

Loxwood Neighbourhood Plan 2013 to 2029

Report by Independent Examiner

Janet L Cheesley BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

CHEC Planning Ltd

February 2015

| Contents | Page |
|--|-------------|
| Summary and Conclusion | 3 |
| Introduction | 3 |
| Legislative Background | 4 |
| Policy Background | 5 |
| The Neighbourhood Plan Preparation | 6 |
| The Loxwood Neighbourhood Plan 2013-2029 | 7 |
| Referendum & the Loxwood Neighbourhood Plan Area | 14 |
| Appendix 1 Background Documents | 15 |

Summary and Conclusion

1. This is my second examination of the Loxwood Neighbourhood Plan following a legal challenge from Crownhall Estates concerning the decision to proceed to referendum with the Loxwood Neighbourhood Plan.
2. I have given careful consideration to representations requesting additional housing and criticism of the site selection process. I have found that the housing allocations will contribute towards the achievement of sustainable development and that there are no adopted strategic policies to justify a more significant growth strategy.
3. I have recommended modification to some of the policies in the Plan. In particular, I have recommended modification to Policies 16 and 17.
4. Since my previous examination, Planning Policy Guidance has been revised with regard to infrastructure contributions through planning obligations. Therefore, it has been necessary to recommend modification to Policy 16 in this respect.
5. Since my previous examination, a Ministerial Statement on Building Regulations indicates that it is unlikely for it to be appropriate to refer to the Code for Sustainable Homes in Neighbourhood Plans once a statement of policy has been produced in early 2015. Therefore, it has been necessary to recommend modification to Policy 17 in this respect.
6. My recommendations ensure that the Plan meets the Basic Conditions. Subject to my recommendations being accepted, I consider that the Loxwood Neighbourhood Plan will provide a strong practical framework against which decisions on development can be made.

Introduction

7. I was appointed as an independent Examiner for the Loxwood Neighbourhood Plan 2013 to 2029 in March 2014. Chichester District Council (CDC) received a legal challenge from Crownhall Estates concerning the decision to proceed to referendum with the Loxwood Neighbourhood Plan.
8. A Local Authority is not subject to the duty to make a neighbourhood plan following a supportive referendum if it considers that the making of the plan would breach, or would otherwise be incompatible with, any EU obligation.
9. The judicial review proceedings raised seven grounds. In summary the basis of the judicial review by Crownhall Estates, was primarily that CDC's decision that a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) was not required and was not adequately reasoned. It was also proposed that the officer who made that decision did not have delegated authority. The decision to hold the referendum should therefore be quashed and the referendum therefore had no legal effect.

10. It was also suggested that if the draft Loxwood Neighbourhood Plan were to be progressed further then a SEA should take place or that a decision is made that a SEA is not required. In order to remedy the matters raised in the judicial review a consent order was agreed by both parties.
11. It was agreed with the claimant that in order to overcome the procedural error it was only considered necessary to go back as far as the 'Regulation 16' stage where the Basic Conditions Statement, in confirming that all EU obligations had been met, could refer to a fit for purpose SEA or fit for purpose screening opinion to confirm that SEA was not required. I will refer to the new SEA screening later in my report.
12. I was re-appointed to undertake this second examination in December 2014. The Plan for examination has been modified following my previous recommendations. Most of my recommendations have been incorporated into this Plan. Exceptions are a further modification to Policy 1 and amendments to Policies 2, 8 and 12, which I will refer to in more detail later.
13. I do not consider it necessary to 'reinvent the wheel'. Therefore, where appropriate I have included relevant explanatory sections from my previous examination.
14. On 8 March 2013, CDC approved that the Loxwood Neighbourhood Area be designated in accordance with the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012. The Area covers the whole of the parish of Loxwood.
15. The qualifying body is Loxwood Parish Council. The plan has been prepared by a Steering Group of parish councillors and local residents on behalf of Loxwood Parish Council. The plan covers the period to 2029.

