
Agenda

**Westbourne Neighbourhood Plan 2017 to 2029
(Submission Version) – Examination**

Hearing

10:00am Wednesday 25 October 2017

At

**The Meeting Place (former Baptist Chapel),
North Street, Westbourne, PO10 8SP**

**Independent Examiner
Jeremy J Edge BSc FRICS MRTPI**

Agenda

Westbourne Neighbourhood Plan 2017 to 2029 (Submission Version) – Examination

- 1) Introductions and welcome
- 2) Hearing Procedure
- 3) Questions

The Designated Neighbourhood Area

Q1) *The designated neighbourhood plan area is the entire Parish boundary and is said to be shown on Figure 2. The Parish boundary cannot be seen clearly on this map base, but is shown with clarity on Figure 1, Westbourne Context Map. May Figure 2 be deleted?*

Policy OA1

Westbourne Settlement Boundary

Paragraph 4.2.2 states;

“4.2.2 Westbourne Parish is rural and the area within the current Settlement Boundary is unable to accommodate all the further housing required. New sites are required adjacent to the existing settlement area.” Similarly, the CLPKP advises at paragraph 5.5 that settlements, such as Westbourne, which are “Service Villages”, will be reviewed through Development Plan Documents and Neighbourhood Plans, taking account of housing and development requirements.

It appears that the Westbourne Settlement Boundary proposed in Figure 6 of the Submission Draft Version of the Plan does not include the proposed housing development in the following policies:

- SS1: Land to the West of Monk’s Hill;
- SS2: Land at Long Copse Lane; and
- SS3: Land adjacent to Chantry Hall, Foxbury Road.

Q2) *Should the Westbourne Settlement Boundary be extended to include these sites?*

Q3) *What is the current planning policy status of the Westbourne Village Design Statement, Submission Version April 2017?*

Q4) *For consistency, should the Westbourne Settlement Boundary be extended to encompass the land identified in the VDS on Page 6, plus: SS2: Land at Long Copse Lane; and SS3: Land adjacent to Chantry Hall, Foxbury Road, to avoid potential confusion in the future? Would Figure 11 provide further support for such a consistent settlement boundary when considering land within Westbourne, excluded from the proposed gaps in Policy LD4?*

Q5) *Is it disproportionate to expect all development to provide the following studies as expected (shown highlighted below) in Policy OA1 -3? Should sub-paragraphs ii), iii) and iv) include the phrase, "where appropriate", or similar, where such impacts are considered likely?*

"3 Development proposals within the Parish will need to take account of all the NP policies to demonstrate that they have considered and accommodated the following, including:

(i) The proposals do not adversely impact the local gaps, views and countryside identified in the WNP (policy LD4);

(ii) The proposals are to be accompanied by a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment to show there is no overall adverse harm to the area (policy LD4);

(iii) The proposals are to be accompanied by a study to demonstrate that there would be no negative impact on local biodiversity. This will include potential harms arising from changes to access points and visibility splays to accommodate typical vehicles (policy BD2);

(iv) The proposals are to be accompanied by technical studies to show that the proposal does not give rise to detrimental increases in levels of activity and traffic, noise and disturbance;

(v) The proposals are to be accompanied by an expert assessment of the potential impact on any designated or undesignated heritage asset and its setting where appropriate (policy LD3)."

Policy OA4 Community Balance

Paragraph 4.6.3 of the Westbourne NP states:

"4.6.3 The Parish Council is conscious that the Population Profile (para 2.2 & Figure 3) show that 52% of residents were aged 45 and over (24% were over 65) at the 2011 census. Over the lifetime of the NP, the Parish will house an increasing proportion of elderly residents, many of whom may wish to downsize to smaller properties within the Parish. Social care is set to become an ever-increasing problem and it requires attracting additional younger residents into the Parish to both help look after the ageing population and to keep the community vibrant. Therefore, the Parish Council will look favourably upon appropriate proposals for the provision of housing for young people, by way of smaller housing units and starter homes, affordable housing development including within the rental sector, as well as live/work and self-build initiatives where they meet the policies of the development plan. Regrettably it has not been possible to identify land suitable to accommodate affordable housing during the preparation of this Plan, but such is the Parish Council's concern for the future of the community in this respect, that high priority will be given to identifying and securing affordable housing in time for the next review of the plan. (see 1.1.8)."

