or Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty...'). We therefore disagree with paragraph 4.17 which states that the sites will 'not lead to any major incursions into the Strategic Gap either side of the village....'. We also note the observation made at paragraph 4.66 in relation to the proposed new road and road bridge to the west of Southbourne, that 'the broad location of the safeguarded land shown on the Policies Map indicates the road alignment and elevated crossing adjoining the settlement boundary to minimize their impact on the <i>precious open countryside between Southbourne and Hermitage</i>'. We agree that this countryside is precious, which is why we object to the inclusion of this site for housing development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Site 2iv: 50 dwellings on land at Nutbourne West</u> We have some concerns regarding potential impacts on the rural setting of the AONB from development of this site due to its projection northwards of the existing settlement and potential views from the AONB boundary (A259). It will be very important that the remainder of the site (the proposed landscaping, public open space, children's play area and new allotments) are carefully laid out and designed to ensure there is no detrimental impact on the rural setting of the AONB, which will include careful thought given to the extent of screening of the eastern boundary of the residential element. We note that this site falls within character area 85 of the Council's Landscape Capacity Assessment (2009) which, again, concludes 'low' capacity for development ('development would have a significant and detrimental effect on the character of the landscape as a whole and, or, on the setting to existing settlement or Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty...'). • We are supportive of the aims and objectives of Policy 3 (The Green Ring) as this could provide a valuable resource for local residents and could help to reduce recreational disturbance at Chichester Harbour. • We support the aims of Policy 5 (Employment) in particular the final paragraph which aims to protect existing employment sites. • Policy 6 (Village Centre and Local Shops) would benefit from the addition of 'to non-
--	--	--	---

			<p>commercial use' after the words commercial units in order to clarify the policy meaning. We are supportive of the thrust of this policy.</p> <p>POLICY 7: ENVIRONMENT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rather than seeking to 'avoid having any significant environmental effects', we suggest that the wording should state that development proposals should 'conserve and enhance' designated environmental and landscape assets. This would accord more closely with the wording regarding AONBs used within Section 85 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act (2000), the NPPF (paragraph 115), Saved Local Plan Policy RE4 and emerging Local Plan Policy 43. • We are supportive of Policy 10 (Community Buildings) and the aim of safeguarding and improving community facilities. • We are supportive of the aims of Proposal 1 under 'Implementation' regarding a dedicated cycle route between settlements in the area. • Under Proposal 2 (Infrastructure Projects), the list at paragraph 5.8 should include mitigation for recreational disturbance, (including financial contributions towards the Solent-wide strategic mitigation package). • On page 51 'Policies Maps and Insets', we would question why the South Downs National Park is shown in yellow, but there is no similar demarcation showing Chichester Harbour AONB. We would suggest that this is included. <p>Concerns with the proposed strategy of allocating all housing to the south of the railway line, as this will inevitably have significantly greater impacts on the rural setting of Chichester Harbour AONB, and also from increased recreational disturbance to Chichester Harbour SPA, than if the housing sites were spread more across the village, including some sites to the north of the railway line. We are unconvinced that the argument regarding traffic congestion is sufficient to influence the housing allocations in this way and we note that there are proposals within the plan for additional road and pedestrian crossings which are designed to help alleviate these problems. In particular, we object to the inclusion of site 2iii at Gosden Green and have concerns with some of the other allocated sites for the reasons given.</p>
--	--	--	---

