

Westbourne Neighbourhood Plan 2017 to 2029 Submission Version April 2017 (Regulation 16)

Chichester District Council Response – July 2017

Page 3: para 1.1.4 – for accuracy the text should set out the date that each authority approved the designation, i.e. Chichester District Council (CDC) 3 December 2013 and the South Downs National Park Authority (SDNPA) 27 November 2013.

Page 10: para 2.7.6 – this makes reference to the identification of two possible sites for a car park but does not state where these are. The plan does not contain any specific policy for car park provision, except by means of an area for car parking identified in Policy SS3 Land adjacent to Chantry Hall. If this is an aspiration for the Plan and parish this should be made clear, possibly in a separate section.

Page 14: Policy OA1: Sustainable Development
Bullets 1 and 2 are comprehensive. The inclusion of bullet 3 adds repetition but is also selective in the policies it makes reference to. Specific studies will only be required where appropriate and are not required for all development proposals.

Page 15: Policy OA2: Local Economy and Employment
Para 3 needs to set out what is meant by ‘employment uses’ in terms of the Use Classes Order.

Page 16: Policy OA3: Community Facilities
The last sentence in para 4.5.1 relates to a specific policy for supporting car parking proposals for the parish/village along with the identification of a site or sites and, as above, this may be better addressed separately. The aim of Policy OA3, from the first sentence, relates to protecting the loss of community facilities, whereas parking provision relates to new provision/sites.

Para 4.5.2: this wording should be added to Policy OA2 for accuracy of implementation.

Page 18: Policy OA4 Community Balance - General comments

Para 4.6.25 –the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) recommended mix (or any successive document) should form the initial basis of the mix requirement, whilst taking account of local need evidence. This should be reflected in the policy.

Page 19: Policy OA4-1 Housing for Younger People
It is not clear what is meant by “*the Parish Council will give priority to provision of affordable housing in time for the next review of the NP*”. If relevant then it should be removed to text rather than policy.

Page 16-19: Community Balance - Comments relating to Gypsy, traveller and travelling showpeople.

CDC acknowledges there are deep and serious local Parish concerns around the issue of Gypsy and traveller provision in Westbourne parish. As a result the increased presence of Gypsies and travellers has led to local community pressure to include a policy in the neighbourhood plan that seeks to balance the overall local parish community and deter over provision of Gypsy and traveller sites.

CDC appreciates the Parish Council's position. However, as currently drafted the policy (Policy OA4-2 GTPPS PLOTS/PITCHES) is not positively worded and does not provide additional criteria over and above the adopted CLPKP Policy 36 (Planning for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople). In this respect the policy does not meet basic condition a. having regard to national policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State it is appropriate to make the order (or neighbourhood plan).

Points of accuracy:

Paragraph 4.6.5 – The statement that most sites have been allowed on appeal is misleading. A total of 7 pitches and 1 travelling showperson plot have been allowed on appeal in the parish of Westbourne since April 2014 whereas 14 pitches and 4 travelling showperson plots have been permitted by the Council.

Paragraph 4.6.9 – this states there are 30 pitches on Cemetery Lane and within its immediate environs. In addition it sets out that most fall below the guidelines for the size of pitch. This is misleading as there are (when taken together) 19 pitches and 5 plots on Cemetery Lane that have been granted planning permission and implemented. There is only one site (known as the Old Army Camp on Cemetery Lane comprising 17 pitches) in the parish of Westbourne which has more than 15 pitches on one single site. This is a public site which is run by Homespace Sustainable Accommodation on behalf of West Sussex County Council. Notwithstanding the above it should be noted that the guidance Designing Gypsy and Traveller Sites – A Good Practice (2008) was withdrawn on 1 September 2015.

Page 18: Policy OA4: Community Balance

Submitted Policy:

Para 4.6.18 – this paragraph appears to draw attention to the emerging policy within the SDNP area of the parish currently set out in South Downs Local Plan: Preferred Options (September 2015). Strategic Policy SD26: Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople. This policy has yet to be submitted to the Secretary of State for examination and therefore at this stage there is no certainty the policy will remain in its current form. However, a similar criteria based neighbourhood plan policy approach which adds to the current CLPKP policy may be acceptable, subject to there being sufficient local evidence and justification for this approach and the policy/criteria complying with the basic conditions.

Page 19: Policy OA4-2 GTPPS Plots and Pitches

The policy states “*Applications for additional Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople pitches/plots within the Neighbourhood Plan area will be resisted, as the supply for the identified need for this type of accommodation has already been exceeded for the plan period within the District, which has been disproportionately met by provision within Westbourne Parish*”.

This sentence is misleading. Whilst there is currently a five year supply of pitches and plots, although close to the required provision the number of pitches and plots needed over the plan period has not yet been exceeded. To date 57 pitches and 18 plots have been granted planning permission. CLPKP sets out that 59 pitches and 18 plots are required for the period 2012-2027.

