

Boxgrove Neighbourhood Plan Regulation 16 Consultation Responses

Summary of representations received by Chichester District Council (CDC) as part of Regulation 16 publication and submitted to the independent examiner pursuant to paragraph 9 of Schedule 4B to the 1990 Act

Parish Name: Boxgrove Parish Council
Consultation Date: 27 April to 8 June 2018

All the original representation documents are included, in full, as part of the examination pack. The table below may be a summary of the representations received so may not always be a verbatim report.

Name and Reference	Date received	Method of submission	Summary of representation
Southern Water (001)	9.5.2018	Email	<p>No comments</p> <p>Thank you for your email below inviting Southern Water to comment on the submission Boxgrove Neighbourhood Plan. I can confirm that we have reviewed the document, and are pleased to note that our representations in the previous consultation have been included. I can also confirm that we have no further comments at this stage.</p> <p>We look forward to being kept updated as to the future progress of the Boxgrove Neighbourhood Plan.</p>
Surrey County Council (002)	4.5.2018	Email	<p>No comments</p> <p>Thank you for consulting Surrey County Council on the Boxgrove Neighbourhood Plan. We have no comments to raise on the consultation documents.</p>
Environment Agency (003)	6.6.2018	Email	<p>No comments</p> <p>Thank you for consulting us on the Boxgrove Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>Based on the environmental constraints within the area and that the Plan does not allocate specific sites we have no detailed comments to make in relation to this Plan.</p>
Highways England (004)	7.6.2018	Email	<p>Comments</p> <p>Thank you for inviting Highways England to comment on the Boxgrove Neighbourhood Plan - Regulation 16 Consultation.</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. We will therefore be concerned with proposals that have the potential to impact the safe and efficient operation of the SRN.</p> <p>Having reviewed the Boxgrove Neighbourhood Plan - Regulation 16 Consultation, we note that the Chichester District Council Local Plan identifies that between 2014-2029, Boxgrove should deliver 25 dwellings, which the Boxgrove Neighbourhood Plan highlights has been met through permission for 22 dwellings at Land at Priors Acre and subsequent infill developments. Under Policy H5 (Small development sites), it further identifies the following sites for development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Site 7 - Land at The Old Granary, Boxgrove - 3-6 dwellings - Site 8 - The Old Coal Yard, Halnaker - 1 dwelling and 5 tourist units - Site 10 - Brambles, Crockerhill – 1 dwelling <p>Accordingly, Highways England does not offer any comments at present on the Boxgrove Neighbourhood Plan – Regulation 16 Consultation. However, if further sites are identified, Highways England requests that it is kept informed for consideration of whether there would be a cumulative impact on the Strategic Road Network.</p>
Historic England (005)	6.6.2018	Email	<p>Comments</p> <p>Thank you for consulting Historic England on the Submission version of the Boxgrove Neighbourhood Plan. As the government’s advisor on planning for the historic environment, Historic England’s remit is to support the conservation of heritage assets and to champion good design principles in historic places. As such we have restricted our comments to those areas of the plan that fall within our areas of interest. We hope these comments are of assistance to the examiner.</p> <p>I am pleased to confirm that, without prejudice to comments we may wish to make on individual planning applications, Historic England do not have any objections to any elements of the plan.</p>

			<p>We are pleased to note that the Steering Group have taken into account many of the comments that we submitted at the Regulation 14 Consultation stage.</p> <p>With regard to Policy H5 we commented at the Regulation 14 consultation stage that the site at The Old Granary, had potential to affect the character of the conservation area and setting of Priory Farmhouse, and that maintaining a view through the site and ensuring the development provided a positive setting for the farmhouse would be important to the successful delivery of this site in order to avoid or minimise any harm to the significance of either designated heritage asset and to protect the character or appearance of the conservation area. We would request that the examiner consider whether these requirements should be specifically stated for determination of applications relating to this site, in order to demonstrate that the plan will deliver sustainable development where the specific potential for harm to heritage assets has been identified.</p> <p>We hope these comments are of assistance to the examiner but would be pleased to answer any queries that relate to them or to provide additional information if necessary.</p>
Sport England (006)	16.5.2018	Email	<p>Comments Thank you for consulting Sport England on the above neighbourhood plan.</p> <p>Government planning policy, within the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), identifies how the planning system can play an important role in facilitating social 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. Providing enough sports facilities of the right quality and type in the right places is vital to achieving this aim. This means that positive planning for sport, protection from the unnecessary loss of sports facilities, along with an integrated approach to providing new housing and employment land with community facilities is important.</p> <p>It is essential therefore that the neighbourhood plan reflects and complies with national planning policy for sport as set out in the NPPF with particular reference to Pars 73 and 74. It is also important to be aware of Sport England’s statutory consultee role in protecting playing fields and the presumption against the loss of playing field land. Sport England’s playing fields policy is set out in our Playing Fields Policy and Guidance document. http://www.sportengland.org/playingfieldspolicy</p>

		<p>Sport England provides guidance on developing planning policy for sport and further information can be found via the link below. Vital to the development and implementation of planning policy is the evidence base on which it is founded. http://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/planning-for-sport/forward-planning/</p> <p>Sport England works with local authorities to ensure their Local Plan is underpinned by robust and up to date evidence. In line with Par 74 of the NPPF, this takes the form of assessments of need and strategies for indoor and outdoor sports facilities. A neighbourhood planning body should look to see if the relevant local authority has prepared a playing pitch strategy or other indoor/outdoor sports facility strategy. If it has then this could provide useful evidence for the neighbourhood plan and save the neighbourhood planning body time and resources gathering their own evidence. It is important that a neighbourhood plan reflects the recommendations and actions set out in any such strategies, including those which may specifically relate to the neighbourhood area, and that any local investment opportunities, such as the Community Infrastructure Levy, are utilised to support their delivery.</p> <p>Where such evidence does not already exist then relevant planning policies in a neighbourhood plan should be based on a proportionate assessment of the need for sporting provision in its area. Developed in consultation with the local sporting and wider community any assessment should be used to provide key recommendations and deliverable actions. These should set out what provision is required to ensure the current and future needs of the community for sport can be met and, in turn, be able to support the development and implementation of planning policies. Sport England’s guidance on assessing needs may help with such work. http://www.sportengland.org/planningtoolsandguidance</p> <p>If new or improved sports facilities are proposed Sport England recommend you ensure they are fit for purpose and designed in accordance with our design guidance notes. http://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/tools-guidance/design-and-cost-guidance/</p> <p>Any new housing developments will generate additional demand for sport. If existing sports facilities do not have the capacity to absorb the additional demand, then planning policies should look to ensure that new sports facilities, or improvements to existing sports facilities, are secured and delivered. Proposed actions to meet the demand should accord with any approved local plan or neighbourhood plan policy for social infrastructure, along with priorities resulting from any assessment of need, or set out in any playing pitch or other indoor and/or outdoor sports facility</p>
--	--	---