Lloyd Fowler (029)	14.10.14	Rep form	I am in favour of the Parish of Southbourne Neighbourhood Plan and especially support that all housing development be placed south of the railway line at Southbourne.
Lorraine Vogel (030)	14.10.14	Rep form	I support the Southbourne Parish Neighbourhood Plan and agree with the site suitability and likewise the site non suitability declarations as in the plan.
Luken Beck (031)	17.10.14	Letter	<p>Policy 1 - Support the principle of the Settlement Boundaries, but object to the overly restrictive approach taken in the policy wording towards resisting development in the countryside, even where it would be located on a 'suitable'1 site immediately adjacent to the urban edge. There is no provision built into the SPNP to allow for this eventuality which is inconsistent with the presumption in favour of sustainable development set out in Paragraph 14 of the NPPF.</p> <p>Object to the proposed alignment of the boundaries that include the proposed Greenfield housing allocations in the SPNP. Three of the Greenfield housing sites are clearly located within areas of countryside that provide important gap functions and do not currently appear to form part of a settlement. The proposed revisions to the boundaries relating to the allocations are therefore considered to be inconsistent with the aim of the Parish Council to protect the defined settlement gaps in Paragraph 4.5 and 4.8 of the supporting text to Policy 1, which suggests landscape sensitivity has been a consideration in the review of the settlement boundaries.</p> <p><i>Suggested changes - The Neighbourhood Plan will support development proposals located inside the Settlement Boundaries of Southbourne/Prinsted, Nutbourne West and Hermitage/Lumley/Thornham, as shown on the Policies Map, provided they accord with other provisions of the Neighbourhood Plan and development plan. Development proposals outside the Settlement Boundary will only be considered appropriate where it is be required to conform consistent with development plan policy in respect of the control of development in the countryside and conforms to the following;</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>it is of a small scale that is appropriate to the locality;</i> • <i>it is substantially enclosed by existing development;</i> • <i>would not have a significant negative impact on views from the surrounding countryside; and</i> • <i>would not comprise the partial development of a larger contiguous site.'</i> <p>Policy 2 The three site allocations in Policy 2 referred to below are not considered to be consistent with</p>

			<p>the objectives of the NPPF, which is the premise of my objections. I object to the allocation of Land North of Alfrey Close for up to 125 dwellings, primarily due to the significant impact this scale of development would have on the landscape that currently provides an important gap function between Southbourne and Hermitage.</p> <p>I object to the allocation of Land at Gosden Green for up to 25 dwellings due to its location within an area of countryside that forms part of the gap between Southbourne and Hermitage.</p> <p>I object to the allocation of Land at Nutbourne West for up to 50 dwellings due to its potential to increase flood risk and its location within an area of countryside that forms part of a gap between the isolated clusters of development within Nutbourne.</p> <p>Suggested change - It is considered the Land South of Kings Court provides a more sustainable and deliverable site for housing development.</p>
WSCC (032)	16.10.14	Email	<p>Minerals Safeguarding</p> <p>The adopted Mineral Local Plan includes a number of site allocations, however none of these allocations are within Southbourne, but two lie just to the north of the Parish, in Westbourne (Woodmancote) and in Funtington (Slades Field).</p> <p>Policy 2: Housing Site Allocations</p> <p>In respect of the Southbourne Neighbourhood Plan, in common with other areas of the district underlain by such mineral resources, the County Council must be satisfied that the proposed development will not unnecessarily sterilise mineral resources. For the purposes of the Neighbourhood Plan, it is recommended that the policies or supporting text should make reference to the presence of such resources to ensure effective consultation with WSCC is undertaken prior to development as follows:</p> <p>Each of the development principles for the four new housing sites set out through Policy 2 'Housing Site Allocations' could be supplemented by the inclusion of the following text:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><i>development phasing and layout has regard to the need to safeguard minerals deposits within and adjoining the site, as shown on the Policies Map</i>'.</p> <p>If the amendment to Policy 2 cannot be achieved, instead the supporting text should be supplemented with the following:</p>

			<p><i>The Chichester Local Plan requires that all development within a West Sussex Minerals Consultation Area must be considered against the latest Minerals Consultation Area guidance and policy produced by West Sussex County Council. Preparation of site plans for development proposed through the Southbourne Neighbourhood Plan will require liaison with West Sussex County Council at an early stage to ensure that potential mineral interests are fully considered in planning development.</i></p> <p>The amendments confirm the requirement for effective consultation between developers and West Sussex County Council in respect of potential mineral resource sterilisation, in line with the requirements of national policy.</p> <p>Policy 8: Education It should be noted that there are no current plans to extend facilities at the Bourne Community College. This area is in the land ownership of the County Council, and for proposals to take place the land owner would need to be in agreement. However, the County Council will continue to monitor the effects of planned housing development and will seek developer contributions towards expansion of education infrastructure where required. Developer contributions will be required towards the expansion of existing educational provision (Early Years, Primary, Secondary and Youth Services) across the locality.</p> <p>Policy 9: Transport This policy identifies a broad location for the long term provision of a new road and an elevated vehicle crossing of the railway line to the west of Southbourne. In the County Council's response to the Pre-Submission Southbourne Neighbourhood Plan consultation, it was suggested that in the absence of feasibility work to support this proposal, this aspiration should be included in the 'Proposals' section of the Plan. This proposal is not required to deliver development identified within the Plan and the supporting text acknowledges that implementation would be beyond the Plan period. It is currently unclear from the Policies Map where the proposed new road would link to the existing local road network to the north. If the new road and vehicle crossing is to remain in the policy, an indicative route should be included in the Policies Map. This would need to be supported by evidence and a clear explanation of the aims of the proposal.</p>
Margaret Clegg (033)	14.10.14	Rep form	Support for the whole document.
Margaret Harriss (034)	12.10.14	Rep form	Fully endorse the neighbourhood plan. Well thought out with extensive consultation with local residents. Any development north of the railway crossing would not be desirable and would

