



**Neighbourhood Planning Regulations 2012 (Part 5 s15)**

**Neighbourhood Plan - Consultation Statement**

**To: Chichester District Council (Local Planning Authority)  
By: Selsey Town Council (Qualifying Body)**

**August 2017**

### Selsey Neighbourhood Plan (NP):

This application relates to Selsey Town Council and the designated boundary is indicated on the plan below.



**Contents:**

Introduction	4
Legislative Basis	4
Background	5
Neighbourhood Plan Consultation	6
Statutory Consultation	6
Conclusion	7
Appendix 1 – Regulation 14 Schedule of Comments	8

Documents are available at [www.selseytowncouncil.gov.uk](http://www.selseytowncouncil.gov.uk). Paper copies are available to view at the Selsey Town Council, Council Offices, 55 High Street, Selsey, West Sussex PO20 0RB. Telephone 01243 605803

**Introduction:**

This Consultation Statement has been prepared with the aim of fulfilling the legal obligations of the Neighbourhood Planning Regulations 2012, which are set out in the legislative basis below.

An extensive level of consultation (community and statutory) has been undertaken by the Working Group and Town Council as required by the legislation. Details of the consultations are detailed below.

**Legislative Basis:**

Section 15(2) of Part 5 of the 2012 Neighbourhood Planning Regulations sets out that, a consultation statement should contain the following:

- (a) details of the persons and bodies consulted about the proposed Neighbourhood Plan;
- (b) explanation of how they were consulted;
- (c) summary of the main issues and concerns raised by the persons consulted;  
and
- (d) description of how these issues and concerns have been considered and, where relevant, addressed in the proposed Neighbourhood Plan.

## **Background:**

Chichester District Council (CDC) designated the Selsey Neighbourhood Plan Area on 4 December 2012.

Selsey's Neighbourhood Plan, created in consultation with the community over the past few years, was subject to review by an Independent Examiner as part of the neighbourhood planning process. In response to the Final Report of the Independent Examiner following that review, in February 2016 Selsey Town Council decided to withdraw the previous version and to proceed to re-draft the Plan to address the issues identified by the Examiner. The Neighbourhood Plan Working Group was formed in February 2016 to progress the re-draft and consists of six Town Councillors and the Clerk of the Council.

Selsey Town Council (STC) uses a variety of methods to keep the community informed of issues, activities and events of interest to them. These methods include:

- Full Council meetings to which the public can attend, listen and speak
- Regular Council Committee meetings to which the public can attend, listen and speak
- Town Council Newsletter (the Official Rumour) published in the Local Life magazine and distributed to all households in the Town.
- Notices placed on nine external Council owned noticeboards located throughout the town, internal noticeboards at the Council Offices and Selsey Centre, a Community Noticeboard (located in Warner's Yard) plus other locations, including, but not only, the Selsey Library, the Selsey Information Exchange and local shops
- A regularly updated Council website ([www.selseytowncouncil.gov.uk](http://www.selseytowncouncil.gov.uk))
- Articles and editorial in the Chichester Observer
- Local Facebook pages (Selsey Town Council, Selsey – News and Gossip)

The Town Council used a number of the above methods to communicate our draft Neighbourhood Plan with businesses and residents.

## Neighbourhood Plan Consultation:

A public consultation Open Day was held at the Town Hall on 18<sup>th</sup> March 2017, where members of the public were invited to view and comment on the Selsey pre-Submission Neighbourhood Plan. Individual Comment Forms were provided and members of the public were also invited to submit comments via email if preferred. In total 191 individuals attended the Open Day.

A further consultation Open Day for Community Groups and Businesses was held on the 20<sup>th</sup> March 2017, and copies of the Selsey pre-Submission Neighbourhood Plan and Comment Forms were also made available.

In total, 49 representations were received from the general public, community groups and businesses in the Parish either via comment forms, email or letter. These have all been recorded in the Regulation 14 Schedule of Comments (see Appendix 1).

## Statutory Consultation:

The Selsey pre-Submission Neighbourhood Plan was published for a six-week consultation period on 20<sup>th</sup> February 2017. The draft Plan was available for inspection at the Town Council Offices, Selsey Centre, Selsey Library and the Selsey Information Exchange. It was also available on the Town Council website ([www.selseytowncouncil.gov.uk](http://www.selseytowncouncil.gov.uk)).

The Statutory Consultees were individually emailed on 21 February 2017 to request representations on the draft plan.

Table 2 – Locations where documentation was available for inspection

<b>Location</b>	<b>Available from</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Town Council office	20 <sup>th</sup> February	Open weekdays – 09:00 – 16:00
Selsey Centre	20 <sup>th</sup> February	Open weekdays – 09:00 – 17:00
Selsey Information Exchange	20 <sup>th</sup> February	Open weekdays and Saturday mornings – 09:30 – 12:30
Selsey Library	20 <sup>th</sup> February	Open weekdays – 10:00 – 17:00 and Saturdays – 10:00 – 14:00

Table 3 - Additional publicity

Method	Target Group	Location	Date
Public Notice	Residents	12 Noticeboards	17 <sup>th</sup> February
Leaflet	Residents	Delivered to every property via Royal Mail	w/c 6 <sup>th</sup> March 2017
Web page update	Community + wider	Online	20 <sup>th</sup> February 2017
Emails	Statutory consultees, businesses, community organisations	Email	21 <sup>st</sup> February 2017
Facebook (various)	Community	Online	20 <sup>th</sup> February 2017

A total of 8 out of the 43 statutory consultees replied. These have all been recorded in the Regulation 14 Schedule of Comments (see Appendix 1). The responses varied in content -

- Some comments raised topics not able to be covered by the Neighbourhood Plan
- Some responders had gone through the draft Plan using their proof-reading skills and alterations made accordingly
- A number commented in some detail and these responses were analysed by the Working Group and either included in the revised draft Plan or explanation provided as to why they were not included.

There were many positive comments, recognising the hard work gone into the preparation of the Plan and echoing what many residents feel about living in Selsey. The number of active community groups in the town and the many annual events demonstrate the true community spirit.

The Selsey Submission Neighbourhood Plan is thus the product of extensive and exhaustive discussion and consultation within the Parish.

### **Conclusion:**

This Selsey Neighbourhood Plan Consultation Statement and its background papers are considered to comply with Section 15(2) of Part 5 of the 2012 Neighbourhood Planning Regulations.

**SELSEY NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN**  
**THE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLANNING (GENERAL) REGULATIONS 2012 REGULATION 14**  
**PRE- SUBMISSION CONSULTATION 20<sup>TH</sup> FEBRUARY – 3<sup>RD</sup> APRIL 2017**  
**SCHEDULE OF COMMENTS RECEIVED**

NAME	REPRESENTATION	OBSERVATION & RECOMMENDATION
<b>Chichester District Council</b>	The Town Council and Neighbourhood Plan Working Group have made considerable progress over the last few months. It is clear the Town Council has taken on board the advice of the Examiner of the previous version of the neighbourhood plan (NBHP). The documentation is now much clearer and has been generally updated. A lot of hard work has been undertaken to reach this stage and the working group should be commended on the time and effort that has been involved.	
	<p><u>General:</u>  Part 1 of the plan clearly now contains the land use policies. However, it would be helpful if the titles of Parts 2 and 3 were clearly identified as Background Evidence and/or Information rather than forming the neighbourhood plan document itself, assuming this is now the intention. Part 2 is no longer a draft version as it represents fact/context; equally Part 3 is a factual audit, not draft but rather evidence.</p>	Noted and Document titles have been amended as appropriate.
	However, on Page 2 the NP text suggests that Parts 1 and 2 should be read in conjunction. If this is the case then it should state clearly that only the policies in Part 1 form the NP and that any guidance in Part 2 is no more than that. It may then be beneficial to include any relevant cross references from Part 1 to Part 2 to draw the reader's attention to relevant information and to help anyone using the policies on the NP.	Reworded to make clear the purpose of each document.
	More generally, it would be helpful in terms of layout if the policies in Part 1 could either be highlighted in a box or perhaps set out in bold text to make them stand out in the document. This would be helpful for users of the NP as would paragraph numbers.	The policies have now been placed in a box as suggested.
	<u>Page 1 – Background:</u> This may need some amendment to the text to reflect the above.	Amended to reflect the above.