			<p>strategy that the local authority has in place.</p> <p>In line with the Government's NPPF (including Section 8) and its Planning Practice Guidance (Health and wellbeing section), links below, consideration should also be given to how any new development, especially for new housing, will provide opportunities for people to lead healthy lifestyles and create healthy communities. Sport England's Active Design guidance can be used to help with this when developing planning policies and developing or assessing individual proposals.</p> <p>Active Design, which includes a model planning policy, provides ten principles to help ensure the design and layout of development encourages and promotes participation in sport and physical activity. The guidance, and its accompanying checklist, could also be used at the evidence gathering stage of developing a neighbourhood plan to help undertake an assessment of how the design and layout of the area currently enables people to lead active lifestyles and what could be improved.</p> <p>NPPF Section 8: https://www.gov.uk/guidance/national-planning-policy-framework/8-promoting-healthy-communities</p> <p>PPG Health and wellbeing section: https://www.gov.uk/guidance/health-and-wellbeing</p> <p>Sport England's Active Design Guidance: https://www.sportengland.org/activedesign</p> <p><i>(Please note: this response relates to Sport England's planning function only. It is not associated with our funding role or any grant application/award that may relate to the site.)</i></p>
West Sussex County Council (007)	8.6.2018	Email	<p>Comments</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment upon the Parish Council's Consultation Pre-Submission Neighbourhood Plan for Boxgrove. Given that the Pre-Submission Neighbourhood Plan for Boxgrove includes the proposed allocation of small scale housing sites (policy H5), it should be noted that this 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. The County Council provided comments and general Development Management guidance in response to the previous consultation.</p>

			<p>Policy comments Our comments on Policy GA2 and LC4 & schedule A, still remain.</p> <p>Policy EH3 –The policy supports the restoration of sites and seeks the reinstatement of footpaths. As the restoration of the former mineral quarries, as recognised in the supporting text is already approved and underway, it is suggested that the focus of the policy could be made clearer, that it is seeking reinstate historic public footpaths. If supporting text makes reference to former quarries in the area, the reference to restoration by 2021 should be amended to 2020 to reflect the decision notice and commencement dates for the restoration of the Boxgrove mineral working. Previous comments regarding the process and contacts remain regarding identifying and recording historic routes, to then seek to reinstate.</p> <p>H1 – the policy should refer to refuse collection arrangements being agreed with the District rather than the County Council.</p>
Natural England (008)	11.6.2018	Email	<p>No comments Natural England has no comments to make on the Plan.</p>
Chichester District Council (009)	8.6.2018 & 9.7.2018	Email	<p>Comments The Parish Council and Neighbourhood Plan Working Group should be commended for the significant hard work that has been put in to this plan to date. The Council recognises there have been a number of challenges for the NP Group to address as work has progressed to this stage. This response provides both general and specific comments with regard to the submitted Boxgrove Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP).</p> <p><u>General:</u></p> <p>The Plan itself provides a helpful overview of Boxgrove Parish, however, the structure of the plan may benefit from some improvements in terms of layout and presentation. It also includes some typos; these should be corrected in the final version.</p> <p>Overall, the aim of the policies reflect the needs of the parish, however some are too detailed for the purpose of the NDP, others are not positively written and in certain cases may not be regarded as relevant (e.g. comments on policy EH3 below). The plan needs to recognise what it</p>

		<p>can realistically achieve. Policies EH2, EH7, EH8, H1 and EE3 are a few examples of policies that may prove difficult to use during decision-making, because either they form a duplication of what is provided by a Local Plan document or, they are too onerous.</p> <p>There is a need for the plan to be consistent in terms of its presentation; for example currently some policies, when listing criteria, use bullet points (Policy EE5), roman numerals (Policy H3) or numbers (Policy H1). Again, there is use of bold italics in the policies whereas others are simply in bold. Further, the Maps presented as appendices to the NDP lack visual clarity and it is difficult to identify place and road names (e.g. Maps A, B, C, D and E).</p> <p><u>The NDP document:</u></p> <p>Section 2.1.2 on Page 10 also needs amending to include references to the South Downs National Park Authority and that currently the development plan includes the saved policies from the Chichester Local Plan – First Review (April 1999) for the SDNPA area.</p> <p>The fifth paragraph on page 5, states that ‘<i>The Plan gives local people the power to decide where new housing should go and how the village could change. Without the Plan CDC would make these decisions on behalf of the people of Boxgrove</i>’. The neighbourhood plan provides an opportunity for local people to make decisions about where new development, such as housing, should go. Where the justification provided is so that an adjacent property owner can downsize (Para H5.4) this is not sufficient justification to allocate land for housing. The Parish has met the majority of its indicative housing numbers through the approval of development of 22 homes at Priors Acre. Any additional housing would be of benefit however it needs to be demonstrated that it is in the interests of the community as a whole.</p> <p>The last sentence in the penultimate paragraph states that ‘<i>Once approved, the Neighbourhood Plan will form part of the Chichester District Council Development Plan</i>’. Perhaps the wording ‘Chichester District Council’ be replaced by ‘statutory’ to ensure that terminology is correct.</p> <p>Just a minor point, but the final paragraph refers to the consultation statement; this should be removed. This is because the consultation statement does not form part of the Neighbourhood Plan document. It supports it for the purposes of plan-making only.</p> <p><u>Page 20: Section 3.7 Community Facilities and Wellbeing</u></p> <p>The NP is to be commended for its identification of community facilities, reference to the asset</p>
--	--	--