The policy states that *“Given the lack of identified need, any new consent would be wholly exceptional and in this regard if deemed to meet the exceptional circumstances the proposal would need to pass the strict physical tests applied within the National Park for this type of development”*

Whilst there is currently a five year supply of pitches and plots, the need for the whole plan period has not yet been met as set out above.

Evidence Base Documents

Housing and Population Document 20: Westbourne GTTSP Evidence Report 2016 ‘Gypsy, Travellers and Travelling Snowpersons. (GTTSP) REPORT for WNDP Policy OA4’ –

Appendix C: The Statistics – GYPSY & TRAVELLER PITCHES AND TRAVELLING SHOWPERSONS PLOTS IN THE CDC DISTRICT PER PARISH/WARD (the table)
Statement of fact and commentary

This provides misleading information. The notes on the figures set out that CDC has a total of 60 Parish and Town Councils within its District which are covered by the CLPKP 2014-2029. However, the CLPKP covers a total of 31 parishes; 12 of which are partly or substantially located within the South Downs National Park Authority.

Page 22: Policy LD1: Local Distinctiveness
Para 4.7.10 should make reference to ‘New’ rather than ‘All’ development.

Bullet 4 - this requirement should not relate to householder extensions.

Page 22: Policy LD2: Important Views
Para 4.8.3 should make reference to ‘New’ rather than ‘Any’ development.

Page 28: Policy LD3 – Heritage
Bullet 1 for accuracy should read ‘The historic environment of the parish and **its** heritage assets.....’

Bullet 2 should read ‘preserve or enhance’ rather than ‘conserve’. This would bring it in line with wording in the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

Bullet 4 - this should be amended for accuracy as set out below:
Archaeological investigation of sites where new developments or improvements are ~~planned~~ **proposed** will be required in areas where there is high archaeological potential. Following a desk-based assessment, appropriate archaeological investigation must be carried out, where appropriate, prior to construction. ~~of new developments~~. Any reports should be made available for public viewing and be submitted to the **District** Council for inclusion in the Historic Environment Record.

Page 32: Local Gaps
Para 4.11.5 and 4.11.6: it is not clear how the areas identified by numbers on Figure 11 relate to the numbered points in the text of the paragraphs. The plan needs to clearly identify which area is which by name and/or description in the text.

Page 34: Policy LD4: Local Gaps

Para 4.11.10 – line 1 should refer to ‘...any **new** development proposed...’

Bullet 1 – it would be more accurate to use the word ‘eroding’ rather than ‘reducing’.

Bullet 5 – it is not clear what is meant by ‘positive community uses’. This needs to be clearly defined in order for the policy to be applied. Without this the intention of the policy may be undermined.

Page 35: Policy BD2: Natural Environment Policy

Policy should make it clear that these green corridors are protected if this is the intention.

Page 40: Policy SS1: Land to the West of Monk’s Hill

Para 4.15.1 – text should be amended to read ‘The site **is** allocated for 6 dwellings...’

The text should refer to a **minimum** of 6 units to be in accordance with the Local Plan.

Bullet 2 – the dwelling footprints shown on the schematic plan may not be adequate to provide bungalows; gaps between dwellings may therefore prove to be smaller.

Bullet 7 - it is not necessary for an archaeological evaluation to be carried out for every site only where required.

Page 41: Policy SS2: Land at Long Copse Lane

This site is currently being built out. However, for accuracy and consistency the policy should refer to a **minimum** of 16 dwellings in accordance with the Local Plan; the timeframe should be in line with the local plan period of 2029 rather than 2015-2020.

Studies can only be required where appropriate and relevant.

Page 42: Policy SS3: Land adjacent to Chantry Hall, Foxbury Lane

Concern that the proposed allocation at Chantry Hall is identified within the proposed local gap; this is inconsistent with the NP policies and, as drafted, will therefore need to deliver the requirements of the gap policy (Policy LD4). The boundary of the gap should therefore be amended to omit the site.

The policy should refer to a **minimum** of 6 dwellings in accordance with the Local Plan

The timeframe should be in line with the local plan period of **2029** rather than 2017-2020.

Figure 18 requires a key, it is not clear what areas are to be paddock, car park, open space, planted buffer etc.

Bullet 1 – reference to Figure 18 does not clearly show which areas are to be developed and for what use. The figure needs to be clearly marked up and relevant areas clearly shown if reference is to be made to Figure 18 in this way. Currently it will not be possible to implement the policy as desired by the local community.

Bullets 6, 7, 8, 9 and 10 are also not clear through reference to Figure18.

Bullet 12 – should refer to ‘**new** residential development’

Bullet 13 - should be clear that permitted development would only be removed IF planning permission is granted, not state that ‘planning permission will be granted’.

Page 48: Housing and Population Documents

Need to include:

- Chichester District Council's Planning Obligations and Affordable Housing SPD, 2016
- GL Hearn Costal West Sussex Strategic Housing Market Assessment Update: Chichester District Summary Report 2012

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 **Westbourne 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:

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Andrew Hunt". The signature is written in a cursive style with a horizontal line under the name.

Head of Planning Services

Date: 21 July 2017

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