<u>Part 1 – Policies:</u> This will need to be updated as the plan progresses to submission to reflect the facts of what is included rather than describing what has happened. The latter may be included in the consultation statement in due course.	
<u>Part 2 - History, Design and Guidance:</u> suggest amending the title to include Background Evidence or Information	Amended as suggested and also referred to as Annex A.
<u>Part 3 – Audit:</u> again suggest amending the title to include Background Evidence or Information	Amended as suggested and also referred to as Annex B.
<b><u>Part 1 Policies</u></b>  The Plan needs to include a map showing the NP area designation.	Map now included as Appendix III
<u>Page 3 – Background 1st paragraph:</u> Suggest the first sentence could be amended to more accurately reflect the local situation. Suggest rewording to read: ‘Whilst Selsey can boast an impressive collection of listed buildings, there is no easily identifiable single overarching architectural character or vernacular style. However, there are many instances where the local vernacular is relevant and where opportunities arise this should be taken into account.’	Text amended as suggested.
<u>Background 3rd paragraph:</u> There is no evidence for the inclusion of the last sentence identifying that new development would require a higher car parking allocation than set out by WSCC.	Text amended to remove this statement.
<u>Policy 001:</u> 3rd bullet rather than restricting development to 3 storeys the policy may benefit from some rewording possibly along the lines of ‘in terms of design, new development should take careful account of height and roof elevations in the context of the topography of the local area in relation to the coastline, built form and rural hinterland.’	Text amended as suggested.
<u>Page 4 – Background 2nd paragraph:</u> The setting of the Conservation Area is also an important consideration; suggest that the text is amended to take this into account.	
<u>Page 4: Policy 002:</u> The 3rd bullet point is clearly worded and therefore there is no need for the first bullet point.	Text amended and corrected as suggested.

	<p>3rd bullet point – typo, should read ‘.....its designated and non-designated .....’</p> <p>4th bullet point (iv) - typo, should read ‘...as defined in the Selsey Conservation.....’</p>	
	<p><u>Page 6: Developments:</u> Background – this section needs to be updated.</p> <p><u>Overview of Schemes</u> – this needs to clearly set out that sites are being identified to meet the Local Plan housing requirements despite already having planning permission. This will need to be made clear and CDC would wish the Ministerial Statement (December 2016) to be relevant when the NP is ‘made’</p>	<p>This has been revised to clarify as suggested.</p>
	<p>Rather than allocating sites in the NP the settlement boundary has been amended to accommodate the sites with permission.</p>	<p>Narrative has been amended to reflect this.</p>
	<p><u>Page 7: Settlement Boundary:</u> Background – The reason for redefining the settlement boundary is as part of the requirement of the Local Plan and it may be helpful to include this in the text. The eighth paragraph makes reference to the ‘current boundary’ but effectively this is the 1999 boundary. Need to ensure it is clear when referring to the 1999 boundary and when the newly amended and defined one. It may help to include the words Chichester Local Plan period after 2029.</p>	<p>Text amended to refer to the 1999 and ‘revised’ boundaries in order to provide better clarity.</p>
	<p><u>Page 7-8: Policy 003</u> – suggest deletion of criteria (ii) in second bullet point as this may open up the area to further development and make defending appeals more difficult. Development outside the settlement boundary will need to comply with Local Plan Policies 45 (Development in the Countryside) and 46 (Alterations, Change of Use and/or Re-use of Existing Buildings in the Countryside) in any case; you may wish to simply refer to these policies.</p>	<p>Text amended to remove this statement.</p>
	<p><u>Page 9: Temporary Agricultural Workers – Policy 004:</u> Concern in relation to the inclusion of this policy specifically for this site. Policy 37 (Accommodation for Agricultural and other Rural Workers) of the Chichester Local Plan would allow for the assessment of any such forthcoming proposals and therefore the policy is not required and regarded as duplication. There is also concern that the current hostel-type accommodation for workers on this site, which has an agricultural restriction, could be lost to temporary worker and converted to general accommodation. If general housing (whether or not</p>	<p>STC Wish to retain this policy as it is specific to a location within the Parish, but outside the Settlement Boundary.</p>

	<p>for local people) is allowed, this would be outside the settlement area and would not, in normal circumstances, be allowed.</p>	
	<p><u>Page 10: Medical and Health services provision:</u> Is Policy 005 aimed just at supporting medical and health services provision as the text above makes wider reference to other services? May need to amend the text to reflect the policy and move some of the text to the Background section or alternatively rewrite this section.</p>	<p>References to 'other services' removed.</p>
	<p><u>Policy 006</u> – suggest including reference to ‘as a theatre or cinema or some other form of community use has been explored....’</p>	<p>It is felt that 'some other form of community use' is too broad and open to mis-interpretation. Text amended to '.....theatre, cinema or performance space has been explored ...'</p>
	<p><u>Page 11: Open spaces:</u> This section needs some further careful consideration. As drafted it is not clear what the Town Council/NP is seeking to achieve. The village green status for the Oval Field is now in place and the protection that goes with that status has now been conferred on the site. Policy 007 refers to ‘open green spaces’ but it is not clear if the intention is to designate the listed spaces as ‘local green space’ in accordance with the requirements of the NPPF (paragraphs 76-78). If so then this designation would provide its own protection for the sites and the policy as worded would be at odds with the objective of the NPPF designation. It is suggested that the text ‘Within these designated areas, development related to sport, open space, recreational and educational facilities will be encouraged’ is removed as this would not comply with the NPPF intent where it states ‘Local policy for managing development within a Local Green Space should be consistent with policy for Green Belts.’ Effectively there are two approaches which need to be separated out. Support for proposals for the provision of sport, open space, recreational and educational facilities provided they comply with the Local Plan and other Selsey NP policies and the issue around protection for relevant designated Local Green Spaces. The last paragraph is also a different issue and should be separated out. Is this related to potential loss of open space or a different policy aimed at</p>	<p>Text amended to refer to 'recreational spaces' rather than 'open green spaces', so as not to conflict with the NPPF, and/or Local Plan.</p>

	‘essential infrastructure’ in itself? Again this needs some further consideration as to what is intended and what restrictions/ criteria may be relevant.	
	<u>Page 11 – Policy 008</u> : Greenlinks across the Manhood (GLaM) only refers to cycle and pedestrian links, it would be helpful if this was clarified with some supporting text.	This policy has been revised to 'Proposals for cross peninsular links will be supported.'
	Unclear what is meant by final bullet point; does an alternative route exist as this refers to ‘maintain’ or is the intention to try and provide an alternative route?	An alternative route for Emergency Services already exists. Text amended to clarify.
	<u>Policy 009</u> – this supports the considerable work the community is undertaking to bring this infrastructure aspiration to fruition. Should this include an indication of what (if any) type of development should contribute to the cycle link or is the intention just to put down a support marker?	The intention of is this policy to be a 'support marker'.
	<u>Page 13 – Economy Policy 010</u> : This policy could be strengthened, for example by including reference to the need for marketing in accordance with Appendix E of the Local Plan and reference to the need for viability appraisal work.	STC consider that the current wording is sufficiently robust.
	<u>Page 14 – Retail Centres Policy 012</u> : The policy needs some further work, particularly with regard to the first bullet point. It would be helpful if the policy set out the identified centres and referred to their identification on the map. The policy needs to be consistent with Policy 29 (Settlement Hubs and Village Centres) of the Local Plan (for example see reference to retail and local need) and the NP text and policy need to reflect each other.	The text of this policy has been revised to fully identify the retail centres.
	<u>Policy 013</u> : This should comply with Local Plan Policy 29 (Settlement Hubs and Village Centres); suggest the NP policy is reconsidered in this context. Also the last paragraph is likely to be contrary to Policy 45 (Development in the Countryside) of the Local Plan. If the intention is for protection of the SPA subject to survey then this may be better included as a separate policy for ecology/biodiversity.	This policy does not suggest that any development would be supported or encouraged outside of the Settlement Boundary.
	<u>Page 16 – Summary</u> : There is no indication where the NP identifies ‘currently undeveloped brownfield sites’ (see also comments under Part 2 Page 41). Further to the points raised above in relation to open spaces, the text referring to ‘local green spaces’ is inconsistent with the NP Policy 007 as drafted.	Reference to brownfield sites removed as this NP doesn’t identify any. Reference to 'local green spaces' also removed.