Legislative Background

16. As an independent Examiner, I am required to determine, under Paragraph 8(1) of Schedule 4B to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, whether:
 - the policies in the Plan relate to the development and use of land for a designated Neighbourhood Area in line with the requirements of Section 38A of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act (PCPA) 2004;
 - the Plan meets the requirements of Section 38B of the 2004 PCPA where the plan must specify the period to which it has effect, must not include provision about development that is excluded development, and must not relate to more than one Neighbourhood Area; and
 - that the Plan has been prepared for an area that has been designated under the Localism Act 2011 and has been developed and submitted for examination by a qualifying body.
17. Subject to the modifications I have recommended in this report, I am content that these requirements have been satisfied.

18. I am obliged to determine whether the plan complies with the Basic Conditions. These are that the Plan is required to:
- have regard to national policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State;
 - contribute to the achievement of sustainable development;
 - be in general conformity with the strategic policies contained in the Development Plan for the area; and
 - not breach, and is otherwise compatible with, EU obligations and human rights requirements.
19. Lepus Consulting has prepared advice on the need for a Strategic Environmental Assessment of the Plan for CDC to consider. It concludes that no significant environmental impacts are likely to occur. CDC has prepared a Strategic Environmental Assessment Screening Opinion, within which it has stated that an environmental assessment of the Plan is not required. There were no adverse comments from Statutory Consultees. Based on this screening opinion and accompanying report, I consider that the Plan does not require a full Strategic Environmental Assessment and is in accordance with the provisions of the European Directive 2001/42/EC.
20. Natural England has stated that the Plan is unlikely to result in significant effect on designated habitats. Therefore, I consider that the Plan does not require an assessment under Article 6 or 7 of the Habitats Directive.
21. I am satisfied that the Plan is compatible with EU obligations and does not breach the European Convention on Human Rights obligations.

Policy Background

22. *The National Planning Policy Framework 2012* (NPPF) sets out the Government's planning policies for England and how these are expected to be applied. The *Planning Practice Guidance* provides Government guidance on planning policy.
23. Loxwood Parish is within the local authority area of Chichester District Council (CDC). The development plan for the Loxwood Neighbourhood Plan Area comprises saved policies from the *Chichester District Local Plan First Review* (adopted in April 1999). This Local Plan includes saved strategic policies regarding the natural environment.
24. I have been referred to CDC's Interim Policy Statements on *Planning for Affordable Housing* (2007) and on *Planning and Climate Change* (2012).
25. CDC published the *Chichester Local Plan: Key Policies Pre-submission 2014-2029* in November 2013. This Local Plan and the Loxwood Neighbourhood Plan have been advancing in parallel.

The Neighbourhood Plan Preparation

26. I am required under The Localism Act 2011 to check the consultation process that has led to the production of the plan. The requirements are set out in Regulation 14 in The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012.
27. The consultation process started with regard to the production of a Community Led Plan. Much of the data collected was used to form the evidence base when this process was switched to a Neighbourhood Plan.
28. The views of local residents were initially sought via a variety of exercises including three workshops run with the help of The Glass House, open days, and a survey questionnaire. Additional support was received from Action in Rural Sussex, Locality and URS.
29. The Consultation period on the pre-submission draft Neighbourhood Plan ran from 4 November 2013 until 15 December 2013. The document was made available on the village web site and 200 hard copies were produced. These were made available at the village post office, butchers and the two pubs in the parish. Copies were also emailed to the statutory stakeholders. A flyer was sent to all households in the parish advertising the consultation. The consultation was advertised in the local village and community publications as well as local news media. Responses could be sent in by email or letter. Two consultation open days were held. 17 display boards were erected around the parish advertising the open days. At these events, residents were encouraged to provide comments on a pre-printed form. A summary of all comments was prepared together with an analysis of comments and proposed changes to the plan arising from these comments.
30. I am satisfied that the pre-submission consultation and publicity has met the requirements of Regulation 14 in The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012. It went well beyond the requirements and it is clear that the Steering Group went to considerable lengths to ensure that local residents were able to engage in the production of the Neighbourhood Plan. I congratulate them on their efforts.
31. CDC publicised a submission Plan for comment during the publicity period between 17 January 2014 and 28 February 2014 in line with Regulation 16 in The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012. My original examination was with regard to that submission Plan.
32. Due to the reasons outlined above with regard to the judicial review, CDC published a further submission Plan for comment during the publicity period between 23 October 2014 and 4 December 2014 in line with Regulation 16 in The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012.
33. A total of 20 responses were received, of which a number of local residents supported the plan in its entirety. I am satisfied that all these responses can be assessed without the need for a public hearing.