			cause considerable congestion in Stein Road.
Martin Cooper (035)	12.10.14	Rep form	Oppose the neighbourhood plan. Disagree with infrastructure being south of the railway line. Development North of Alfrey Close will lead to more traffic from parents dropping their children at school. Development at Cooks Lane could encourage children to walk/cycle to school. Need to include land at Cooks Lane to ensure delivery of the footpath over the railway line. Land south of Cooks Lane is preferable to land at Alfrey Close and Gosden Green.
Maureen Grunnitt (036)	17.10.14	Rep form	Support for the whole document.
Micheal Barker (037)	11.10.14	Email	I own the land that Southbourne Village Council proposed to put a foot path through my land, and I oppose this as I keep live stock on this land and it will then be open to young people who cannot be seen as it will be away from the public eyes they will be able to damage and worry my live stock and cause them harm. Please do not let this plan go any further and do not let them put a foot path over my land causing me and my livestock harm and distress.
Marine Management Organisation (038)	16.10.14	Email	We would suggest that reference to the MMO's role in consenting projects be made within planning documents to ensure that necessary regulatory requirements are covered.
Monica Auric (039)	08.10.14	Rep form	Support for the whole document.
Jim and Irene Jennings (040)	16.10.14	Rep form	Support except Policy 9 paragraph 4.65 where we object to the future road bridge during the Plan period. Support the Green Ring and would like to see infrastructure provided ahead of or instead of housing. Development opportunities should be strictly controlled to avoid harm to SDNP and Chichester Harbour AONB.
Charles Warwick Foster English (041)	15.10.14	Rep form	Include the SHLAA site east of South Lane (SB08339).
David Neame (042)	16.10.14	Rep form	Para 2.39 - oppose and suggest revising to take account of Saved Local Plan polices being out of date. Greater weight should be attached to the NPPF and emerging Local Plan policies. Para 2.40 – support, as identifies saved polices on housing are out of date. Para 3.2 – amend objective 6 “to provide open market and affordable homes to meet the requirements of the emerging Chichester Local Plan but ensure the local utilities infrastructure can accommodate new development”. Para 4.12 – oppose, amend Policy not to refer to saved Local Plan policy. Para 4.13 – Amalgamate with para 4.12 and remove reference to saved Local Plan policy.