	<p><u>Page 17 - Appendix I:</u> the reference to ‘existing settlement boundary’ should be altered to refer to ‘CDC Local Plan settlement boundary 1999’ or similar. Also rather than ‘proposed’ settlement boundary it may be more accurate to refer to ‘amended’ settlement boundary.</p>	<p>Amended to refer to '1999 boundary' and to 'Revised boundary'.</p>
	<p><u>Page 18 – Appendix II:</u> This may need to be amended to reflect changes to the open space policy and text as set out above. A NP policy reference for the retail centres may also be helpful in the key.</p>	<p>The map key has been amended.</p>
	<p><b>Part 2 History, Design and Guidance</b>  General: There is a need to edit this part of the documentation carefully and for its role in relation to the NP to be clear. As it stands it is not clear, for example, what the intention of the Design Guidance considerations are; are they to be progressed towards SPD or to remain as suggestions for developers/landowners etc.? Should there be cross references from the NP policy document to examples in Part 2?  There is also need for the Part 2 document to be brought up to date. Some changes have been made but the old wording still remains and this will need to be checked throughout the documentation. There is no longer a Design Code in the NP document beyond the requirements of Policy 001 and therefore some amendments will be required to Part 2 to take this into account. Also there is a need for updating in terms the various projects referred to in the text; the aspirations should be reflected in the list of projects identified by the Town Council for the CDC Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) and Infrastructure Business Plan (IBP)?</p>	<p>Part 2 is intended as ‘General suggestions’ to developers. The text has been reviewed and revised to clarify and update where appropriate.</p>
	<p><u>Page 7:</u> this text requires updating in terms of what has and is being built and what are the future aspirations.</p>	
	<p><u>Page 9:</u> what is the date of the consultation findings referred to? Are these still relevant?</p>	
	<p><u>Pages 11 and 12:</u> Date and source of map would be helpful; is this the most up to date version?</p>	
	<p><u>Page 12:</u> some of the text is overly restrictive and needs amending (e.g. every roof should be covered with photovoltaic panels etc.....)</p>	

	<p><u>Page 13:</u> the date of this consultation would be helpful, again has this been reconfirmed if some time ago?</p>	
	<p><u>Page 14:</u> again some editing may be of help in terms of development may be ‘encouraged’ but cannot necessarily be ‘expected’ to deliver some of the requirements.</p>	
	<p><u>Page 15:</u> reference is made to survey results from October 2012; it would be helpful to show that this is still relevant. Some of the measures included in relation to road safety extend beyond the remit of the NP. This text needs some amendment.</p>	
	<p><u>Page 16:</u> Libraries - the English needs checking in the first sentence.  Parking – the NP cannot influence parking charges.  Access to the A27 and congestion on the A27- does this reflect the most recent round of A27 consultation or previous older consultations and findings?</p>	
	<p><u>Page 18:</u> not sure how far the NP can deliver getting people out of their private cars and using alternative forms of transport; may need some rewording of the text.</p>	
	<p><u>Page 20:</u> text relating to the local plan needs updating in para 6</p>	
	<p><u>Page 22 and Page 26:</u> may help to reflect the position with regard to the rebuilding of the school following the fire last year?</p>	
	<p><u>Page 23:</u> Housing Needs – para 2 refers to June 2013 and a figure of 448; this should be updated to refer to March 2017 and 163 people.</p>	
	<p><u>Page 27:</u> suggest adjusting text as referred to for Part 1 (along the lines of Page 3 – Background 1st paragraph).</p>	
	<p><u>Page 29:</u> this section relating to design considerations needs some reconsideration on the basis of comments made above. For example, text should read ‘will be encouraged’ rather than ‘must’; again the list of requirements is too restrictive and needs some amendments.</p>	

	<u>Pages 31, 34 and 35:</u> these sections may benefit from some further consideration in terms of achievability.	
	<u>Page 36: Live-work units:</u> Reducing traffic is to be encouraged, but it needs to be clear what is the nature of live work units proposed and what justification/evidence there is for them. How would they be monitored and checked against misuse?	
	<u>Page 37:</u> Section 5 – 1st bullet point – Crime Impact Statements and Design Out Crime Assessments are not required for applications and this text needs to be amended.	
	<u>Page 40:</u> the reference to this Design Guide implies that it forms part of the NP; this should be revised to make it clear that it provides advice and guidance but it is not part of the NP or policy.	
	<u>Page 41:</u> Brownfield sites and windfall developments - there no longer appear to be any brownfield sites identified in the NP. This section therefore needs some updating to reflect the current position. Similarly the Community Right to Build section also needs to be updated to reflect the current position.	
	<u>Page 42:</u> Design and Planning guidance – this section needs updating on the basis of the comments made above.	
	<u>Page 43:</u> should some of this section be in the NP itself? Again may need some updating but if this helps to provide the context for the NP then it may help to move it to Part 1.	
	<u>Page 44:</u> Appendix I – what is the date for this information? The notes (Page 46) suggest that it is not recent and may be sourced from somewhere other than to reflect the most up to date position in relation to the Town Council’s projects identified to CDC as part of the CDC Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) and Infrastructure Business Plan (IBP)? Again may need some revision.	
<b>Stagecoach South</b>	No Response Received	

<b>Western Sussex Hospitals Trust</b>	No Response Received	
<b>Chichester Harbour Conservancy</b>	The Conservancy's only interest in this matter would be if any housing allocations proposed or extension of the settlement boundary came within 5.6km of the AONB boundary, whereupon Policy 50 would engage to mitigate for any ecological impact from recreational disturbance from occupiers of newly formed dwellings. Having checked the relevant map, Selsey is not within this 5.6km buffer zone.	Noted.
<b>Thames Water Utilities Ltd</b>	No Response Received	
<b>Southern Water</b>	Thank you for consulting us on the above named document. Southern Water is the statutory sewerage undertaker for Selsey. We were consulted on previous versions of the Selsey NDP and are pleased that our representations have been addressed. We wish to make no further representations at this stage. We would be grateful if you could keep us informed of the progress that is made.	Noted.
<b>Havant Borough Council</b>	No Response Received	
<b>Portsmouth Water Ltd</b>	No Response Received	
<b>Waverley Borough Council</b>	No Response Received	
<b>Sussex Wildlife Trust</b>	No Response Received	
<b>Historic England</b>	Thank you for your e-mail of 17th February advising Historic England of the consultation on the Pre-Submission version of the Selsey Neighbourhood Plan 2017. We are pleased to make the following comments.	<i>The Selsey Neighbourhood Plan – Annex B – Audit – Background Evidence</i> addresses these issues.



	<p>Whilst we welcome and support Policy 001 in principle, the requirements for new development to recognise the “distinctive character” of the Parish and for materials in any new development to complement the “established vernacular” seems rather at odds with the opening sentence in the section on Design and Heritage that “there is no dominant architectural character or vernacular style to provide a reference for future development”.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
	<p>However, if Selsey is characterised by “quite distinct areas defined by the different styles of architecture prevalent at the time of construction”, then perhaps Policy 001 should refer to these distinct character areas. We note the character assessment that has been undertaken for the Plan area as set out in Part 3, and it would be helpful to have clearer links between this section and policy and Part 3.</p>	<p>The <i>Selsey Neighbourhood Plan – Annex B – Audit – Background Evidence</i> addresses these issues.</p>
	<p>Nevertheless, Historic England welcomes the character assessment as we consider that Neighbourhood Development Plans should be underpinned by a thorough understanding of the character and special qualities of the area covered by the Plan, in accordance with paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework, which states that Local and Neighbourhood Plans should “... develop robust and comprehensive policies that set out the quality of development that will be expected for the area. Such policies should be based on stated objectives for the future of the area and an understanding and evaluation of its defining characteristics”.</p>	<p>The <i>Selsey Neighbourhood Plan – Annex B – Audit – Background Evidence</i> addresses these issues.</p>
	<p>We would like to see more detail in the Plan on the historic environment of Selsey: the first sentence on page 2 tantalisingly states that “Selsey can boast an impressive collection of listed buildings”, but no information is given on these (other than in Part 3 of the Plan).</p>	<p>The <i>Selsey Neighbourhood Plan – Annex B – Audit – Background Evidence</i> addresses these issues.</p>
	<p>The National Planning Practice Guidance considers that it would be helpful for Neighbourhood Plans to include enough information “about local heritage to guide decisions and put broader strategic heritage policies from the local plan into action at a neighbourhood scale” and “about local non-designated heritage assets including sites of archaeological interest to guide decisions”</p>	<p>Noted. The two parts, previously known as ‘<i>History, Design and Guidance</i>’ and ‘<i>Audit</i>’ are now Annex’s to the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>
	<p>We welcome and support Policy 002, although again the issue of the character of existing development arises. The policy refers to Conservation Areas but the opening text to this section suggests that there is only one. We (and the National Planning Policy Framework) refer to the “significance” of historic</p>	<p>There are two conservation areas and revisions to the text emphasise this.</p>

