

## Bosham Neighbourhood Plan Submission (Regulation 16)

### Chichester District Council Response – October 2015

#### Page 16: Para 5.8

This sentence needs to be amended. The policies will form part of the development plan and therefore it will be a requirement for them to be taken into account rather than 'observed' as a 'guide'.

#### Page 17: Policy 1 The Settlement Boundary

Criterion (A) - It is not clear what 'development of an appropriate size and type for the settlement' means. Development will need to take account of the character and appearance of the area and the policy should be reworded to reflect this.

Criterion (B) (ii) – If the intention is to support development that requires a countryside location then this should be made clear. If it is other than this then again the policy needs to be worded to identify clearly what development is envisaged and what exceptions may be acceptable (e.g. a new school etc).

#### Page 19: Para 5.11.2

Delete the word 'an' after 'is'.

#### Page 20: Para 5.11.12

The last sentence is misleading. The allocation of land outside existing settlement boundaries is a recognised way of accommodating new housing.

#### Page 22: Policy 2 Housing Allocations

Criterion (B) – Policy needs to be clear what is meant by 'Any residential or housing development'. It should not include extensions and alterations to the dwellings once built.

#### Page 24: Policy 3 Criteria for Housing Development

Criteria (A) (ii): The SHMA emphasises a need for smaller market units as they are generally more affordable. Rephrase criterion to enable a balanced mix. The mix of housing would be better informed by this and the character of the area, rather than solely the character of the adjacent residential areas. The policy should be amended to reflect this.

Criterion (A) (iii) - Reference to the 'Code for Sustainable Homes' should be removed due to changes in government policy (March 2015).

Criterion (A) (v) – what is meant by 'professionally designed'? This should be either removed or defined.

Criterion (B) (i) – there is no justification for the policy to limit the scale of development to 6 dwellings on previously developed land outside the AONB.

#### Page 25:

Notes to Policy 3 (1):

Remove reference to “or where the combined gross internal floorspace of the development exceeds 1000sqm” as this has been removed from the NPPG and it is not referred to in the Chichester District Local Plan.

Notes to Policy 3 (2):

Incorrect reference is made to the requirement of 40% affordable housing on sites within the AONB; this should refer to 30% in accordance with the Local Plan. If the figure of 30% is to be varied it would require justification and evidence to demonstrate that the viability of the scheme.

Notes to Policy 3 (3):

The last sentence cannot be adhered to and therefore should be removed.

Notes to Policy 3 (5):

May not just be dependent on agreement of CDC officers but also West Sussex County Council or potentially other statutory bodies. Suggest rewording to state that it should be agreed ‘in conjunction’ with the BPC.

It needs to be made clear that a commuted sum will only be sought on sites with 6-10 units, anything more will need to provide an on-site contribution.

Notes to Policy 3 (4):

CIL is separate to affordable housing contributions. Affordable housing will continue to be secured via a S106 agreement. The wording “or via the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)” should therefore be removed.

There is a time limit on spending commuted sum monies, if there is no imminent affordable housing scheme within the parish in which to allocate the monies CDC would have to spend it elsewhere. However, should a scheme come forward after, CDC would allocate other commuted sums to help deliver a scheme.

Page 28: Policy 4 Commercial and Economic Development  
Policy approach lacks justification in the text.

Criterion (A) – Need to clarify if this policy relates to just B1-B8 uses in accordance with Policy 26 of the Chichester Local Plan: Key Policies 2014-2029 (LP). The principal employment sites should be identified on a map.

Criterion (B) – It is not clear if the policy is aiming to allow the units at Delling Lane to convert from office and other B1 uses or to them. There is no definition of what an appropriate exception to Policy 4(A) would be. This needs to be clear as otherwise it would be difficult to resist uses that do not meet Policy 26 of the LP.

Throughout the policy there is no reference to the need for a marketing exercise to address the need (or otherwise) to retain the use. At minimum a cross reference should be included to Chichester Local Plan Policy 26 and Appendix E.

Page 29-30: Bosham Primary School

The text clearly identifies issues relating to education provision and the recreation ground. This does not seem to be replicated in the section towards the end of the Plan related to Infrastructure Aspirations. This would benefit from cross referencing.

Page 29: Community Facilities

Para 5.13.2 – This states that the village hall is not in need of any refurbishment or updating. This is inconsistent with the Council’s Infrastructure Delivery Plan that identifies the village

hall for improvements. The Parish needs to clarify the position. If the village hall is in need of improvements then the text of the NP should be altered to reflect this and a cross reference to the need for this infrastructure should be included in Section 6. If not then the project will be removed from the IDP.

Page 30: Policy 5 Community Facilities

With regard to any proposed loss of a community facility a cross reference should be included to the need for a marketing exercise in accordance with the requirements of the Local Plan (Appendix E) to provide adequate protection to such facilities.

Page 37: Policy 6 Conservation of the Historic Environment

Criterion (A) (iv) – state Conservation Area Character Appraisal in full as forms part of the Policy rather than CACA.

Criterion (B) (iv) – ‘provide adequate but appropriate parking’ – it is not clear what is meant by adequate or appropriate. Wording should reflect the highways authority standards/parking calculator and any exceptions should be made clear (eg in the interest of preserving and enhancing the conservation area/protecting listed buildings etc.)

Page 48: Policy 9 Flooding and Drainage

Criterion (A) – Amend first sentence to make it clear the policy relates to applications within areas known to be at risk of flooding.

Criterion (A) (iv) – it is not clear what is meant by ‘not result in coastal squeeze of any designated sites’. Amend to read ‘no encroachment of designated sites....’

Page 55: Policy 10 Transport and Highways

The text would benefit from aspirations for wider connectivity beyond the parish. Paragraph 5.18.3 could be amended to read ‘Better footpaths and public rights of way linking areas of the village *and wider communities/destinations* would help address this issue’. Relatedly there is a local group promoting an Emsworth to Chichester cycle route <https://www.facebook.com/chemroute>

The transport aspirations would have greater clarity through an annotated plan/map. This should include the signage, bike racks and routes for addition/upgrade. Quantification would facilitate the addition of such infrastructure to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan with the associated estimated cost.

Para 5.18.9: If items 3, 6 and 7 by inference refer to the production of ‘feasibility studies’, then the BNP would have greater clarity if the items were reworded to have specific reference to ‘feasibility studies’ (which would assess the aspiration and work up the costings necessary to make the aspiration more implementable).

Para 5.18.9: Bullet point 8: add specific bus service numbers for clarity.

**Exercise of Delegated Authority - Head of Planning Services**

I hereby exercise my delegated power in accordance with Chichester District Council's Constitution:

‘to make formal comments on a draft Neighbourhood Plan at Pre-Submission stage and Submission stage’

AND DETERMINE THAT, the above comments are the formal response made by Chichester District Council on the **submission stage** of the **Bosham Neighbourhood Plan** in relation to comments made under Regulation 16 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 (as amended by The Neighbourhood Planning (General) (Amendment) Regulations 2015):-

Signed:



**Head of Planning Services**

Date: ..... 7/10/..... 2015

Note: The deadline for making representations should not be less than 6 weeks from the first day the draft plan was publicised.