			<p>Para 4.29 – amend the paragraph to refer to an allowance for an access corridor only rather than specific access proposals in the context of Policy 9.</p> <p>Policy 1 – amend the wording to include in the first sentence “The Neighbourhood Plan will support development proposals located inside the settlement boundaries as amended by Policy 2 ...”</p> <p>Policy 2 – the policy should be amended to remove the specific references to 1, 2, 3, and 4 bedroom homes and replace with “a mix of homes”.</p> <p>Policy 2 - the wording for Site III should be amended as follows “ is accessed from the A259 Main Road by way of a new road along the eastern boundary of the site together with an access corridor which takes in to account the provisions of Policy 9 of the SPNP”.</p> <p>Policy 3 – supports the approach for a Green Ring and is content to make provision within its land interest at Gosden Green.</p> <p>Policy 4 – unclear why the policy refers to flood risk, this should be put in a separate policy if needed. Remove reference to ecology as this is referenced in Policy 7.</p> <p>Policy 9 and para 4.67 – wording should be amended to reflect Gosden Green site can only make provision for an access corridor to help meet the future objective to provide a link road.</p>
John Pike (043)	07.10.14	Letter	Amend the Settlement Boundary at Nutbourne to include land Nutbourne Business Centre.
Hunter Page Planning on behalf of Beechcroft Land Ltd (044)	16.10.14	Rep form	<p>Oppose Policy 2</p> <p>Development at Breach Avenue, is in a sustainable location. Can be adequately accommodated by existing infrastructure and would not cause any major incursion to the Strategic Gap to the east of the village.</p> <p>The appeal decision (Ref: APP/L3815/A/13/220528) should be taken into account as a reason for the inclusion of the site (Breach Avenue).</p> <p>A greater coalescence argument exists in relation to the allocated sites within the NP (Land north of Alfrey Close and Land at Gosden Green) which is relevant to the coalescence between Southbourne and Hermitage.</p> <p>Recent completed survey data supports development to the north of the level crossing.</p> <p>A number of key facilities are located to the north of the level crossing. No evidence has been submitted by the parish Council as to what impact there would be on the usage of the level crossing on Stein Road if all 350 houses were to be built to the south of the railway. A more sensible and rational development strategy would see new development located to both sides of the railway.</p> <p>Reference made to surveys conducted by the developer in June 2014. Breach Avenue will have</p>

			<p>a minimal impact on the level crossing and would provide a direct access for students without the need to use the crossing. Would not be of detriment to highway safety. View supported I appeal decision (Ref: APP/L3815/A/13/220528).</p> <p>Dwellings to the south of the level crossing would lead to significant increase in movements. Development to the north will provide a better balance to development within the village. Reference made to evidence base and the assessment of land at Breach Avenue. Concluded that the evidence base is flawed as it has not relied on factual information.</p> <p>Reference to the status of the emerging Local plan. Neighbourhood Plan should not progress to examination and referendum due to its restrained approach to growth and its correlation with the emerging Local Plan.</p>
Mrs J Hoar (045)	13.10.14	Rep form	<p>I don't agree with all of the development sites being south of the railway. There should be at least one north of the railway where there are shops, schools, etc.</p> <p>No provision for parking for school and station.</p> <p>Cooks Lane should be widened or pavement put in to make safer for pedestrians.</p> <p>Footbridge goes onto private land in Cooks Lane with no approval from owner.</p> <p>Look at an alternative site north of the railway, i.e Seawards, Cooks Lane. Include parking and footpath.</p>
Natural England (046)	16.10.14	Email	<p>Development set out within Policy 2 falls within the zone in which the "Interim Policy Statement on Development and Disturbance of Birds in Special protection Areas and Identified Compensatory Habitats" applies. Reference to this would provide some guidance on how development proposals will be considered in the period up to the adoption of the new Local Plan. This is particularly important because of the financial implications for development, and for the funds remaining to deliver the Neighbourhood Plans other aspirations. The link could be made through Policy 7.</p>
Network Rail	16.10.14	Letter	<p>Policy 2</p> <p>Policy 2 (I.C) – Any potential footbridge over the railway line would require Network Rails agreement and approval. Network Rail will need to be contacted and consulted at an early stage.</p> <p>(d) Would welcome further discussion on the proposed new footpath to Southbourne railway station.</p> <p>Policy 9</p> <p>Reference to Plans long term vision. Acknowledges this vision as it would increase railway safety and could lead to the closure of level crossings. Would welcome further discussion. Raise concerns regarding the narrow nature of Inlands Road.</p>