	buildings and sites, so we would prefer the third bullet point to say “...significance, local distinctiveness and character.....”.	
	We welcome and support Policy 006 and the reference in the vision for 2029 to the design code set out in the Neighbourhood Plan helping protect and enhance the town’s iconic buildings and heritage assets. However, we can find no reference in the design code to the conservation and enhancement of the significance of heritage assets.	Noted. The two parts, previously known as ‘ <i>History, Design and Guidance</i> ’ and ‘ <i>Audit</i> ’ are now Annex’s to the Neighbourhood Plan.
<b>Defence Estates (MOD)</b>	No Response Received	
<b>Scotia Gas Networks</b>	No Response Received	
<b>Network Rail</b>	No Response Received	
<b>Environment Agency</b>	Thank you consulting the Environment Agency on Selsey Neighbourhood Plan. Having reviewed the document we have the following comments to make;	Noted.
	We understand that the 2 sites proposed within the document to meet the 150 homes target allocated in Chichester Local Plan have already gained planning permission. We are therefore not providing comment on these in this response.	Noted.
	We are pleased to see that throughout your Neighbourhood Plan you recognise the importance of climate change and the natural environment, specifically the Medmerry Managed Realignment Scheme. The plan provides strong guidance and detailed information on climate change, flood risk and water efficiency. We are also pleased to see the water quality impacts of surface water are considered alongside the flood risk.	Noted.
	We are very supportive of the content.	Noted.

<p><b>Highways England</b></p>	<p>Thank you for your email dated 17 February 2017, advising Highways England of the above consultation and seeking a response no later than 3 April.</p> <p>Highways England has been appointed by the Secretary of State for Transport as strategic highway company under the provisions of the Infrastructure Act 2015 and is the highway authority, traffic authority and street authority for the strategic road network (SRN). The SRN is a critical national asset and as such Highways England works to ensure that it operates and is managed in the public interest, both in respect of current activities and needs as well as in providing effective stewardship of its long-term operation and integrity.</p> <p>Highways England will be concerned with proposals that have the potential to impact on the safe and efficient operation of the SRN, in this case with particular reference to the A27 in Sussex.</p> <p>Having examined the above document, we note the Town Council's comments with regard to improvements on the A27 at Chichester. Highways England will work with partners to implement improvements to the A27 to accommodate development. These are outlined in the document "Local Plan: Transport Study of Strategic Development Options and Sustainable Transport Measures", dated March 2013 and available on Chichester District Council's website (<a href="http://www.chichester.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=18647&amp;p=0">http://www.chichester.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=18647&amp;p=0</a>).</p> <p>In addition to the A27 junction improvements above, it is noted that the Town Council would potentially like to see the creation of another access to the A27 Chichester Bypass from a spur road from either the A286 or the B2145. Highways England would not be agreeable to such a proposal as additional access would potentially create further issues on the operation of the A27 Chichester Bypass.</p> <p>Finally, in accordance with normal national policy and procedure we would also expect to be consulted on any applications or proposals that could impact on the safety or operation of the SRN.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p><b>Sport England</b></p>	<p>Thank you for consulting Sport England on the above Neighbourhood Consultation.</p> <p>Planning Policy in the National Planning Policy Framework identifies how the planning system can play an important role in facilitating social</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

	<p>interaction and creating healthy, inclusive communities. Encouraging communities to become more physically active through walking, cycling, informal recreation and formal sport plays an important part in this process and providing enough sports facilities of the right quality and type and in the right places is vital to achieving this aim. This means positive planning for sport, protection from unnecessary loss of sports facilities and an integrated approach to providing new housing and employment land and community facilities provision is important.</p> <p>It is important therefore that the Neighbourhood Plan reflects national policy for sport as set out in the above document with particular reference to Pars 73 and 74 to ensure proposals comply with National Planning Policy. It is also important to be aware of Sport England’s role in protecting playing fields and the presumption against the loss of playing fields (see link below), as set out in our national guide, ‘A Sporting Future for the Playing Fields of England – Planning Policy Statement’. <a href="http://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/planning-for-sport/development-management/planning-applications/playing-field-land/">http://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/planning-for-sport/development-management/planning-applications/playing-field-land/</a></p> <p>If new sports facilities are being proposed Sport England recommend you ensure such facilities are fit for purpose and designed in accordance with our design guidance notes. <a href="http://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/tools-guidance/design-and-cost-guidance/">http://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/tools-guidance/design-and-cost-guidance/</a></p>	
<b>South East Water</b>	No Response Received.	
<b>British Telecommunications</b>	No Response Received.	
<b>West Sussex County Council</b>	No Response Received.	

<b>Southern Electric Power Distribution plc</b>	No Response Received.	
<b>Natural England</b>	<p>Natural England does not have any substantial comments on the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>As the Neighbourhood Plan does not allocate new sites for residential development, there will be no impacts on internationally designated sites (Pagham Harbour Special Protection Area (SPA) and Chichester to Langstone Harbours SPA) through increased recreational disturbance. In this respect, we welcome the recognition of potential recreational disturbance impact in Policy 004.</p> <p>Natural England welcomes the efforts to increase the sustainability of buildings in the Design Guidance (Part 2 of the Neighbourhood Plan).</p>	Noted.
<b>Arun District Council</b>	No Response Received.	
<b>Marine Management Organisation</b>	<p>We believe that the document has been prepared to a high standard, but we would like some additional references to the MMO as the marine planning authority for England, the Marine Policy Statement and the emerging South Marine Plans.</p> <p>The Marine Management Organisation (MMO) is a non-departmental public body responsible for the management of England's marine area on behalf of the UK government. The MMO's delivery functions are; marine planning, marine licensing, wildlife licensing and enforcement, marine protected area management, marine emergencies, fisheries management and issuing European grants.</p> <p><u>Marine Licensing</u> Activities taking place below the mean high water mark may require a marine licence in accordance with the Marine and Coastal Access Act (MCAA) 2009. Such activities include the construction, alteration or improvement of any works, dredging, or a deposit or removal of a substance or object below the mean high water springs mark or in any tidal</p>	As the Neighbourhood Plan does not cover Marine use this is not relevant to the NBH Plan.

river to the extent of the tidal influence. You can also apply to the MMO for consent under the Electricity Act 1989 (as amended) for offshore generating stations between 1 and 100 megawatts in England and parts of Wales. The MMO is also the authority responsible for processing and determining harbour orders in England, and for some ports in Wales, and for granting consent under various local Acts and orders regarding harbours. A wildlife licence is also required for activities that that would affect a UK or European protected marine species.