		<p>register, reference to the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) and how the Parish wishes to spend the allocation. For consistency the NP should include Boxgrove Village Hall as it does other community buildings.</p> <p><u>Page 24: Vision Statement</u> States that 'In 2030 Boxgrove Parish will continue to be an attractive place to live and work...'. The NDP covers the period to 2029, so this date should be reflected here, rather than 2030.</p> <p><u>Para 4.2 Core Objectives</u> States '...issues that are not relevant to the NP will be dealt with via a Community Action Plan'. It is not clear where this future Community Action Plan is. It is potentially confusing for the reader when identifying issues relevant only to a Community Action Plan using the letters 'CA'. If issues are not directly relevant to the neighbourhood plan, then it is suggested that they are removed. If considered necessary and/or relevant, all issues to be covered by the Community Action Plan could be listed in an Appendix. The text suggests that a 'basic list is in the Evidence Base' however when the evidence base is opened online, there is no list, or any reference to the Community Action Plan.</p> <p><u>Page 24: Section 4.2 Core Objectives - 3 Community</u> The text states to 'create new and improve and maintain Parish facilities by retaining the facility of a village shop and pub'. The NP goes on to set out the wish to enhance and extend existing play and exercise facilities, provide opportunities for activities and support services but does not refer to protecting, supporting, extending, improving the village hall and the services it provides or the St Blaise Centre.</p> <p><u>Page 27: Presumption in favour of sustainable development</u> The 13th bullet point is not relevant as it relates to mineral development which is a county matter and 'excluded development' as defined by Section 61K of the Localism Act 2011. It is therefore beyond the scope of Neighbourhood Plan provisions and reference to it should be removed.</p> <p><u>Page 28: Policy SB1 – Settlement boundary</u> The map showing the settlement boundary at Boxgrove (Map E) has not been updated in accordance with the amended settlement boundary identified in the emerging Site Allocations Development Plan Document (DPD) (Inspector's report expected in July 2018). The amended site boundary in the Site Allocations DPD reflects the inclusion of land off Priors Acre which has</p>
--	--	--

		<p>been permitted through an appeal decision (APP/L3815/W/15/3138439) dated 26 May 2016. The Inspector's decision (para 6) acknowledges that 'There is no capacity within the development boundary of Boxgrove for significantly more housing so the boundary will need to be redrawn'. It also reiterates that the Chichester Local Plan: Key Policies (CLPKP) (Policy 2) requires settlement boundaries to be reviewed through DPDs and Neighbourhood Plans.</p> <p>This policy is not positively written. The wording should encourage the granting of planning permission for development outside the settlement boundary only where a set of criteria are met. These criteria should reflect, but not duplicate, those of Policies 45 and 46 of the CLPKP, possibly even cross-refer to them.</p> <p><u>Page 29: Policy EH2 Renewable and Low Carbon Energy</u> The policy is too detailed for the purposes of a neighbourhood plan and appears to go beyond the remit of planning control. Paragraph EH2.2 is not directly relevant to the policy.</p> <p><u>Page 30: Policy EH3: Reinstatement and restoration of land at Boxgrove and Eartham Quarries</u> All planning permissions relating to Boxgrove and Eartham Quarries will/do require the approval of a restoration and aftercare scheme through which the restoration principle is established. This policy should avoid duplication of restoration principles established by policies contained in the West Sussex Minerals Local Plan (adopted or emerging), particularly where minerals (and waste) are county matters, nor must it consider restoration for particular sites which are already the subject of an approved restoration scheme. As a consultee, the Parish Council is consulted on all planning applications affecting these sites and therefore will have the opportunity to comment on any future restoration and aftercare schemes</p> <p>It is unclear as to whether or not this policy is intended to safeguard historic footpaths (and woodland) generally in the parish and to ensure that any future development (quarries or not) ensures that the historic route of footpaths is safeguarded. Further, it is noted that policy GA1 considers the footpath and cycle network, so if the intention of the policy is to protect historic public footpaths then the key issues raised by this policy would be better placed in Policy GA1.</p> <p><u>Page 29: Policy EH5 Development on Agricultural Land</u> There is no description of which grades are included in 'best and most versatile land' and where they exist within the Parish. A definition should be included of what constitutes 'other land-based rural business'.</p>
--	--	--

		<p><u>Page 31: Policy EH6 Landscape Character and important views</u> There is a lack of evidence regarding ‘important views’ and no map identifying clearly the ‘important views’ that are considered relevant to the NP is included. The policy overall lacks distinction. Reference to the Boxgrove Conservation Area and Halnaker Conservation Area as well as any key landscape features which have been identified by the relevant Landscape Character Assessment should be included to ensure that there is a steer for the policy and that it ties in with relevant and existing evidence relating to conservation areas and landscape character.</p> <p>The policy refers to Appendix 2 and 3 but it is not clear what this is intended to include as there is no Appendix 2 or 3 to the Neighbourhood Plan. It also lists a number of key heritage assets, but does not identify any specific views that may be affected or how they could be protected.</p> <p><u>Page 32: Policy EH7 Dark Skies</u> Street lighting may be required for highway safety and/or crime/security reasons. Specific requirements regarding lighting may be the subject of planning conditions where it is considered on a case by case basis for individual planning applications. Policy SD9 of the emerging South Downs National Park Local Plan considers Dark Skies therefore this policy needs to ensure it does not duplicate that policy. Reference to it would be acceptable.</p> <p><u>Page 32: Policy EH8 Conserve and Enhance the Heritage Environment</u> This policy appears to cover a similar topic area to Policy EH6. To conserve and enhance a heritage asset, consideration should also be given to views as part of an assessment of impact upon ‘setting’. It is also questioned as to why natural beauty and wildlife is covered by this policy, when the main focus is the heritage environment.</p> <p>Last bullet point – it is unclear what is meant by ‘existing designed or natural landscapes’. Landscape is covered by Policy EH6 and should not be included by this policy too.</p> <p><u>Page 32: Policy EH9 South Downs National Park</u> The ‘part of the parish lying within the South Downs National Park’ is the northern section of the parish. It is suggested this is made clearer. The supporting text does not cross refer to the map shown on page 8 of the NDP. This policy should also cross refer to the objectives set out by the South Downs National Park Management Plan and emerging Local Plan and Core Policy SD1:</p>
--	--	--

			<p>Sustainable Development in the South Downs National Park, however it does not.</p> <p><u>Page 34: Policy EE1 Support existing employment and retail</u> The parish lies in a rural area and does not have significant employment or retail development, although it is noted that there may be some small-scale enterprise. The second paragraph of this policy is not positively written (through the use of ‘will not be permitted’). The policy refers to Appendix E of the Chichester Local Plan which allows for sites to be tested in terms of marketing/viability however it is considered that the second paragraph is not necessary.</p> <p><u>Page 35: Policy EE2 Tourism activities</u> There is no evidence to support how important tourism is to the parish or what the established sources of tourism are. Goodwood motor circuit and race course is nearby, so the parish is highly likely to have some Bed and Breakfast establishments that rely on the associated events. This would also be applicable to any events associated with the Tinwood Estate Vineyard (e.g. glamping). Boxgrove Priory is also of tourism interest. These sources of tourism are not mentioned by the policy or its supporting text. There is also no cross reference to Policy 30 (Built Tourist and Leisure Development) of the adopted Chichester Local Plan.</p> <p><u>Page 35: Policy EE3 Communications Infrastructure</u> As noted at Regulation 14, the policy appears to support approval for all communications masts. It is unclear as to whether or not this is the intention of this policy.</p> <p><u>Page 36: Policy EE4 Agricultural/Horticultural/Equine/Viticultural employment</u> The policy as currently worded is inflexible and negative; suggest the inclusion of criteria (for example in relation possibly to marketing, viability etc – referring to Appendix E of the Chichester Local Plan) and to avoid the use of ‘will not be permitted unless’. The supporting text does not make clear what or where such development takes place within the parish. This policy alludes to this type of employment being more significant than the employment considered by Policy EE1. Again, if this addresses the same issue, then there is no need for two separate policies for employment. The parish is rural and therefore it is highly likely that businesses and enterprise will be of a rural nature. Overall, it is recommended that a ‘rural enterprise’ policy would be more suitable for the purposes of the plan rather than two separate employment policies which are too general and do not address key issues affecting the community.</p> <p><u>Page 37: Policy LC1 Support Independent Living</u></p>
--	--	--	--