Oona Hickson (048)	16.10.14	Rep form	Support
Paul Dewey (049)	16.10.14	Rep form	Support
Pegasus Planning Group on behalf of Lightwood Strategic (050)	06.10.14	Rep form	<p>Oppose Policy 2 Land north of Cooks Lane should be included in the Neighbourhood Plan as a housing allocation in addition to, or instead of, existing proposals and the overall housing allocation for Southbourne should be increased to 600 dwellings. Such a change offers the best prospect of the Neighbourhood Plan remaining in force when the Chichester Local Plan is ultimately adopted with higher housing targets and would help to ensure its continuing relevance. If no changes are made, there is a strong possibility that the Neighbourhood Plan will become rapidly out of date when the Chichester Local Plan is modified prior to its adoption and that the Neighbourhood Plan will, in the interim, offer a misleading prospectus to local residents.</p> <p>Suggested amendment An increase in the housing target for Southbourne to 600 dwellings and the allocation of land north of Cooks Lane and east of Kelsey Avenue, or, alternatively, a small village housing site on a site of 1.37ha north of Cooks Lane.</p>
Peter Harriss (051)	30.09.14	Rep form	<p>Support Policy 2 Further development must be made south of the railway crossing to avoid further disruption to traffic using Stein Road. There is no requirement to have any major/minor development north of the railway crossing.</p>
Havant Borough Council (052)	01.10.14	Email	<p>I would refer you to the Council's comments on the Pre-Submission version of the Neighbourhood Plan, dated 5 June 2014. It appears that the suggestion of a minimum width of 'Green Ring' (Policy 3) has not been taken up. It is understood that by necessity the width would be likely to vary around the ring and I note that a broad location is indicated on inset map A. I assume you are satisfied that this is sufficiently precise to allow effective operation of the policy.</p> <p>I note the supporting text to Policy 5 and the Basic Conditions Statement explain the absence of any specific employment allocations. I assume you are satisfied that this is consistent with the emerging Chichester Local Plan.</p> <p>I would suggest that Policies 5 and 6 (or their supporting text) should include criteria for the</p>

			<p>evidence that would be required to demonstrate whether an existing use was 'no longer viable'.</p> <p>The supporting text to Policy 9 is helpful and in my view addresses the question of why the full extent of the road over the railway cannot be determined at this time.</p>
Hallam Land Management (053)	16.10.14	Letter	<p>Generally supportive.</p> <p>Amend Land North of Alfrey Close to reflect the site has capacity for 130 dwellings.</p> <p>Policy 2 criterion IIa – amend to recognise that the access solution could be one of two options and to concur with the corresponding text at para 4.26.</p>
SGN (054)	16.10.14	email	<p>SGN have assessed the impact of the neighbourhood plan and can conclude that on the whole, the gas infrastructure should not be significantly affected by the levels of growth proposed / projected.</p>
Sigma Planning Services (055)	15.10.14	Email	<p>The SPNP comes as a surprise and a fait accompli without prior consultation with the wider community or any evaluation and comparison of other strategy options.</p> <p>Lack of evidence in support of the plan strategy or proposed allocations.</p> <p>The SPNP is not in conformity/compliance with the NPPF or the emerging Chichester Local Plan, specifically Policy 20.</p> <p>The SPNP does not contribute to achieving the three elements of sustainable development (social/economic/environmental).</p> <p>Alternative sites have not been considered. The SEA only considered the larger SHLAA site SB08328 Land East of Kelsey Avenue.</p> <p>The SPNP has not undertaken a Sustainability Appraisal it should have been subject to a Habitats Regulations Assessment.</p> <p>Needs to be a re-assessment of the policies and their current lack of ability to deliver the key objectives of the neighbourhood plan.</p> <p>Introduction of reserve sites to accommodate up to 560 dwellings or defer the progress of the neighbourhood plan to await the outcome of the Chichester Local Plan.</p> <p>Identify housing sites and employment sites north of the railway line that can deliver the Green Ring more effectively.</p> <p>Remove the first paragraph of Policy 9 and re-assess the underlying concepts of the neighbourhood plan on the basis of there being no certainty of delivery of grade vehicular or pedestrian crossing of the railway during the plan period of the longer term.</p>