34. Some responses suggested additions and amendments to policies. My remit is to determine whether the Plan meets the Basic Conditions. Where I find that policies do meet the Basic Conditions, it is not necessary for me to consider if further suggested additions or amendments are required. Whilst I have not made reference to all the responses in my report, I have taken them into consideration.
35. In an email dated 22 December 2014, CDC stated that *'In relation to the representations submitted by Planit Consulting on behalf of Crownhall Estates, the Council has noted that these are quite extensive and include a legal opinion. In this respect the Council is requesting the opportunity to reply to you in more detail in relation to these submissions.'* By return email dated 22 December 2014 I confirmed that I wished to seek clarification on this matter, to assist my examination. Once I received the clarification, in the interest of fairness and openness, I gave Crownhall Estates the opportunity for final comments.

The Loxwood Neighbourhood Plan 2013 to 2029

36. Loxwood Parish is made up of the village of Loxwood together with the hamlets of Alfold Bars to the North and Roundstreet Common to the South.
37. The Plan defines a clear vision statement for the parish as follows: *To maintain Loxwood as a semi-rural parish, yet one which welcomes incremental change that will sustain and enhance its facilities and character and contribute to a greater sense of community and neighbourliness.*
38. It is clearly stated that the objectives identified for the plan period will be used to define the Plan policies.

POLICY 1

39. CDC has recognised that it has a five-year housing land supply shortfall. There is not an up-to-date strategic policy against which to assess the overall housing figures. Draft Policy 5 in the emerging Local Plan states an indicative figure of 60 dwellings for Loxwood Parish during the period 2012-2029. I realise that this figure may be subject to alteration through the Local Plan examination. It is not for me to pre-judge the outcome of that examination. I understand that the indicative figure of 60 dwellings has been derived reflecting the settlement hierarchy and following assessment of the housing potential and capacity of each Parish.
40. Following my previous examination, CDC and the Parish Council sought further alteration to Policy 1. One of these amendments was to refer to 'provide' rather than 'allocate' a minimum of 60 dwellings. In the editing, it appears that this was not altered. Having pointed this out to CDC, it was confirmed by CDC and the Parish that they wished to see this amendment to provide clarity to the policy. Although this could have been considered as an editorial matter, in the interest of fairness and openness, I considered it appropriate to seek the views of interested parties. I sought these views

between 22 January and 7 February 2015. The views received have not altered my opinion that this amendment does not significantly alter the objective of this policy with regard to housing provision.

41. Since my previous examination, The Local Plan Key Policies Pre-Submission document which was submitted for examination in May 2014 provided for 6,973 homes (410 homes per year) in the District as a whole. Following the Inspector's comments at the Local Plan examination, CDC undertook a re-assessment of the evidence supporting the Local Plan. Based on this, CDC is now proposing modifications to the Local Plan which would increase the housing provision to 7,388 homes (435 homes per year) in the District as a whole. This is less than the objectively assessed housing needs (OAN) of 560-575 homes per year for the District. CDC has stated that the OAN figures cannot be readily disaggregated to the level of individual parishes or settlements, or to sub-areas of the District such as the North of the Plan area. CDC anticipates that there will be a small shortfall in projected housing supply in the north of the Local Plan area.
42. The district-wide housing provision is currently being considered as part of the examination of the Local Plan. The Neighbourhood Plan Examination process does not require a rigorous examination of district wide housing land requirements. This is the role of the examination of the emerging Local Plan.
43. The housing allocations in the Neighbourhood Plan meet the requirements for Loxwood Parish in Draft Policy 5 in the emerging Local Plan. From the evidence before me, I consider the indicative housing figure provides me with the best guidance on total housing numbers for the Loxwood Parish area. In the absence of adopted strategic housing policies, it is not my role to determine whether the Neighbourhood Plan would be inconsistent with the adopted version of the emerging Local Plan if it were to be subject to future amendments to accommodate further growth.
44. There has been objection to the definition of windfall sites from Crownhall Estates. The definition in the Plan of small developments of less than 6 houses is that defined in paragraph 7.13 in the emerging Local Plan. Paragraph 7.29 in the emerging Local Plan recognises that *in some cases, suitable sites of 6+ dwellings may come forward as planning applications. Where such sites are permitted, the requirement for additional housing in the parish will be reduced accordingly.* Most importantly paragraph 7.28 states that *it is intended that the identification of sites and phasing of delivery will be determined primarily by local communities through a neighbourhood planning process.*
45. The NPPF in paragraph 185 is clear that outside the strategic elements *neighbourhood plans will be able to shape and direct sustainable development in their area.* National policy emphasises that development means growth. The Neighbourhood Plan has sought to provide for sustainable growth by allocating two sites and identifying the provision of a minimum of 60 dwellings on those sites and windfall sites. In this respect, I