		<p>The definition of 'independent living' needs to be clear. Also, the plan does not discuss the existing situation in terms of care homes and there is no evidence to support this policy.</p> <p><u>Page 38: Policy LC4 Designation of local green spaces</u> The areas of Local Green Space (as recognised by paragraphs 76 and 77 of the NPPF) designated and shown on Map A are not named and the visual presentation of the boundaries of the sites needs to be improved to enable the designation to be applied accurately. The Local Green Spaces that the policy aims to protect have not been listed and there is no justification given as to why they are demonstrably special to the local community (i.e. Boxgrove Quarry and the reinstatement of historic footpaths), tranquillity or richness of its wildlife. The ratings listed at Schedule A are also confusing and could be presented in a better way.</p> <p><u>Page 38/39: Policy LC5 Designation of local open spaces</u> The areas listed in Schedule B and shown on Map B are identified for protection under this policy. The map provided is poor and the sites are not labelled. The policy and/or supporting text does not make any cross reference to Policy 54 of the Chichester Local Plan which considers Open Space, Sport and Recreation. Policy 54 refers to the Chichester Open Space Study which provides details of open space requirements for Boxgrove parish. Reference is made to surveys in the supporting text, but these are not named/dated and no reference is made to them being in the evidence base. The use of 'will not be permitted' is also not a positive way of wording the policy. The policy should cross refer to the relevant policies in the Chichester Local Plan to ensure consistency.</p> <p><u>Page 39: Policy LC6 Village Shop</u> The use of the phrase 'will not be permitted' does not represent positive wording in a policy.</p> <p><u>Page 39/40: Policy H1 Quality of Design</u> This policy is too detailed for the purpose of the neighbourhood plan and risks duplicating Policy 33 of the Chichester Local Plan. This policy should cross refer to the relevant policies of the Chichester Local Plan to ensure consistency. Some of the criteria may also not be achievable (for example, criterion 2, 6 and 9). As it stands, the policy wording would be difficult to deliver and enforce.</p> <p>Further, point number 1 refers to bin stores and recycling facilities. If it relates to waste collection, then this is a District matter in any case and the Waste Storage and Collection</p>
--	--	--

			<p>Guidance published by Chichester District Council would be the relevant document to refer to.</p> <p>Overall, it is considered that the policy seeks too much detail that goes beyond the scope of planning control.</p> <p><u>Page 41: Policy H2 Housing Mix</u> The adopted Chichester Local Plan (Policy 5) identifies an indicative housing number of 25 to Boxgrove Parish. This housing number has by and large been met through the granting of permission (by appeal) of land off Priors Acre, for 22 houses and when coupled with the identification of other small housing sites (Map C, Policy H5).</p> <p><u>Page 41: Policy H3 Windfall Sites</u> This policy refers to the settlement boundary shown on Map E. This boundary is incorrect as it does not include the approved housing development at Priors Acre. For consistency, the first part of the policy should refer to criteria rather than ‘the following factors’ to be consistent with other policies in the plan.</p> <p>Criterion vi) is questioned because deliverability can depend on a number of factors, including viability and availability. Criterion viii) should also be amended to state that ‘proposed sites should be subject to archaeological and environmental surveys before being developed where it has been considered/assessed as appropriate’.</p> <p><u>Page 42: Small development sites:</u></p> <p><u>Site 7 Land at The Old Granary</u> There is no overriding requirement for the parish to identify any further housing allocations. This is a sensitive site in close proximity to various recognised heritage assets. However, it is noted that a detailed heritage impact assessment has been compiled in relation to the proposal for this site. Any such policy for this site should use the findings of the heritage impact assessment to inform a more detailed and robust policy that would seek to enhance and not detract from the significance of the identified heritage assets in this sensitive location.</p> <p><u>Site 8 The Old Coal Yard, Halnaker</u> This site has planning permission and therefore there is no reason to include this proposal. This site should therefore be removed from the plan.</p>
--	--	--	--

			<p><u>Site 10 – Brambles at Crockerhill</u> There does not appear to be any justification for this proposal for a single dwelling in the countryside other than the ‘owner of the adjoining house’ wanting to downsize. This is not in the interests of the wider community and should be removed from the plan. This evidence alone is not sufficient to include such a site in the plan.</p> <p><u>Page 43: Policy GA1 Footpath and cycle path network</u> The second paragraph makes reference to CIL contributions. This is out of place in this section of the plan and should either be placed in the supporting text or into a policy of its own in section 5.6 of the Plan ‘Leisure and Community’.</p> <p>The ‘Permissive Paths’ shown on Map D are not identified on a key (e.g. footpaths, bridleways, byways) without which, it is not clear what the status of existing access to the countryside is (for example, to encourage cycling in the parish, it would be useful to know where the bridleways and byways are, because cyclists are not permitted to use footpaths). Proposed permissive paths are shown, but it is unclear as to whether or not they have been adopted. This Map should either be removed or improved.</p> <p><u>Page 44: Policy GA2 Parking in new development</u> Para GA2.1 states that ‘the Parish suffers from significant road traffic and parking issues’ however there is no evidence submitted to support this statement. It is questioned as to whether or not this policy is necessary because on-street parking is enforceable by the police and not the planning authority. Further, if it is considered necessary, then it is suggested that simply refers to Policy 39 of the Chichester Local Plan (Transport, Accessibility and Parking). This includes reference to West Sussex County Council’s parking calculator and guidance.</p> <p><u>Page 45: Policy GA3 Streets and Access Ways to serve new residential development</u> The final section of the policy provides useful guidance to materials and design features however and could be carried through in the plan (possibly as a vision or objective rather than a policy).</p>
Patrick Birchenough (010)	31.5.2018	Email	<p>Support I am happy to support all proposals in the document.</p>
Ayumi	31.5.2018	Response	<p>Support</p>