Marine Planning As the marine planning authority for England the MMO is responsible for preparing marine plans for English inshore and offshore waters. At its landward extent, a marine plan will apply up to the mean high water springs mark, which includes the tidal extent of any rivers. As marine plan boundaries extend up to the level of the mean high water spring tides mark, there will be an overlap with terrestrial plans which generally extend to the mean low water springs mark. Marine plans will inform and guide decision makers on development in marine and coastal areas. On 2 April 2014 the East Inshore and Offshore marine plans were published, becoming a material consideration for public authorities with decision making functions. The East Inshore and East Offshore Marine Plans cover the coast and seas from Flamborough Head to Felixstowe. For further information on how to apply the East Inshore and Offshore Plans please visit our Marine Information System. The MMO is currently in the process of developing marine plans for the South Inshore and Offshore Plan Areas and has a requirement to develop plans for the remaining 7 marine plan areas by 2021. Planning documents for areas with a coastal influence may wish to make reference to the MMO's licensing requirements and any relevant marine plans to ensure that necessary regulations are adhered to. For marine and coastal areas where a marine plan is not currently in place, we advise local authorities to refer to the Marine Policy Statement for guidance on any planning activity that includes a section of coastline or tidal river. All public authorities taking authorisation or enforcement decisions that affect or might affect the UK marine area must do so in accordance with the Marine and Coastal Access Act and the UK Marine Policy Statement unless relevant considerations

	<p>indicate otherwise. Local authorities may also wish to refer to our online guidance and the Planning Advisory Service soundness self-assessment checklist.</p> <p><u>Minerals and waste plans and local aggregate assessments</u> If you are consulting on a mineral/waste plan or local aggregate assessment, the MMO recommend reference to marine aggregates is included and reference to be made to the documents below:</p> <p>The Marine Policy Statement (MPS), section 3.5 which highlights the importance of marine aggregates and its supply to England's (and the UK) construction industry.</p> <p>The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) which sets out policies for national (England) construction minerals supply.</p> <p>The Managed Aggregate Supply System (MASS) which includes specific references to the role of marine aggregates in the wider portfolio of supply.</p> <p>The National and regional guidelines for aggregates provision in England 2005-2020 predict likely aggregate demand over this period including marine supply.</p> <p>The NPPF informed MASS guidance requires local mineral planning authorities to prepare Local Aggregate Assessments, these assessments have to consider the opportunities and constraints of all mineral supplies into their planning regions – including marine. This means that even land-locked counties, may have to consider the role that marine sourced supplies (delivered by rail or river) play – particularly where land based resources are becoming increasingly constrained.</p>	
<b>Coastal West Sussex</b>	No Response Received.	
<b>Office of Rail Regulation</b>	No Response Received.	
<b>Civil Aviation Authority</b>	No Response Received.	

<b>Hampshire County Council</b>	No Response Received.	
<b>Coastal West Sussex Clinical Commissioning Group</b>	No Response Received.	
<b>Sussex Local Nature Partnership</b>	No Response Received.	
<b>Chichester Harbour Conservancy</b>	No Response Received.	
<b>South Downs National Park Authority</b>	No Response Received.	
<b>Sussex and Surrey Police</b>	No Response Received.	
<b>South East Coast NHS Foundation Ambulance Trust</b>	No Response Received.	
<b>Surrey County Council</b>	Thank you for consulting Surrey County Council on the Selsey Neighbourhood Plan. We have no comments on the document.	Noted.
<b>East Hampshire District Council</b>	No Response Received.	
<b>Southern Railway</b>	No Response Received.	
<b>NHS England</b>	No Response Received.	



<p><b>Sports Dream/Youth Dream/Arts Dream</b></p>	<p>Thank you for the considerable work that has gone into the production of the revised Neighbourhood Plan. Warm congratulations to all concerned. Could I just point out a few things please?</p> <p>1 we welcome the constant reference to flood prevention and sea defences. Flood Active Group Selsey is a voluntary activity supporting this priority.</p> <p>2 we welcome the stress on community partnerships and especially the desire as a town to take more responsibility for delivering our own services in response to need.</p> <p>3 we welcome the importance given throughout to Eco tourism and cycling with the attendant support for the Selsey to Chichester Greenway.</p> <p>4 the provision of Youth Workers in Selsey is now shared between Snak Skak where the youth worker engages in generic work and the Bridge where six staff offer mental health and emotional wellbeing services to young people and families.</p> <p>5 Arts Dream is now seeking performance space and an arts centre of which a museum may be a part. The old Pavilion is now being developed by its own trust.</p> <p>6 Sports Dream has been able, in partnership with STC , to develop the new storage facility on the recreation ground.</p> <p>7 Seal school no longer uses its field for weekend community use.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
	<p>8 please could mention be made of Selsey Community Watch offering a joined up partnership service to vulnerable older people and beginning a project to deliver a dementia friendly town.</p>	<p>Noted as a concern, however this does not form part of the scope of the NBHP</p>
	<p>9 could there be a separate mention of mental health service provision through different agencies?</p>	<p>Noted as a concern, however this does not form part of the scope of the NBHP</p>
	<p>10 Youth Dream is happy to continue to lead youth facility development in the town especially through the Selsey Youth Network.</p> <p>11 STC and others deserve praise for new skate park provision and other new playground upgrades.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p><b>Timothy Morley</b></p>	<p>I think the draft plan is an excellent document, well-written, comprehensive and well-produced. However, there are two points that I think would be valuable to emphasise a bit more:</p>	

	<p>1. Cycle Route - The desire to support a new cycle route to Chichester is mentioned, which is good. What does not come across, though, is the urgency with which a safer route for cyclists is needed. The B2145 is highly unpleasant and very dangerous to cycle along, thus effectively cutting road cyclists off from Chichester and beyond. The road is not wide enough for motorists to overtake cyclists safely in the face of oncoming traffic, therefore either motorists get frustrated and impatient, or they overtake dangerously, putting lives at risk.</p>	A cycle route, the Selsey to Chichester Greenway, is already being actively pursued and is supported by Selsey Town Council.
	<p>2. Diving - Selsey is a nationally recognised and important diving venue, with many wrecks and reefs to explore from the shore or from boats. The needs of divers are mentioned in the Audit section, but the economic and leisure development opportunities that diving could bring to Selsey are not highlighted. I think that they should be, in a similar vein to the paragraphs about the RSPB Pagham reserve.</p>	Noted as a concern, however this does not form part of the scope of the NBP
<b>John Connor</b>	I've just had the my first look at the document; unfortunately, in Part 3 (Audit), on p5 the photo at top right has been mistitled. It is titled "Merryfield", but in fact it is a photo of "Marisfield Place".	Amended
<b>Jerry Goodman</b>	Thanks for the consultation prompt. My comments on the 2017 plan are as follows :-	
	<p>There should be a strengthened policy to reduce the amount of unnecessary street furniture supported by :</p> <p>a) A free at point of distribution, local 'map' that is widely available in the town that will inform and direct visitors to its attractions and facilities. (One similar to the Chichester City version, cost deferred by advertising revenue.)</p> <p>b) b) Town wide free Wi-Fi that enables 'hand held' device access to an events timetable, the location of town attractions / facilities and mapping as in (a)</p>	Noted as a concern, however this does not form part of the scope of the NBH Plan.

	<p>A Green policy, to conserve resources, that should be included as :-</p> <p>a) The declaration of a "Selsey Dark Sky" policy, which includes a presumption against any above horizontal / upward light spill, excessive lumen powered general street and advertising lighting beyond 2230 or business closure times. (Sadly, the Park Road and ASDA developments will create yet another significant light pollution hot spot.)</p>	Noted as a concern, however this does not form part of the scope of the NBH Plan.
	<p>In terms of the access for a walked Coastal Path, within the neighbourhood plan, it is NE that sets the path and proposes the route. Aspirations for the coastal path are going to be met, by 2020, and thanks to NE's coastal access duties under the Marine and Coastal Access Act 2009, it is already in the process of implementing it. The new coastal path will have the new and already adopted National signage scheme – as it will be a new National trail – and so it will meet the signage aspirations within the plan. The local plan should be altered to take account of this. There are also existing WSCC standards of general footpath signage that are well recognised and which, when maintained, are clear, informative and widely understood.</p>	Noted as a concern, however this does not form part of the scope of the NBH Plan.
<b>Mr &amp; Mrs Crequer</b>	<p>1. We understand that no "council" housing is being included to reduce the number of people on the register 2. Will the new medical centre be built before the houses in the new development? 3. Will the local sewage works cope with the extra pressure of these new developments? 4. With the difficulty experienced to provide the cycle path along the B2145, will land be available to take out sharp bends and install a tram track on to the A27? 5. Able residents will shop in selsey but will go further afield for many reasons, trying to create an insular society in selsey to avoid the use of the B2145 seems unrealistic. 6. Would M&amp;S come to selsey? Bognor is a larger centre &amp; M&amp;S arent there. WE have a good hardware store and other good stores which should make a better living with extra selsey residents, without having competition from multi-stores.</p>	Noted.
<b>Stan Keeler</b>	<p>1.A well drafted document with some forward thinking ideas. Good emphasis on solar and work/live. 2. Off street parking ratio of 1 to 3 units seems to be too low. 3. On page 9 a property next to Home Farm has been omitted even though it has been there for the 110 years " the Studio" The council should take a good look at the whole site as it is overdeveloped and "seasonal"</p>	Noted.