consider that Policy 1, with the suggested revised wording, meets the Basic Conditions.

46. The criteria for site selection was based on a matrix. I realise that certain criteria including the settlement boundary and access were not framed in the most appropriate manner. The Site Assessment Table is not an 'exact science' and the consultants URS who derived the criteria in the table have confirmed that it has subsequently been revised. What it does give is an indication of suitability of sites and it is clear that the two allocated sites and the site South of Loxwood Place Farm were all considered against the criteria.
47. Whilst the site selection process has been criticised, the chosen sites received local support during a transparent and robust consultation process. Any assessment of land availability in the production of Neighbourhood Plans needs to be proportionate. I am satisfied that the chosen sites are deliverable and together with the overall housing strategy in the Neighbourhood Plan will contribute towards the achievement of sustainable development by the provision of sustainable growth.
48. There is no legal requirement to test the Neighbourhood Plan against emerging policy although Planning Policy Guidance advises that the reasoning and evidence informing the Local Plan process may be relevant to the consideration of the basic conditions against which the neighbourhood development plan is tested. The qualifying body and the local planning authority should aim to agree the relationship between policies in the emerging Neighbourhood Plan, the emerging Local Plan and the adopted development plan, with appropriate regard to national policy and guidance.
49. CDC has confirmed in its *Chichester District Council Response to Examiner's Request (22 December 2014) re Crownhall Estates Representations* that CDC does not consider it to be necessary to allocate further development (specifically on the site promoted by Crownhall Estates) in order for the Neighbourhood Plan to be in accordance with the emerging Local Plan. This demonstrates an agreed relationship between policies.
50. In reaching my conclusion on this matter, I consider it relevant to refer to the recent High Court Judgment of *Gladman Developments Limited v Aylesbury Vale District Council & Winslow Town Council [2014] EWHC 4323 (Admin)* on 18 December 2014.
51. The following is an extract of paragraph 58 of that judgment: *In my judgment, a neighbourhood development plan may include policies dealing with the use and development of land for housing, including policies dealing with the location of a proposed number of new dwellings, even where there is at present no development plan document setting out strategic policies for housing. The examiner was therefore entitled in the present case to conclude that the Neighbourhood Plan satisfied basic condition 8(2) (e) of Schedule 4B to the 1990 Act as it was in conformity with such strategic policies as were contained in development plan documents notwithstanding the fact that the local planning authority had not yet adopted a development*

plan document containing strategic policies for housing. Further, the examiner was entitled to conclude that condition 8(2) (d) of Schedule 4B to the 1990 Act was satisfied. That condition requires that the making of the neighbourhood development plan “will contribute to the achievement of sustainable development”. The examiner was entitled to conclude that a neighbourhood plan that would provide for an additional 455 dwellings, in locations considered to be consistent with sustainable development, did contribute to the achievement of sustainable development notwithstanding that others wanted more growth and development plan documents in future might provide for additional growth. Similarly, the examiner was entitled to conclude that having regard to national guidance and advice, including the Framework, it was appropriate to make the neighbourhood plan even though there might, in future, be a need for further growth.

52. **Recommendation: at the request of CDC and the Parish Council, I consider that the suggested amendment to Policy 1 to refer to ‘provide’ rather than ‘allocate’ meets the Basic Conditions. Policy 1 to read as follows:**

The Loxwood Parish Neighbourhood Plan will provide a minimum of 60 houses on allocated and windfall sites located within the Settlement Boundary defined in accordance with policy two of this Plan.

(Policy three will define the location of the sites.)