Addison (011)		form	I support the Boxgrove neighbourhood plan in its entirety. The plan has been subject to the community investment process and the proposed allocation of housing is considered appropriate for the village of Boxgrove.
Bargate Homes (012)	29.5.2018	Email	<p>Comments The wording and the implications of this policy are not clear.</p> <p>Is the inference that developments where Lifetime Homes (LTH) Standards are not provided for will not be supported and therefore be seen as contrary to policy (assuming the NP is adopted)?</p> <p>If this policy is <i>requiring</i> developments to ensure that 25% of units are built to LTH Standards then this ought to have been the subject of a viability exercise to understand whether this policy would adversely impact upon development being brought forward.</p> <p>Suggested changes to Policy H2 below:</p> <p>“Proposals for new housing must should deliver a range of house types, sizes and tenures. Applicants should demonstrate how the proposal will meet local needs. Proposals where at least 25% of dwellings meet Lifetime Home Standards, or its equivalent, will be supported”</p> <p>The settlement boundary proposed does not meet the Basic Condition to be in general conformity with the strategic policies contained in the development plan for the area of the authority (or any part of that area).</p> <p>Specifically the settlement boundary proposed is not consistent with Chichester District Council’s Submission Site Allocations Development Plan Document (SADPD) which has been through Examination and has been the subject of a recent Modifications Consultation and which will amend the settlement policy boundary to include the site.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Neighbourhood Plan (NP) barely acknowledges the District Council’s allocation of the site (for 25 units through the SADPD, under Policy BX1) which seems oddly inconsistent and likely to cause confusion, given the Neighbourhood Plan (if adopted) would be the “first port of call” for local residents to understand proposals for development within the Parish.</p> <p>The settlement boundary should be updated to be consistent with the Chichester District Council</p>

			<p>SADPD, which will more than likely be adopted before this Neighbourhood Plan is examined (excerpt below).</p> <p>Additionally, it is felt it would be helpful for the NP at the very least “signpost” where the further details of the District Council’s allocation for the site can be found (i.e. the SADPD).</p>
Bryan Marshall (013)	17.5.2018	Response form	<p>Support The entire package is to be highly commended. I hope, at long last, to see some positive movement.</p>
Carla Lock (014)	17.5.2018	Email	<p>Support I have been engaged with the Plan for many years through the regular consultation events and news bulletins. The Plan reflects what I want to see happen in our village. We need housing for the elderly to downsize into and it is vital that we maintain our Conservation areas. I commend the Plan and thank the volunteers for their work. Let us get it through referendum and make it policy.</p>
Christopher Tod (015)	8.6.2018	Email	<p>Support Thank you for inviting us to make comments on the proposed Boxgrove Neighbourhood Plan. I have lived with our family in Boxgrove for 40 years and so am very conversant with the Parish. The Plan is the result of considerable engagement with the residents of the Parish. It is a well balanced proposal for the period 2017-2029 and it has my full support.</p>
Christine Potter (016)	7.6.2018	Email (response form)	<p>Support Particularly satisfied with the efforts within this plan to try and make the streets safer for pedestrians in both Halnacker and Boxgrove.</p>
Henry Potter (017)	7.6.2018	Email (response form)	<p>Support Particularly satisfied with the efforts within this plan to try and make the streets safer for pedestrians in both Halnacker and Boxgrove.</p>
David Leah (018)	9.5.2018 and 16.5.2018	Email (response form)	<p>Support I fully support the Policies in the Plan in particular need to preserve the import views outlined in the Conservation Character Appraisals for both Boxgrove and Halnaker villages.</p> <p>Also, as outlined in Policy EH8 para graph EH8.2 the parish council needs to implement the</p>

			<p>proposal for a sub committee to monitor these and any article D planning applications.</p> <p>GA4 is a very important policy for most residents and actions to reduce the dependence on cars would be appreciated by all.</p> <p>I generally support the policies of the plan and will vote in favour at the referendum on this basis.</p> <p>1) The residents were clearly in favour of the Boxgrove housing allocation being allocated to a plot (Halnaker Crossing) between Boxgrove and Halnaker on Goodwood estate land. This had the advantage of creating a road diversion to prevent rat running. This being in preference to the site known as "land west of Priors Acre" which is has difficult access and is adjacent to the A27. CDC rightly refused this but by putting up a poor defence of their decision, the Planning Inspector overruled making a nonsense of the emerging neighbourhood plan and government policy.</p> <p>2) It was the team's hope that we could keep our original housing development as a reserve in the likelihood that we would need to contribute more housing in the future. Unfortunately, CDC, after protracted discussions decided that upwards of £10K needed spending on an SEA to support inclusion, which was never going to happen in a parish with a £33K precept. This has lengthened the NP process by about 18mths and they insisted that this be completely erased from our plan.</p> <p>3) CDC has not helped the team in anyway during the process. Their time to respond to questions and queries has been lengthy and at time contradictory. They clearly have not had the resources to help and twice we have had to write to the Director Planning to intervene. There has been no proactive support just delay upon delay as they inform us in hindsight our mistakes.</p> <p>4) Hopefully the residents of Boxgrove will see a benefit in the plan and vote in favour at the eventual referendum.</p>
Gladman Developments (019)	4.6.2018	Email	<p>Comments</p> <p>This letter provides Gladman Developments Ltd (Gladman) representations in response to the submission version of the Boxgrove Neighbourhood Plan (BNP) under Regulation 16 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012. Gladman requests to be added to the Council's consultation database and to be kept informed on the progress of the emerging</p>

		<p>neighbourhood plan. This letter seeks to highlight the issues with the plan as currently presented and its relationship with national and local planning policy.</p> <p>Legal Requirements</p> <p>Before a neighbourhood plan can proceed to referendum it must be tested against a set of basic conditions set out in paragraph 8(2) of Schedule 4b of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended). The basic conditions that the BNP must meet are as follows:</p> <p><i>(a) Having regard to national policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State, it is appropriate to make the order.</i></p> <p><i>(d) The making of the order contributes to the achievement of sustainable development.</i></p> <p><i>(e) The making of the order is in general conformity with the strategic policies contained in the development plan for the area of the authority (or any part of that area).</i></p> <p><i>(f) The making of the order does not breach, and is otherwise compatible with, EU obligations.</i></p> <p>National Planning Policy Framework and Planning Practice Guidance</p> <p>The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) sets out the Government’s planning policies for England and how these are expected to be applied. In doing so it sets out the requirements for the preparation of neighbourhood plans to be in conformity with the strategic priorities for the wider area and the role in which they play in delivering sustainable development to meet development needs.</p> <p>At the heart of the Framework is a presumption in favour of sustainable development, which should be seen as a golden thread through both plan-making and decision-taking. For plan-making this means that plan makers should positively seek opportunities to meet the development needs of their area and Local Plans should meet objectively assessed needs, with sufficient flexibility to adapt to rapid change. This requirement is applicable to neighbourhood plans.</p> <p>The recent Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) updates make clear that neighbourhood plans should conform to national policy requirements and take account the latest and most up-to-date evidence of housing needs in order to assist the Council in delivering sustainable development, a neighbourhood plan basic condition.</p> <p>The application of the presumption in favour of sustainable development will have implications for how communities engage with neighbourhood planning. Paragraph 16 of the Framework makes</p>
--	--	--