	workers have become "permanent" and work at park farm. Validity of caravans as permanent homes should be looked at.	
<b>C Joy</b>	Road marking outside of East Beach shop (parking/road).When dark drive down East Beach ward to shops, suddenly foot path sticks out in to start of one way. Cars parking on grass verge left hand side of Merisfield Place opposite NO 16 - 24. Put post in to grass to stop this. Merisfield Place should have a name sign put up to show where it is. ( Beach Road end). Holes in road and too many downside roads.	Noted as a concern, however this does not form part of the scope of the NBH Plan.
<b>D McEnroe</b>	Why are 250 houses being built instead of 150 that were allocated to Selsey? Too much traffic - schools will be too full and health centre will be too busy. Road repairs need to be looked at.	The 150 homes allocated to Selsey in the Chichester Local Plan are only a minimum requirement.
<b>Humphreys</b>	The thought that so many houses are still planned when the "improvements to the A27 road have come to a halt is dreadful. Building on the remaining greenfield land should not happen.	Noted as a concern, however this does not form part of the scope of the NBH Plan.
<b>Kym Macdonald</b>	We really need street lights on the main road in and out of selsey, it is 2017 now. Also we need less cafes but need more shops to buy household items such as bedding, towels and clothing and shoes to save people travelling to chichester	Noted as a concern, however this does not form part of the scope of the NBH Plan.
<b>Green</b>	Glad to see the cycle path to chichester is a priority, and also the coastal path. Well done on all of your hard work	Noted.
<b>Steve</b>	Concerned about the possibility of forcing development boundary, when money talks people do not matter, lack of infrastructure to support the already over crowded town.	Noted.
<b>Mr &amp; Mrs Condon</b>	Having moved to Selsey 3 years ago, we were told of these things and apart from new developments it seems to be a slow progression. With regard to pull ins on the main road, surely if these are done it will help with emergency services or to incorporate an ambulance at the fire station.	Noted.
<b>Cloud 9</b>	The pavillion will be wonderful when restored, however with the loss of the academy, we & SACOS no longer have a venue to perform in. The school when rebuilt has no stage & the pavillion will be too small. How can the council help or we will be forced to move out of selsey.	Noted as a concern, however this does not form part of the scope of the NBH Plan.

<b>Carol Aartsen</b>	Selsey should be supporting the community/people. Help, extra funding is needed for the selsey shops, with outrageous rents, how can any business survive, with shops like asda/walmart who are worth 40 billion dollars what chance do other retailers british farmers and workers stand.I like some of the ideas a NHS Dentist more to be done on the highstreet, some good ideas. I would like to see more of a police presence, i very rarely see the wardens or any sign of the police. I like living in selsey, its the people and community not the greedy corporations. The solar farm is good as it gives back to selsey and we need a clothes shop. Thank you for the work you do.	Noted as a concern, however this does not form part of the scope of the NBH Plan.
<b>Mike Edwards</b>	Doctors surgery is inadequate for present population which is now going to be increased by new developments.	Noted as a concern, however this does not form part of the scope of the NBH Plan.
<b>Donna Johnson (Selsey Carers.)</b>	Superb! A great deal of though has gone into this. So good to know that people care and our town will go forward with a clear plan.	Noted.
<b>Paul Furlonger</b>	Selsey is becoming a ghost town. Too many restaurants and over payed councillors. Sort your selves out selsey.	Noted.
<b>Marilynne Prigg</b>	Retail/highstreet. Thought could be given to use of hard to let shop premises as "pop-up" shops. This could be of interest to young selsey inhabitants, and cover a variety of merchandise	Noted as a concern, however this does not form part of the scope of the NBH Plan.
<b>Mr M D Rose</b>	Very informative and hope we can get the funding for all or most of the projects. As I live in Kingsway if harbour goes ahead would we be informed of all of the processes and updates. Many thanks.	Noted.
<b>Mike Edwards</b>	As discussed with Mike Beal 1 Provisision of broadband and phone line to new developments (we have waited 9 months) 2 Policing of dog poo needs on prom needs to be improved. 3 Excessive flood lights throughout night somewhere near Academy.	Noted as a concern, however this does not form part of the scope of the NBH Plan.
<b>Susan Faldo</b>	Reinstate the Selsey tram and enlarge the medical centre (more doctors)	Noted as a concern, however this does not form part of the scope of the NBH Plan.
<b>Karen Dunford</b>	Horsefield road needs resurfacing if the farm road development goes ahead they need to remove the bollards at Paddock Lane, as the cars already fly down Colt Street we need an NHS dentist. Colt Street needs traffic calming	Noted as a concern, however this does not form part of the scope of the NBH Plan.

	put in place its not a race track! Also need cheaper bus fares as it costs over £35 per week for my two children to go to school/college.	
<b>Pauline Woodcraft</b>	I have only just moved to the area and I am shocked to find out that there is only one access road in and out of Selsey! The site of lorries to natures way day and all night! Too many houses already for what could be a lovely resort. This little place cannot accommodate any more people especially families i.e schools, GPs etc Still that is England now -'what a shame'!!	Noted.
<b>Joan Taylor</b>	Road improvements should be a priority before more building. New houses should incorporate solar panels as standard.	Noted.
<b>D Goodenough</b>	I do not believe many of the wishful aims expressed here. I do not believe that housing will be created on mainly 'brownfield' sites.This is not borne out by recent developments on farmers fields. I do not believe that "local plans" will carry any weight with council government. Witness the permission for ASDA despite rejection by all three tiers of local government	Noted
<b>J Herbert</b>	No more houses. The B2145 needs upgrade we need more doctors and a 20 mile an hour speed limit in the town	Noted.
<b>P Carrington</b>	We live in Granary Lane and are concerned regarding the 68 houses alongside old farm road. We registered our objection to this earlier in the year. Our objections being existing planting and landscaping adjacent to our property which thawscraft have not maintained for the last 5/6 years. We would like someone to maintain this and wondered if the council would take it out. WSCC do cut the grass.	Noted.
<b>Roxanne Brazier</b>	10-20 mile an hour restrictions on roads. Using horsefield road from Colt Street on a regular basis. The speed the cars travel will one day kill or maim a child. School lane during teaching hours definatly needs to be reviewed.	Noted.
<b>S Jenkins</b>	Page 6:paragraph 1 states priority to infill and brownfield sites for the 150 homes that are being built on farmland, paragraph 2 giving the get-out clause. So the 150 homes position is a last resort. (paragraph 3?) so no houses off old farm road, Page 13 co-op prices are co-op prices throughout the country - they do not push prices up. If the chichester local plan (page 6) has allocated 150 homes which are being built (possible 249) why is there future housing	Noted.