POLICY 2

53. Representations have been made with regard to the Settlement Boundary line. These include an extension to the settlement boundary to include land in the south of the village on High Street. I do see some sense in such an extension and a suggested extension to the Settlement Boundary to incorporate the dwellings between Hall Hurst Close and the allocated Nursery Site. However, my role is restricted to determining whether the Plan meets the Basic Conditions. Neither of these matters has any bearing on whether the Plan meets the Basic Conditions.
54. It is necessary for new development in rural areas to be in accordance with not only Policy 12 in this Neighbourhood Plan, but also all relevant policies in this Plan, the wider development plan and the NPPF. Therefore, in the interest of clarity, I recommend the deletion of the last part of the Policy where it refers to ‘and development should comply with policy 12 of this neighbourhood plan’.
55. **Recommendation: to meet the Basic Conditions, I recommend modification to Policy 2 by the deletion of ‘and development should comply with policy 12 of this neighbourhood plan.’**

POLICIES 3, 4 and 5

56. Whilst the choice of specific allocations has been objected to by Crownhall Estates, this has not extended to the detailed content of these policies. I found in my previous examination that Policy 3 met the Basic Conditions. The modifications I suggested to Policies 4 and 5 as part of that examination have been incorporated into these policies. I have already expressed my opinion with regard to the allocation of the sites in the Plan. For these reasons, I consider that these policies meet the Basic Conditions.
57. Southern Water has requested the inclusion of specific reference within the accompanying text to Policy 4 to existing sewers below the site. Whilst it may be prudent to identify this constraint in the supporting text to this policy, it would have no bearing on whether Policy 4 meets the Basic Conditions.

POLICY 6

58. Southern Water has requested reference to the need to allow essential infrastructure in designated Local Green Space. The NPPF states that local communities will be able to rule out new development on Local Green Spaces other than in very special circumstances. These very special circumstances are not defined in the NPPF and it is not for me to decide whether essential infrastructure constitutes very special circumstances. I am aware that the national Planning Practice Guidance states that: *in identifying sites it will be important to recognise that water and wastewater infrastructure sometimes has particular locational needs (and often consists of engineering works rather than new buildings) which mean otherwise protected areas may exceptionally have to be considered where consistent with their designation.*
59. In my opinion, Policy 6 meets the Basic Conditions. If the development of essential infrastructure in Loxwood constitutes the very special circumstances as defined in the NPPF and the locational needs are as recognised in the national Planning Practice Guidance, this would be supported by national policy and guidance. Therefore, specific reference in Policy 6 is not necessary to meet the Basic Conditions.

POLICY 8

60. Southern Water has raised concern that Policy 8 requires local infrastructure to be required in advance of construction of development. In my previous examination, I recommended the inclusion of the phrase 'or can be provided in time to serve it', at the end of the policy. This would meet the Basic Conditions with regard to the deliverability of the proposed new housing development. The phrase has been included in Policy 8, but prior to the phrase 'in advance of the construction of the development'. This alters the meaning of Policy 8 significantly. There is no reason why infrastructure could not be provided in parallel with development. To meet the Basic Conditions, I recommend modification to Policy 8 to re order the phrases.

61. **Recommendation: modification to the last sentence of Policy 8 to read as follows:**

New developments will be permitted only if the network can accommodate the additional demand for sewerage disposal either in its existing form or through planned improvements to the system in advance of the construction of the development, or can be provided in time to serve it.

62. Southern Water has requested a new policy regarding the provision of utility infrastructure. The development plan currently seeks to ensure the provision of adequate infrastructure in saved Local Plan Policy BE11. It is not necessary to replicate policies already found elsewhere in a Local Plan. Therefore, it is not necessary to include the suggested policy in this Plan in order to meet the Basic Conditions.

POLICIES 7, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15 and 18.

63. These policies have not been objected to during the Regulation 16 consultation period. They have been subject to my suggested modifications where required to meet the Basic Conditions as part of my initial examination of the Plan. There has been no material change in circumstances since my previous examination in respect to these policies. As such, I do not intend to dwell on the content of these policies and simply confirm that they meet the Basic Conditions.