			<p>clear that Qualifying Bodies preparing neighbourhood plans should develop plans that support strategic development needs set out in Local Plans, including policies for housing development and plan positively to support local development.</p> <p>Paragraph 17 further makes clear that neighbourhood plans should set out a clear and positive vision for the future of the area and policies contained in those plans should provide a practical framework within which decisions on planning applications can be made with a high degree of predictability and efficiency.</p> <p>Neighbourhood plans should seek to proactively drive and support sustainable economic development to deliver the homes, jobs and thriving local places that the country needs, whilst responding positively to the wider opportunities for growth. Paragraph 184 of the Framework makes clear that local planning authorities will need to clearly set out their strategic policies to ensure that an up-to-date Local Plan is in place as quickly as possible. The Neighbourhood Plan should ensure that it is aligned with the strategic needs and priorities of the wider area and plan positively to support the delivery of sustainable growth opportunities.</p> <p>Planning Practice Guidance</p> <p>It is clear from the requirements of the Framework that neighbourhood plans should be prepared in conformity with the strategic requirements for the wider area as confirmed in an adopted development plan. The requirements of the Framework have now been supplemented by the publication of Planning Practice Guidance (PPG). On 11th February 2016, the Secretary of State (SoS) published a series of updates to the neighbourhood planning chapter of the PPG. In summary, these update a number of component parts of the evidence base that are required to support an emerging neighbourhood plan.</p> <p>On 19th May 2016, the Secretary of State published a further set of updates to the neighbourhood planning PPG. These updates provide further clarity on what measures a qualifying body should take to review the contents of a neighbourhood plan where the evidence base for the plan policy becomes less robust. As such it is considered that where a qualifying body intends to undertake a review of the neighbourhood plan, it should include a policy relating to this intention which includes a detailed explanation outlining the qualifying bodies anticipated timescales in this regard.</p> <p>Further, the PPG makes clear that neighbourhood plans should not contain policies restricting housing development in settlements or preventing other settlements from being expanded. It is with that in mind that Gladman has reservations regarding the BNP's ability to meet basic</p>
--	--	--	--

		<p>condition (a) and (d) and this will be discussed in greater detail throughout this response.</p> <p>Relationship to Local Plan To meet the requirements of the Neighbourhood Plan Basic Conditions, neighbourhood plans should be prepared to conform to the strategic policy requirements set out in the adopted Development Plan. The current adopted plan that covers the Boxgrove Neighbourhood Plan area and the development plan which the BNP will be tested against is the Chichester Local Plan: Key Policies, which was adopted on 14th July 2015. It provides the overarching planning policy framework for Chichester covering the period up to 2029. The adopted plan sets out a minimum housing target across the 17-year plan period of 7,388 homes equivalent to 435dpa. The Council are currently in the process of preparing a Local Plan Review to supplement the adopted Local Plan Part 1. The emerging plan will set out to provide a new policy framework for planning and development in the district up to 2034, and once adopted will constitute the statutory development plan relevant to the BNP. The Local Plan Review is at a very early stage of preparation and as such, Gladman suggest sufficient flexibility is therefore drafted in to the policies of the BNP to ensure that there is no conflict with the emerging Local Plan Review that could lead to these policies being superseded under Section 38(5) of the Planning Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.</p> <p>Boxgrove Neighbourhood Plan This section highlights the key issues that Gladman would like to raise with regards to the content of the BNP as currently presented. It is considered that some policies do not reflect the requirements of national policy and guidance and as such Gladman have sought to recommend a series of alternative options that should be explored. Gladman would like to take this opportunity to remind the Council that it is not within the remit of a Neighbourhood Plan to determine planning applications, and as such where reference is made in the plan to ‘permitting’ or ‘refusing’ development, Gladman suggest that the wording is amended to read ‘supported’ or ‘not supported’.</p> <p>Policy EH6 – Landscape character and important views Policy EH6 states that development should preserve the attributes of views and vistas, and it must maintain the local character of the landscape. In line with this policy, Gladman suggest changing the wording to ‘Development should conserve and enhance the attributes of views and vistas’. This would bring the policy in line with the NPPF, and the NP own core objectives as set out on p24.</p>
--	--	---

			<p>We submit that new development can often be located in areas without eroding the views considered to be important to the local community and can be appropriately designed to take into consideration the wider landscape features of a surrounding area to provide new vistas and views.</p> <p>Gladman have seen no evidence to demonstrate why these views are of such value to the local community. Opinions on landscape are highly subjective, therefore, without further evidence to demonstrate why these views are considered special will likely lead to inconsistencies in the decision-making process.</p> <p>Furthermore, Gladman note the key views cover extensive areas of the undeveloped eastern section of the neighbourhood plan area. This could be viewed as an attempt to impose an almost blanket restriction towards development in a significant part of the neighbourhood area, if proposals are not deemed to be in full compliance with this policy. Gladman consider that to be valued, a view would need to have some form of physical attribute, and as such the policy or supporting text must identify which views contain such a physical feature. This policy must allow a decision maker to come to a view as to whether particular locations contains physical attributes that would ‘take it out of the ordinary’ rather than selecting views which may not have any landscape significance and are based solely on community support.</p> <p>The Guidance states that <i>“Proportionate, robust evidence should support the choices made and the approach taken. The evidence should be drawn upon to explain succinctly the intention and rationale of the policies in the draft neighbourhood plan”</i>. Accordingly, Gladman consider that this matter should be investigated and based on appropriate evidence prior to the Plan being submitted for Examination.</p> <p>Policy EH8 – Conserve and Enhance the Landscape and Heritage Environment</p> <p>Policy EH8 states that development must ‘respect and enhance’ the distinctive character of the area and the significance of local heritage assets. The Framework requires a distinction to be made between designated and non-designated assets and different policy tests should then be applied to each. Paragraph 132 of the Framework makes it clear that great weight should be given to a heritage asset’s conservation and that ‘the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be’.</p>
--	--	--	---