	provision (page 23). Page 44 - projects soft play area for children. When budgens was built we were told the childrens play area would be reinstated, instead it has gone to the selsey centre site. There is no child play area to the west of the high street. The plan and presentation are much better than last time.	
<b>David Tindale</b>	Page 23 Location record for the bill Longacre is described as "un-adopted narrow road with grass verges and pavements" Access only. Longacre is adopted and has access at both ends .	Amended.
<b>Mr &amp; Mrs Bone</b>	The provision of a more comprehensive doctor/dentist/health care provision and care would considerably reduce local traffic and main routesto chichester. Building on flood plains is still happening despite local common knowledge regarding the land and chances of saturation being widely expressed. We need an arts centre/exhibition hall for continuous use instead of ad hoc usage in Town hall and Church halls.	Noted as a concern, however this does not form part of the scope of the NBH Plan.
<b>Barbara Shepherd</b>	As selsey is taking more than the 150 minimum new housing, we ought to have an alternative access route on the B2145. How about investigating the originally proposed dual carriageway from the fishbourne round about to Wittering with the spur off to selsey.	Noted as a concern, however this does not form part of the scope of the NBH Plan.
<b>G Trickey</b>	Page 20 "Selsey bill public house"no longer exists it was redeveloped into flats in 2016	Amended.
<b>A Rhodes</b>	will the sea wall defences receive funding for maintenance/upgrading in a similar way to the road for instance? We all know how reliant we are on it and with rising sea levels it is a concern... Is the wall designed for this or does it require a review and eventual "shoring up"?	Noted as a concern, however this does not form part of the scope of the NBH Plan.
<b>Paul Crozier</b>	No mention at all about the Marina/haven that if done properly could have a big impact on the regeneration of selsey. The withdrawing of funding for the A27 should put an immediate stop on any further house building in selsey. No northen route, no houses. Reduce rates & rents for the shops in selsey High street would regenerate selsey	Noted as a concern, however this does not form part of the scope of the NBH Plan.
<b>C Bennet</b>	We have many quite large empty stores/shops. Could we encourage a good clothes shop that is affordable for families with young children and also a decent affordable shoe shop. We need to bring in shops that are sustainable and useful to selseys growing families.	Noted as a concern, however this does not form part of the scope of the NBH Plan.

<b>M Taze</b>	A main improvement the road to chichester is a priority for most people. In my opinion we need no more supermarkets in selsey, keep our present shops, there are already free buses to Tesco and Sainsburys. This should cover the needs of people needing super markets. Making selsey bigger will change its whole character and it will be like anywhere else.	Noted.
<b>Helen Dean</b>	3rd bullet page 16 of summary:- I object strongly to the presumption that "we are happy to accept more housing" I don't believe that it reflects the views of selsey residents, particularly as we already have more than our allocated CDC quota. In fact I think it is foolhardy at best and should be withdrawn, particularly as we do not have the infrastructure to support our current housing population. Whilst applauding the design and handy bullet points (p3) these are not enforced and it therefore doesn't happen. Drift road development is a classic example. Similarly with policies and 005, 007 ,008 ,009 , 011 etc whilst applauding the sentiments its meaningless to say "will be supported" or "will be encouraged" unless the particular strategies are specified and delivered. Thank you for the opportunity to comment.	Noted
<b>Robin Kitchen</b>	No mention of Snakshak (pg15) p28 "but the potential lies on the greens and beachfront..." could be developed into more tourist/commercial enterprises etc. these are both used by dog walkers extensively. Will local residents be consulted before any new development. Plus I didn't find any mention of selsey haven in respect of the possible development.	Noted.
<b>R Bradley</b>	Expansion of selsey is inevitable and it has been thought through. My only concern at present is that the character of selsey and the traditional livelihoods such as fishing should not suffer for tourism. Tourism will be seasonal the other employments are year round. i have been reassured that the green in kingsway will not be built on.	Noted.
<b>S Goodenough</b>	we have already allowed park farm and drift field which fulfills any requirement for housing. What would be the secondary access for emergency vehicles? No more retail developments on open fields. Lifeboat house- iconic building which should be retained. ideal venue for the fish restaurants suggested in the neighbourhood plan. It defines selsey.	Noted.
<b>D Goodenough</b>	This appears to want to convert selsey into a facsimile of any high street with extraordinarily expensive rents and buisness rates so that only major chains	Noted.



	can afford premises. Thus your wish for Robert Dyas and Marks and Spencers to arrive! How many more supermarkets?	
<b>Mr R Burdon</b>	Support for the infrastructure projects. 1. Ferry bend B2145 improvements. 2. High street layout changes. 3. East beach Green enhancement- plus development of better facilities. Any improvement to the sea front at East beach will be welcome!	Noted.
<b>Rose Guscott</b>	I'm interested to note p6 of "The plan" that greenfield sites should be used as last resort! A large proportion of greenfield has been used to build the new ASDA & Drift Road houses - doesn't seem very environmentally sound to me. A traffic management scheme is urgently needed Sidlesham is having a bad time too as a knock on effect. Any scheme to help with school traffic would be helpful. i wondered if a school bus could take the selsey children from sidlesham primary to a central point like the carpark adjacent to the playing area in Hillfield. Many children are being transported to and from school in individual cars. Any changes in volume of traffic would be of benefit. Cyclists are holding the traffic flow up more and more at their peril. Cycle lanes are expensive but would be a vital assist.	Noted
<b>Chrissy Gosiewski</b>	Any new retail needs staff parking - situation in Manor Road even though checkatrade now have staff parking is not tenable. More bus Shelters or seating for the elderly are required. B2145 at ferry corner improvement is urgent as there has been another car over the edge recently.	Noted.
<b>Paul Henry</b>	Overall I think the Council has produced a good plan and it is well presented. I do think, however, that there should be some changes and improvements. I do not comment below on everything that I think is good and to be supported but concentrate on the most significant items.	Noted.
	1) Part 1 Page 3. Although the 2nd para rightly highlights the importance or renewable energy and reducing the carbon footprint, this is not included in Policy 001. I strongly submit that it should be included, perhaps even including all the points 1-5 of page 29 of Section 2, which are exactly the things that the council and any builders should be doing. Insisting on buildings having energy- efficiency built in (and not retro-fitted) through wall, floor and roof insulation, solar and heat sink sources etc is as important as ensuring they minimise the impact of flooding. Assuming the Council	Noted as a concern, however this does not form part of the scope of the NBH Plan.

	<p>agrees as it seems to from elsewhere in the Plan sections, it should be included as part of Policy 001. The Town Council's Policy on renewable energy is mentioned on Section 2 Page 13, but it is not clear to me whether this means the Council already has one (in which case why can't I find it available on the Council's website?) or it is actually the statements on Page 14 of Section 2. If it is the latter I suggest: a) those statements should go further, by at least integrating with the points about building design set out in the first two paras above in Comment 1; b) make it an explicit Policy in addition to the 13 set out. This might be especially important if the Council really means it when it says in Section 2 Pages 12 -14 that Selsey could and should be at the forefront in developing alternative renewable energy sources and behaviours in energy use, can be a testing ground etc.</p>	
	<p>The Town Council's Policy on renewable energy is mentioned on Section 2 Page 13, but it is not clear to me whether this means the Council already has one (in which case why can't I find it available on the Council's website?) or it is actually the statements on Page 14 of Section 2. If it is the latter I suggest: a) those statements should go further, by at least integrating with the points about building design set out in the first two paras above in Comment 1; b) make it an explicit Policy in addition to the 13 set out. This might be especially important if the Council really means it when it says in Section 2 Pages 12 -14 that Selsey could and should be at the forefront in developing alternative renewable energy sources and behaviours in energy use, can be a testing ground etc.</p>	<p>Noted as a concern, however this does not form part of the scope of the NBH Plan.</p>
	<p>2) Part 1 Page 3 Policy 001 - Building Height It is absolutely right for the Council to insist that no building should be more than 3 storeys high, but this should not be watered down elsewhere as it seems it might be by the reference on page 42 of Section 2 to unless there are exceptional reasons; this latter clause should be deleted from Section 2 page 42.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
	<p>3) Part 1 Page 4 I suggest that the excellent point about maintaining Selsey's semi-rural character mentioned in Section 2 Page 34 should also be included as part of the Policy and that, for new design and development and refurbishment of roads and paths, the planting of trees is promoted as policy. But I'd suggest further that, as in some other countries, we plant fruit trees</p>	<p>Noted as a concern, however this does not form part of the scope of the NBH Plan.</p>