POLICY 12

64. The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (Amendment) (England) Order 2013 allows existing redundant agricultural buildings of 500m² or less to change to a range of new business uses, to boost the rural economy whilst protecting the open countryside from development. Prior approval is required for such a change of use of buildings between 150 - 500m².
65. The *Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (Amendment and Consequential Provisions) (England) Order 2014* came into force on 6 April 2014. This allows, under certain circumstances, the change of use of agricultural buildings to residential use and change of use of agricultural buildings to registered nurseries providing childcare or state-funded schools, under the prior approval system.
66. In my previous examination I recommended that the Policy be modified to clarify that development supported in this Policy is in addition to that allowed under the General Permitted Development Order. Although Policy 12 refers to the General Permitted Development Order, it does not provide sufficient clarity with regard to the re-use of agricultural buildings.

67. **Recommendation: in the interest of clarity and precision, I recommend modification to the first paragraph of Policy 12 to read as follows:**

Development within the rural area will be in accordance with the NPPF paragraph 55, the CDC Emerging Local Plan and the General Permitted Development Order. The re-use of farm and rural buildings outside the Settlement Boundary for agricultural/ business purposes or to provide dwellings for agricultural workers, which is not allowed under the General Development Order, will be supported subject to the following criteria:

POLICY 16

68. Paragraph 18.16.9 in the accompanying text to Policy 16 refers to developer contributions towards traffic calming works. These contributions would not only be from allocated site developments. They would also be contributions from the development of any open market housing development greater than one house in size.
69. Since my previous examination, Planning Policy Guidance has been revised (on 28 November 2014) with regard to infrastructure contributions through planning obligations. By way of explanation, the following is an extract from the Planning Practice Guidance (Paragraph: 012 Reference ID: 23b-012-20141128):

There are specific circumstances where contributions for affordable housing and tariff style planning obligations (section 106 planning obligations) should not be sought from small scale and self-build development.

Contributions should not be sought from developments of 10-units or less, and which have a maximum combined gross floorspace of no more than 1000sqm.

In designated rural areas, local planning authorities may choose to apply a lower threshold of 5-units or less. No affordable housing or tariff-style contributions should then be sought from these developments. In addition, in a rural area where the lower 5-unit or less threshold is applied, affordable housing and tariff style contributions should be sought from developments of between 6 and 10-units in the form of cash payments which are commuted until after completion of units within the development. This applies to rural areas described under section 157(1) of the Housing Act 1985, which includes National Parks and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

Affordable housing and tariff-style contributions should not be sought from any development consisting only of the construction of a residential annex or extension to an existing home.

70. CDC has confirmed that Loxwood lies within a rural area described under section 157(1) of the Housing Act 1985. It is not for me to determine whether the lower threshold of 5-units or less is appropriate. As the

Planning Policy Guidance states, this is for local planning authorities to choose. In the absence of a determination by CDC as to whether the lower threshold applies, I recommend modification to the first paragraph of Policy 16 to refer to developer contributions 'where applicable'.

71. **Recommendation: To have regard to Planning Policy Guidance, I recommend the inclusion of the wording 'were applicable' in Policy 16 and for clarity I recommend a similar amendment to paragraph 18.16.9. The first sentence of Policy 16 to read as follows:**

Traffic calming along the B2133 and Station Road in the parish of Loxwood will be progressively introduced during the Plan period by means of developer contributions where applicable.

POLICY 17

72. Since my previous examination, a Ministerial Statement on Building Regulations (September 2014) indicates that it is unlikely for it to be appropriate to refer to the Code for Sustainable Homes in neighbourhood plans once a statement of policy has been produced in early 2015. As this is a clear indication of the direction and intentions of National Policy, I recommend deletion of this section in Policy 17.
73. **Recommendation: modification to Policy 17 by the deletion of the second sentence.**

Referendum and the Loxwood Neighbourhood Plan Area

74. I am required to make one of the following recommendations:
- the Plan should proceed to Referendum, on the basis that it meets all legal requirements; or
 - the Plan as modified by my recommendations should proceed to Referendum; or
 - the Plan does not proceed to Referendum, on the basis that it does not meet the relevant legal requirements.
75. **I am pleased to recommend that the Loxwood Neighbourhood Plan as modified by my recommendations should proceed to Referendum.**
76. I am required to consider whether or not the Referendum Area should extend beyond the Loxwood Neighbourhood Plan Area. I see no reason to alter or extend the Neighbourhood Plan Area for the purpose of holding a referendum.