			<p>With reference to designated heritage assets, the Policy should refer specifically to paragraphs 133 and 134 of the Framework which sets out that Councils should assess the significance of the designated heritage asset and where there is less than substantial harm, this should be weighed in the planning balance against the public benefits of the proposal. Where there is deemed to be substantial harm, then the proposal would need to achieve substantial public benefits to outweigh that harm.</p> <p>For non-designated heritage assets, the policy must reflect the guidance set out within paragraph 135 of the Framework. This states that the policy test that should be applied in these cases is that a balanced judgement should be reached having regard to the scale of any harm and the significance of the heritage asset. Gladman believe that this policy needs to be redrafted in order to ensure that it conforms with the guidance and requirements set through national policy.</p> <p>Policy EE1 – Supporting existing employment and retail Gladman raises concern with criterion (3) of this policy which seeks to ensure that new residential development should be located to ensure there is no significant adverse impacts from existing commercial uses. Gladman consider this policy too broad, and suggest the policy is refined to consider each application on a site by site basis.</p> <p>Policy H1 – Quality of Design Policy H1 sets out a list of 10 design criteria that all proposals for residential development will be measured against. Whilst Gladman recognise the importance of high quality design, planning policies should not be overly prescriptive and need flexibility in order for schemes to respond to sites specifics and the character of the local area. There will not be a ‘one size fits all’ solution in relation to design and sites should be considered on a site by site basis with consideration given to various design principles. Gladman therefore suggest that more flexibility is provided in the policy wording to ensure that a high quality and inclusive design is not compromised by aesthetic requirements alone. We consider that to do so could act to impact on the viability of proposed residential developments. We suggest that regard should be had to paragraph 60 of the NPPF which states that: <i>"Planning policies and decisions should not attempt to impose architectural styles or particular tastes and they should not stifle innovation, originality or initiative through unsubstantiated requirements to conform to certain development forms or styles"</i>.</p> <p>Policy H5 – Small development sites</p>
--	--	--	--

			<p>Policy H5 proposes that between 5-7 new dwellings will be delivered over the plan period. This is to go above the 25 homes designated by CDC in the site allocations plan. Boxgrove is classified as a Service Village in the adopted Local Plan and will be the focus of new development consistent with the identified local need. Gladman acknowledge that seeking to support sites for development is a positive approach however there is insufficient evidence to support the allocations. Having considered the Housing Sites Analysis assessment, as available on the Neighbourhood Plan website, little assessment has been made regarding the sustainability of the proposed small development sites. Due to the lack of evidence and the small scale of these allocations, Gladman suggest that to meet the basic conditions these allocations would be better placed under the windfall policy.</p> <p>Policy GA2 – Parking in new development Gladman note the Parish Councils concern regarding on street parking and the associated congestion issues. Gladman suggests that the policy is redrafted to conform with policy 39 of the CLP. Policy 39 states that <i>“The level of car parking provision should be in accordance with the current West Sussex County Council guidance. This, together with residential parking and the level of cycle parking, will be assessed on a flexible site by site basis”</i>. As currently worded, it would suggest that all future housing development would be expected to meet the maximum levels of off street parking and any applications would not be considered on a site by site basis. This could lead to viability issues of such schemes and does not accord with Framework.</p> <p>Conclusions Gladman recognises the role of neighbourhood plans as a tool for local people to shape the development of their local community. However, it is clear from national guidance that these must be consistent with national planning policy and the strategic requirements for the wider authority area. Through this consultation response, Gladman has sought to clarify the relation of the BNP as currently proposed with the requirements of national planning policy and the wider strategic policies for the wider area.</p> <p>Gladman is concerned that the plan in its current form does not comply with basic conditions (a) and (d). The plan does not conform with national policy and guidance and in its current form does not contribute to the achievement of sustainable development. Gladman hopes you have found these representations helpful and constructive.</p>
Graham Dipple	4.5.2018	Email (response)	<p>Support I give my full support to this plan in its entirety. Adoption of this plan would be a sound basis for</p>

(020)		form)	the future of this Parish. At this time I would not suggest any improvements or modifications.
Heather Birchenough (021)	6.6.2018	Email	Support I fully support the policies presented in the Boxgrove Neighbourhood plan and would like it to be accepted by the District Council forthwith.
Jill Dipple (022)	21.5.2018	Response form	Support Having taken an interest in the Boxgrove Neighbourhood Development Plan from the beginning I would like to support it as a whole. It shows an understanding of Boxgrove as a village and a community – something I would like to see retained.
Jim McDonald (023)	16.5.2018	Email (response form)	Support It is long overdue that Boxgrove PC have a guide against which to judge all developments, spending priorities and deployment of resources. I fully support the plan and believe it to be a well-considered document containing excellent proposals for the sustainability of the Parish. It is very important that we tackle issues of traffic management, accessibility, sustainability and heritage and these factors are all well addressed in the plan. It is time the plan was approved and circulated widely so we can operate to this plan which has been in the making for some time.
Kerry Fynamore (024)	31.5.2018	Response form	Support I support the Boxgrove Neighbourhood Plan in its entirety. The plan has been subject to the community involvement process and the proposed allocation of housing is considered appropriate for a village of Boxgrove's size.
Margaret Marshall (025)	17.5.2018	Response form	Support Excellent document. Lots of hard work on behalf of the village gone into it. Deserves support.
Mia Tod (026)	8.6.2018	Email	Support As a long term resident with our family in Boxgrove, I am pleased with the proposals and the Plan has my total support.

<p>Neamesutton OBO Mr and Mrs Parry (027)</p>	<p>8.6.2018</p>	<p>Email (response form and letter)</p>	<p>Object Support the principle of the Neighbourhood Plan, but objects to the <u>amount of housing proposed is not needed</u>. There is a need to protect and enhance the special qualities of the village. As currently drafted, the Boxgrove Neighbourhood Plan goes beyond meeting the future needs of Boxgrove for the period up to 2029 without reasoned justification.</p> <p>The Chichester Local Plan (Policy 5) states that small scale housing sites will be identified to address the specific needs of local communities, and in relation to Boxgrove identifies the need to allocate sufficient sites to deliver a total of 25 dwellings in the period 2017 to 2029. New housing should be focussed in larger settlements, where it would be more sustainable. Boxgrove is a service village. The indicative number of 25 dwellings has been met by appeal APP/L3815/W/15/3138439 (22 dwellings on Priors Acre) and subsequent infill developments. The housing needs of Boxgrove until 2029 have therefore been met in full.</p> <p>There is no overriding need for housing in Boxgrove to justify the allocation of site 7 – Land at the Old Granary, which both Chichester District Council and Historic England consider to be a sensitive site.</p> <p>The <u>location of proposed housing sites</u> does not reflect the wider community's views. The Parish Council's assertion (page 7, consultation statement) that site 7 – Land at Old Granary should remain allocated to reflect the wishes of the residents, is not agreed with.</p> <p>Land at Halnacker Crossing has been omitted from the neighbourhood plan, the reason being that the Parish Council could not afford to undertake an SEA to support it. However when options were considered at the earliest stage (January 2016) 16% showed support for Site 7, compared with 72% for Site 2 at Halnacker Crossing. As a result, the inclusion of Site 7 fails to take into account the majority view of the community and as such fails to have regard to the objectives of neighbourhood planning as set out by paragraph 184 of the NPPF.</p> <p>The Heritage Impact Assessment is also flawed as the map submitted with it omitted trees that lie along the site frontage onto The Street and also trees along the access road to the Old Granary. These trees contribute to the site character and appearance as this part of Boxgrove as you enter the village. These trees should be shown.</p> <p>Also, it is questioned as to why the layout of buildings has been included on The Street, where</p>
---	-----------------	---	---