Policy OA4 encourages an appropriate tenure balance and housing mix for Westbourne, but the draft Plan provides no clear guidance as to what might be appropriate. Evidence of housing need in the area has been provided by CDC, based on the earlier Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) in 2014.

Q6) *Should Policy OA-4 provide guidance as to the preferred housing mix in relation to the allocated housing sites?*

Q7) *What is the current position with the development proposals in relation to the housing allocation on at Land at Long Copse Lane, (Policy SS2), where planning permission has been granted on appeal for 16 dwellings? The development appears to be substantially complete. I note that the section 106 Agreement records the agreed affordable tenure and mix in clause 1.3 as being;*

2 intermediate tenure dwellings:

1 x 2 bedroom house with a minimum floor area of 75.5m² (GIA); and

1 x 3 bedroom house with a minimum floor area of 86m² (GIA).

4 Affordable Rented units of the following mix and sizes:

2 x 2 bedroom apartments each with a minimum floor area of 67m² (GIA);

1 x 2 bedroom house with a minimum floor area of 82m² (GIA); and

1 x 4 bedroom house with a minimum floor area of 100m² (GIA).

Q8) Whilst accepting that social and affordable housing will frequently be occupied by young households, is it correct that Policy OA4-1 should be entitled HOUSING FOR YOUNGER PEOPLE? Affordable housing might be needed and occupied by members of all age groups. There is no specific category of housing for young households in the NPPF or CLPKP. Should Policy OA4-1 be relaxed to include all age groups, but related to need?

From the housing evidence supplied to the Parish Council by CDC entitled; “Westbourne Housing Information December 2014”, there would appear to be a particular need for smaller dwellings, including 1 bed housing units. The housing evidence also notes that smaller dwellings are more affordable to provide by housebuilders as well as being more affordable to occupy by households. The housing evidence supplied by CDC clearly indicates that within Westbourne there is a need for affordable dwellings, with 22 residents in the parish being on the housing waiting list in August 2014. It appears unfortunate that in the light of a national housing crisis and a clear imperative to increase the amount of all housing, including affordable housing, that the Westbourne NP fails to make any provision for affordable housing development despite a horizon to 2029.

Q9) Whilst accepting that the minimum additional housing provision expected in the Parish to 2029 is 25 dwellings, in the light of manifest housing need evidenced in the SHMA, is it reasonable for the Plan not to identify any affordable housing sites during the Plan period?

OA4-2 GTTS Plots / Pitches

There appears to be a disagreement between the Parish and the LPA as to the need for further GTTS plots and pitches¹. The Parish Council contends that the supply of plots and pitches has met the identified need, whilst the Council’s position is that this is not yet the case.

The Regulation 16 reply from the District Council indicated that 57 pitches and 18 plots have been granted planning permission, but that the CLPKP sets out a requirement for 59 pitches and 18 plots for the period 2012-2027 in the District.

Q10) It appears that the need for plots for travelling showpeople is therefore met. Is this correct?

¹ “Planning policy for traveller sites”, August 2015, Department for Communities and Local Government. Annex 1, paragraph 5, defines pitches and plots as follows:

“For the purposes of this planning policy, “pitch” means a pitch on a “gypsy and traveller” site and “plot” means a pitch on a “travelling showpeople” site (often called a “yard”). This terminology differentiates between residential pitches for “gypsies and travellers” and mixed-use plots for “travelling showpeople”, which may / will need to incorporate space or to be split to allow for the storage of equipment.”

It would be helpful if, in advance of the Hearing a brief table could be provided identifying;

- 1) The location (e.g Cemetery Lane), number of plots and pitches that currently exist in Westbourne Parish; whether there are any planning permissions remaining to be fully implemented and the number of plots and pitches yet to be developed, if any; together with the last census population for the Parish;
- 2) the same information for the other Parishes within the CDC administrative area.

From this table, it should then be possible to verify the extent to which Westbourne may have disproportionately met need within the District, as claimed by the Parish in Policy OA4-2. It would be helpful if a very brief Statement of Common Ground could be tabled at the Hearing.

Included within the brief Statement of Common Ground, I would also be grateful if the parties could also please confirm the number of pitches and plots that exist at the Cemetery Lane facility.