Janet Cheesley

Date 25 February 2015

Appendix 1 Background Documents

The background documents include

The National Planning Policy Framework (The Framework) (2012)

The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act (2004)

The Localism Act (2011)

The Neighbourhood Planning Regulations (2012)

The Planning Practice Guidance (2014)

Statutory and Core Documents

Chichester District Council 1999 Local Plan saved policies including August 2011 status of Development Plan documents doc, and Chichester District Public Art Strategy.

Chichester District Local Plan Key policies pre submission November 2013

Chichester District Local Plan preferred options document April 2013

Coastal West Sussex SHMA – Chichester District summary.

Interim Policy Statement on Planning and Climate Change June 2013

Interim Statement on affordable housing September 2007

Chichester District Council – Allocation scheme July 2013

CDC Design Guidelines for Alterations to Dwellings and Extensions (2009).

Saved Policies report June 2012

The Consultation Summary which has excel spread sheets as a separate document

The Basic Conditions Statement October 2014

Traffic Calming Report

Allocated site assessment table

CDC landscape capacity assessment - Loxwood area

CDC Neighbourhood Plan guide

Chichester District Council - Settlement Capacity Profiles - Loxwood Parish

Chichester District Local Housing Requirements Study Final Report by DTZ

Final CLP Questionnaire 25th Aug 12

Glass-House final report

Housing trajectory

Initial CDC Sustainability appraisal for Loxwood

Localism Act 2011

Locality Neighbourhood Plan roadmap

Locality Neighbourhood Plan Roadmap-worksheets

Loxwood CLP Survey Report - October 2012

Loxwood Neighbourhood Plan designation letter

Loxwood Neighbourhood Plan Evidence Base Gap Analysis 12.03.13

Loxwood Neighbourhood Plan Support Basic Conditions March 2013

Loxwood Neighbourhood Plan Support Site Allocations March 2013

Loxwood Neighbourhood Plan Support Writing Policies March 2013

Loxwood Village Design Statement July 2003

Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment Loxwood 2010

Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment March 2013

Survey Actions

Survey responses analysis of responses and graphics
 URS Loxwood Neighbourhood Plan Support Transport Evidence May 2013
 report
 WSCC planning school places document

| |
|--------------------------------------|
| Regulation 14 responses. |
| Chichester District Council (CDC) |
| West Sussex County Council |
| Southern Water |
| Natural England |
| Landlinx Estates |
| Cathy & Howard Thomas |
| Jonathan Lane |
| Kelly Heath and Geoff Richards |
| Mrs Elizabeth Dugdale |
| Mr Hugh Kersey |
| Christopher Chapman |
| Margaret Carr |
| Yvonne Rees |
| Ian Barnard |
| Bryan Smith |
| Peter Hyem |
| Anita Bates |
| Featherstone and Ford |
| Mr B Frost |
| Mrs Hannah Harbottle |
| MR R J Setterfield |
| Mr Stewart & Mrs Anne Holmes |

| |
|------------------------------|
| Mr David & Mrs Hilary Mahony |
| Mr & Mrs TC Walker |
| Mr Roger Newman |
| Peter Dale |
| Peter Winney |
| Steve & Alix Parsons |
| Mr R Brennan |
| John Baker |
| Mrs Patricia Breakell |
| Nigel Gibbons |
| Peter Hughes |
| James Jewell |
| Peter & Sue Hyem |
| |

Regulation 16 responses.

Chris Agar

Genesis Planning

Highways Agency

Andrew Spencer

Elsbeth Carr

Hugh and Ann Kersey

James Dore

Jean Spira

Linda Colling

Roger Good

Roger Good – Plan

Roger Good – additional

Mr and Mrs Denny

Nigel Gibbons

Peter Hughes

Planit Consulting

Robert Brennan

Sport England

SGN Gas

Southern Water

Tony Colling

WSCC

Legal Opinion CDC

Chichester District Council Response to Examiner's Request (22 December 2014) re Crownhall Estates representations

Planit Consulting- Comments on the District Council's Submissions and Further Matters Raised By The Examiner On The Second Draft Document

Responses to the revised wording to Policy 1