			<p>the report states that impacts cannot be assessed yet as no development has been proposed. It is also contrary to Local plan Policy H3.</p> <p>Proposed rewording of Policy H5:</p> <p>Notwithstanding our Client's assertion that site 7 is not necessary to meet future housing needs up to 2029 and should therefore be deleted, in the event that the site remains within the Plan then our Client's support the views of Chichester District Council that the Policy would benefit by the inclusion of "<i>additional criteria to protect the characteristics of the site and mitigate any potential impact development proposals may have. Any such policy, for example, could use the findings of the heritage impact assessment to inform a more detailed and robust policy that would seek to enhance and not detract from the significance of the identified heritages assets in this sensitive location</i>".</p> <p>Whilst it is noted that the Parish Council has amended the policy wording to include a requirement for the design and layout of any development to reflect the historic sensitivities of the area, which is supported by our Clients, it is suggested that the Policy should also include the requirement to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • retain those trees along the site frontage onto The Street and also those trees along the access road to the Old Granary, which it is argued contribute to the sites character and appearance and this part of Boxgrove as you enter the village; and • ensure any development is set back within the rear of the site to protect the key view across the site as identified in the Conservation Area Appraisal.
Nik, Hazel, Charlotte, Guy and Freddie Rochez (028)	8.6.2018	Email	<p>Support Just to add our full support for the Plan.</p>
Patricia Hinman (029)	5.6.2018	Response form	<p>Support We live in Boxgrove and we think it's a good idea.</p>
Paul Addison	31.5.2018	Response	<p>Support</p>

(030)		form	I support the Boxgrove Neighbourhood Plan in its entirety. The plan has been subject to the community involvement process and the proposed allocation of housing is considered appropriate for a village of Boxgrove's size.
Peter Gillespie (031)	6.5.2018	Email	Support I fully support the work put into this submission and in particular the time and thought put into the vision for the Parish. It is a thought-out vision which represents the knowledge and contribution of residents who have a broad church of knowledge and experience of the Parish and understanding of the Residents feelings and wishes for how they wish the Parish to evolve in the near to medium future.
Susan Leah (032)	9.5.2018	Email	Support I fully support the Policies in the Plan in particular need to preserve the import views outlined in the Conservation Character Appraisals for both Boxgrove and Halnaker villages. Also, as outlined in Policy EH8 para graph EH8.2 the parish council needs to implement the proposal for a sub-committee to monitor these and any article D planning applications. GA4 is a very important policy for most residents and actions to reduce the dependence on cars would be appreciated by all. I generally support the policies of the plan and will vote in favour at the referendum on this basis.
Wendy Gillespie (033)	25.5.2018	Email	Support As a resident I have attend all public meetings and studied the plan as proposed The plan was constructed by a group of residents who care about the Parish on all levels and their recommendations I fully support I trust this plan will be supported and actioned by the relevant authorities.
William Tod (034)	7.6.2018	Email	Support I have studied the Proposed Boxgrove Parish Neighbourhood Plan which is currently out for consultation. I fully support the proposals included in it and consider that they are appropriate and suitable for the Parish.
Jane Barnes	5.6.18	Response	Support

(035)		form	We live in Boxgrove and think it's a good idea.
South Downs National Park Authority (036)	12.6.2018	Email	<p>Comments The SDNPA would like to commend the hard work and effort of the Neighbourhood Planning group in the preparation of the Boxgrove Neighbourhood Development Plan (BNDP) and have the following comments.</p> <p>Page 5, 2nd paragraph, last bullet point Refers to the SDNP Local Plan (due to be adopted September 2018). It would be better to refer just to the emerging South Downs Local Plan. Page 10, 2.1.2 Local Planning policy Still refers to “the secondary planning authority of South Downs National Park”. Referring back to our response to the pre-submission NDP of 1st November 2017. It would better to describe the parish as falling within two planning authority areas rather referring to the SDNPA as ‘secondary’.</p> <p>Policy SB1 Settlement boundary The settlement boundary for Boxgrove has been identified by Chichester District Council to include three buildings running left to right along the adjacent lane, in the neighbourhood plan, it includes four buildings. Please correct map so that it is consistent with Chichester Local Plan. Boxgrove Settlement Boundary differences between CDC and Boxgrove NP.</p> <p>Policy EH1 Protection of trees and hedgerows, EH1.1 The value of trees and hedgerows goes beyond an open and pleasant feel. Trees and woodland are a significant asset with regard to ecosystem services, contributing to many supporting, provisioning, regulating, and cultural ecosystem services, including for example carbon storage, biodiversity, air quality, and tranquility (South Downs Local Plan presubmission, 2017). Please add in their key roles in reducing the worst effects of a changing climate and biodiversity benefits.</p> <p>Policy EH5 Development on Agricultural Land SDNPA note the removal of the Agricultural grading map, however we refer you back to our letter responding to the Boxgrove Pre-Submission Draft of 1st November 2017 regarding safeguarding the most fertile agricultural land from development and reiterate the need to be in accordance to the NPPF.</p> <p>Policy EH6 Landscape character and important views</p>

			<p>It should be made clear that “positive ‘unlisted’ buildings” are also identified on the map - Appendix 3.</p> <p>Policy EH8 Landscape & Heritage Environment Landscape and wildlife have been included into a largely heritage related policy. Suggest that references to Landscape are kept within EH6.</p> <p>Policy EE2 Tourism Refers to the “built up area boundary” – suggest this should be amended to “settlement boundary”.</p> <p>Policy GA4 Promoting Sustainable Movement SDNPA previously suggested that the section of the policy referring to how CIL money will be spent, may be better in the supporting text rather than the policy itself. We hope you find these comments helpful and please do get in touch if you would like to discuss any of the above or require any clarifications.</p>
Andrew Birchenough (037)	8.6.2018	Email	<p>Support I am happy to support all proposals in the document.</p>