	such as apple trees that all the community can benefit from, rather than just ornamental trees.	
	4) Part 1 Page 11 I suggest that either as part of Policy 007 or an 007b, the Council should state that it's policy is to maintain the Village Green status of the Oval Field and not allow any building or infringement of it. The fact that this is not stated in unequivocal terms leads me to wonder if the proposal to set up an educational yet entertaining solar and stellar observatory with auditorium <sup>2</sup> mentioned on Section 2 Page 7 and Section 2 Page 42 will be proposed again to be sited on the Oval Field as it was a while ago. This should not be re-proposed. If the Observatory is to be should be given to siting it at either the east end of east Beach car park, where it could be raised on stilts to avoid flooding and get good vision, or on the east end of Lifeboat Green where the temporary Lifeboat shop and building has been placed, which has given no detriment to the field's use. The advantages of either site would be that they would not involve losing any/much precious green recreational space and there is parking close by. The advantages of either site would be that they would not involve losing any/much precious green recreational space and there is parking close by. But in the vicinity of Oval Field I would suggest that the Council works with RSPB to provide a Hide for Birdwatchers at the end of Grafton Road, where many birdwatchers congregate in all weathers as a good vantage point. Although a hardy lot, a hide would be welcome I'd think and Selsey should try and capitalise on having so many birdwatchers visit Pagham, Church Norton and Medmerry i.e. get them to feel welcome, stay and spend.	Noted.
	5) Part 1 Page 12 Again I think the Council's policies on Transport especially regarding the roads and cycling route need strengthening. Regarding the roads, if the Council's views are only in the text and not in an actual Policy i.e. 009 or 009a/b, they are presumably less forceful. I would suggest it should be a numbered Policy that the Council will use all efforts to get the WSCC and Highways Agency to drop any plans to widen roads or create new ones and instead to concentrate on resurfacing the roads, especially B2145 and A27, and other cross-Manhood roads and create greater safety. The latter could be addressed (apart from cycle routes which I deal with below) by for instance using speed cameras, particularly in Sidlesham and Selsey's main	Noted as a concern, however this does not form part of the scope of the NBH Plan.

	<p>roads to actively discourage speeding and dangerous driving. Any money used to widen the B2145 or A27 for cars would be wasted and counterproductive, as drivers would speed more and risk more. The Council and others should do as is said elsewhere in the Plan and discourage use of cars. The traffic flow from Selsey into Chichester is not that bad and the only real hold-ups are when there are cycles or farm vehicles backing up traffic. Buses do not cause a problem and we can all be more patient. Employers and employees could stagger start and finish times at work more to avoid traditional rush- hours more, otherwise it is something we should just continue to put up with if we use our cars. (Note: the same applies to the A27, a bit of delay is part of what you get for travelling at peak times; the M25 and other roads show the folly of just adding more width- lanes are not used properly, you get more traffic and no lessening of slow traffic blocks and delays, and as many, if not more, accidents. No more money into new/widened roads, please; let's get good surfaces on the ones we have.)</p>	
	<p>6) Part 1 Page 12 Policy 009 It is good to see that the Council will support a cycle route. I suggest that it is time to make this a priority to pursue with WSCC and Highways Agency. I suggest that also in this Policy should be the commitment that any new pathways are joint pedestrian- and cycle-paths. It is mentioned briefly elsewhere, e.g. Section 2 Page 42 under Design and Planning Guidance, but should be a Policy. People already want to commute to Chichester and more might if they could have a direct safe route. The Bill way is too out-of-the-way for commuting and even those wanting to use it need a safe approach along the B2145 to get to Pagham RSPB site (I have nearly been knocked off at least 3 times). I suggest more on the Cycle Route proposal and the suggested route should be available on the Councils web-site. It is disappointing that it is not there but available only via the Selsey Information Exchange Community Forum web-site, which does not say, what the current progress is, other than the route proposal developed with Sustrans has been put to WSCC. I suggest the Council should push this issue now. But also it would be easy for WSCC to reject if it only has one option. I suggest a second option could be developed quickly in the form of creating a cycle lane alongside the north lane of the B2145 using existing footpaths (widened) and board walks over ditches and obtaining land where there is no other option.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

	<p>I suspect this would not be too expensive, maybe less that the proposal that has been submitted, and certainly would be better use of public funds than widening the road or creating extra lay-bys. (So I do not agree entirely with the vision regarding roads on Section 2 pages 6 and 17. Resurfacing, yes; widening, no, except for the bike route. And an absolute No to the idea of a flyover on the A27 mentioned on Section 2 Page 16; the visibility of Chichester and the cathedral must not be sacrificed.) We need more people on bikes and able to walk within and between villages, not more sunk into car use. I say this as a car user as well as cyclist and I fully acknowledge the need for people to drive to work and for other activities out of Selsey- two factors which will not change. (Despite good bus services people will still use cars. The Council's support of public transport in Section 2 Page 7 and elsewhere is good, buses especially. But I would not want the Council to spend any public money on even a feasibility study of a monorail or replacement tramway mentioned on that page and page 18, because it is highly unlikely the public will change travelling behaviour so massively by 2029 to make such operations more financially viable than buses. The Manhood does not have populations comparable to places where such schemes exist. Its good to be futuristic and challenging in our thinking but let's also be practical and realistic.)</p>	
	<p>7) Part 1 Page 13 It is right for the Council to push a policy of developing new employment space. In order to achieve Business Development and the vision of Selsey in Section 2 Pages 6 &amp;7, the Council should consider promoting Selsey as, for example, a place where artists and artisans can have studios and workshops, perhaps using some of the frequently empty High Street premises which may require the Council to promote changes of use. Some flexibility within the general aim of Policies 010 and 011 may be required.</p> <p>Policy 011 could be strengthened in this sort of way to create more tangible options for businesses.</p> <p>(Note: I would suggest that getting a large number of working artists in studios and workshop spaces, with a link to display and retail outlets, would</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

	<p>be better than what I imagine the concept of a Community Art Centre, listed at Section 2 Page 45, to be. Artists want cheap accessible working accommodation and living accommodation, rather than a <sup>3</sup>Community Centre. But the two are not mutually exclusive. I focus on the former as it relates to business and vibrancy.)</p> <p>Other areas of business the Council could perhaps promote are computer-based businesses, diving and similar activities of eco-tourism, sustainable building design and construction such as eco-houses (Selsey has such mixed architecture and lots of new builds, as well as builders and architects. Some might be encouraged to go down a production route for modern eco-friendly housing.) No doubt the Council could come up with many ideas as to what businesses could help achieve the vision but I suggest it needs a policy to work with other agencies to promote Selsey as a place that will give them advantages for siting their businesses here.</p>	
	<p>8) Part 1 Page 14-15 This is an essential Policy- to protect the High St and East Beach shopping areas. The retail centre which ASDA is developing is not shown on the Policies map on p15, but it is there as a retail centre and its effects on the High Street could run directly counter to the Councils avowed position of protection.</p> <p>I suggest the Council makes clear that it will oppose any extension of the retail facilities on this new site. Moreover it should add to the restriction regarding the effects on wildlife of any proposed new sites outside the area on arable or open fields the condition that such proposals must be guaranteed not to diminish the High Street or east Beach retail service to Selsey and will be fully opposed by the Council if there is a prospect of a negative effect.</p>	<p>Noted. The Policies Map now includes the ASDA development as a Retail Centre.</p>
	<p>9) Part 1 Pages 11-16 I am surprised there is no mention of Broadband and Mobile connectivity in an actual Policy, either Infrastructure or Economy as the most likely Policies. Broadband is only mentioned briefly on pages 22 and 43 of Section 2.</p> <p>Section 2 Page 36 notes how many home-workers and businesses there are in Selsey and Section 2 Page 6 talks of Business Development.</p>	<p>Noted as a concern, however this does not form part of the scope of the NBH Plan.</p>

	<p>For these, as well as for other businesses especially new ones, fast reliable broadband and mobile telephone connections are vital. The Council could not only support the main developers and service providers but could examine a more localised service, perhaps a co-operative. There are some models to examine elsewhere in England.</p> <p>At the very least the Council should explore whether a mast to improve signals is necessary and whether one could be sited with minimal impact on people and the environment at, say, the Coastguard station or near the Fire station.</p>	
	<p>10) Aside from these points and suggestions I would support most of what is in Section 2.</p>	
<p><b>Landlink</b></p>	<p>On behalf of the landowner of Park Farm/Middle Field to the north of Selsey, we welcome and support the land's allocation in the Selsey Neighbourhood Plan as a housing site and its inclusion within the settlement boundary.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>