South East Water (056)	04.09.14	Email	No comment on the SPNP as not infrastructure provider for the area.
Clare Gibbons (057)	14.10.14	Rep form	<p>Policy 2 - The 'Basic Conditions Statement' submitted in support of the Southbourne Neighbourhood Plan does not identify paragraphs 17, 109 or 162 of the NPPF or have full regard to policy 20 of the Local Plan: Key Policies 2014-2019. Our suggested amendment would rectify these omissions and ensure three of the basic conditions necessary for a Neighbourhood Plan to be met, namely: to have regard to national policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State, be in general conformity with the strategic policies in the development plan and contribute to the achievement of sustainable development.</p> <p>Suggested amendments – To ensure consistency with the NPPF, the National Planning Practice Guidance and strategic policies of the Local Plan 1999 and Local Plan: Key Policies 2014-2019, we reiterate that the following criteria should be included in policy 2 of the Southbourne Neighbourhood Plan:</p> <p><i>I. up to 150 dwellings on land at Loveders Mobile Home Park, Main Road, provided the scheme: e. <u>provides a connection to the nearest point of adequate capacity in the sewerage network, in collaboration with the service provider.</u></i></p> <p><i>II. 125 dwellings on Land North of Alfrey Close, provided the scheme: c. <u>provides a connection to the nearest point of adequate capacity in the sewerage network, in collaboration with the service provider.</u></i></p> <p><i>III. 25 dwellings on Land at Gosden Green, provided the scheme: c. <u>provides a connection to the nearest point of adequate capacity in the sewerage network, in collaboration with the service provider.</u></i></p> <p><i>IV 50 dwellings on Land at Nutbourne West, provided the scheme: e. <u>provides a connection to the nearest point of adequate capacity in the sewerage network, in collaboration with the service provider.</u></i></p> <p>There is no policy to support the delivery of new or improved infrastructure, which is required to serve new development identified in the Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP). Suggest additional policy as follows "<u>New and improved utility infrastructure will be encouraged and supported in order to meet the identified needs of the community, subject to other policies in the</u></p>

			<u>development plan.”</u>
Stephen Jupp (058)	15.10.14	Rep form	<p>Policy 2 – The mix of dwellings should allow for the possibility of 5 bed houses, subject to an appropriate mix.</p> <p>2iv a – access [pedestrian] will be provided via the footpath.</p> <p>2iv c – What is ‘reasonable’? If the site development proposals demonstrate that the run-off will be no greater than its current green field run-off then there is no justification for off-site contributions as they would not satisfy the tests for financial contributions.</p> <p>2iv d – the wording is too vague – what dwellings adjoin the site. I thought that it was only going to be the terrace of 4 properties known as Midway Cottages.</p> <p>The new SPA boundary line as shown on Inset B: Nutbourne West is drawn too tightly and will give rise to a density of development not in keeping with the locality. The line also appears to exclude Nutbourne PO and the terraced houses behind.</p> <p>Suggested amendments -</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) include 5 bed houses in the mix allowed. (2) Delete ‘is accessed’ from 2iv a and insert ‘Vehicle access is’ (3) Delete requirement 2iv c OR amend so financial contribution is only required where there will be an increase in run-off from the site (4) Change 2iv d and 4.32 so it is specific to certain neighbouring dwellings (5) Insert ‘vehicular’ between ‘with’ and ‘access’ in line 2 of 4.32 (6) Delete or amend wording of para 4.33 (7) Amend the proposed SPA boundary as shown on Inset B in order that it corresponds with the developable area shown on the attached indicative site layout for the site which is illustrated on the attached plan. (8) Amended SPA boundary so that it includes all of Nutbourne PO site and houses and gardens of terraced houses to north of former PO.
Sue Talbot (059)	08.10.14	Rep form	<p>Reps made as a resident although also volunteer and member of NP steering group.</p> <p>Support policies, proposals and projects and overall strategy which provides a practical and</p>

			<p>farsighted framework for the future of the parish.</p> <p>The proposed allocations are neighbourly, well located to services and facilities with good access to the A259 and public transport, without having a detrimental impact on the landscape, ecology or heritage interest. They also avoid increasing congestion at the Southbourne level crossing which is a major local issue.</p> <p>Support the provision and safeguarding of land for a new road bridge and the closure of the uncontrolled at-level pedestrian rail crossing that this strategy should facilitate.</p> <p>Support the provision of the Green Ring.</p> <p>Satisfied that the mechanism provided by CIL and Section 1`06 Agreements is capable of providing the infrastructure required to support new development locally.</p> <p>Support the projects which will give local residents practical opportunities to become more involved in shaping their local environment.</p>
Susanne Poliszczuk (060)	09.10.14	Rep from	Support the plan in principle as it fulfils Southbourne's agreed contribution to the future housing needs. It minimises the impact of new development on the ecology by providing a Green Ring and by containing new development south of the railway it minimises the impact of increased traffic at Stein Road.
Terry Connell (061)	10.10.14	Rep from	Support the neighbourhood plan and the great effort taken to look at the needs of the community. It offers a considered, practical and viable plan for the future.