DCLG publication "Planning policy for traveller sites", August 2015, Policy C, "Sites in rural areas and the countryside" may offer further assistance in possibly re-formulating an appropriate policy covering the matters in the draft neighbourhood plan policy, OA4-2 GTTS Plots / Pitches. In addition, the SDNPA draft policy SD33 regarding Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople is not within an adopted plan and is still subject to public consultation and Examination. The SDNPA in its Regulation 16 response has suggested that paragraph 3 of this draft policy may offer a means of development management for the Westbourne NP. At present, this reads as follows:

- "3. Development proposals to meet the needs of the Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople community (as defined in Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (2015) or any subsequent policy) will be permitted where they:
- a) Can demonstrate a local connection;
 - b) Can demonstrate that there is no alternative available pitch which could be used in the locality;
 - c) Do not result in sites being over-concentrated in any one location or disproportionate in size to nearby communities;
 - d) Are capable of being provided with infrastructure such as power, water supply, foul water drainage and recycling/waste management without harm to the special qualities of the National Park;
 - e) Provide sufficient amenity space for residents;
 - f) Do not cause, and are not subject to, unacceptable harm to the amenities of neighbouring uses and occupiers;
 - g) Have a safe vehicular and pedestrian access from the public highway and adequate provision for parking, turning and safe manoeuvring of vehicles within the site; and
 - h) Restrict any permanent built structures in rural locations to essential facilities"

Q11) Would a criteria based policy to manage the development needs of gypsies and travellers and travelling showpeople suitably adapted without reference to the National Park, but otherwise similar to draft policy SD33, paragraph 3 and the DCLG guidance (2015) offer a suitable means of managing GTTS needs in the Parish of Westbourne?

Policy LD4 - Local Gaps

Q12) What is the significance of the numbering system relating to the gaps identified on Figure 11? To what view locations do the letters A-H inclusive refer as shown on Figure 11?

Q13) Is there a need to distinguish between inter and intra local gaps if the policy criteria in Policy LD4 is identical for each type of gap?

Policy LGS1: Cemetery Green Space

The policy states that the area of the Cemetery and its Heritage setting is very important to Westbourne residents, to the families whose loved ones have been laid to rest there and to visitors to the area and is classified in Chichester District Council's Historic Environment Register as a non-designated heritage asset.

Q14) *Is there evidence sufficient to justify LGS designation in accordance with NPPF guidance at paragraph 77 which states;*

“The Local Green Space designation will not be appropriate for most green areas or open space. The designation should only be used:

- where the green space is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves;*
- where the green area is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty, historic significance, recreational value (including as a playing field), tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and*
- where the green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land.?*

To what extent does the land beyond the boundary of the cemetery and proposed for inclusion in the Plan as Local Green Space hold a particular local significance? How would the LGS be owned and managed if designated as LGS? In the event that the cemetery was not protected as LGS to what extent it any would the current use and management of the site be put at risk? Would an amended settlement boundary alone, or in combination with a Local Gap policy give adequate protection to preclude development in relation to the land proposed as LGS?

Policies SS1- 3

Q15) *If the settlement boundary of Westbourne were recommended to be altered to include the three housing sites proposed in the WNP, to be consistent with Policy 2 of the CLPKP, would there be any purpose in removing permitted development rights from the WNP housing sites?*

In order to reflect the housing policy within Policy 5 of the CLPKP, the housing allocations will need to be a minimum 6 dwellings to count towards the Parish housing figures. Policies SS1 and SS3 will therefore need to provide for a minimum of 6 dwellings at each site.

Q16) *In order to avoid overly prescriptive planning control, yet providing adequate flexibility, could development under Policies SS1 - SS3 inclusive, simply be expected to conform to the guidance in the Westbourne Village Design Statement?*

Q17) *West Sussex County Council as Highway Authority indicated in its Regulation 16 consultation reply regarding the proposed allocation of small scale housing sites that these will be subject to the resolution of any highway safety and access issues at the planning application stage or as part of a consultation on a Community Right to Build Order. Can access and layout issues be deferred until the planning application stage?*

Policy SS1 - Land to the West of Monk's Hill

Q18) *What evidence exists that would imply residential development should be restricted to only one storey with pitched roofs with frontages facing Monk's Hill?*

Policy SS3: Land adjacent to Chantry Hall, Foxbury Lane

Q19) To what extent is it necessary to provide open space within this residential site? How would it be owned and managed if provided? Would the open space be accessible to the public?

Q20) What is the evidence to support the need for a car park on the edge of the settlement? If provided as part of a residential development, how would it be owned and managed?

4) Any other business.