

Hunston Neighbourhood Development Plan

2019 - 2037

Consultation Statement

1. Introduction

- 1.1. This Statement has been prepared by Hunston Parish Council (“the Parish Council”) to accompany its submission to the local planning authority, Chichester District Council (CDC), of the Hunston Neighbourhood Development Plan 2019 (“the Neighbourhood Plan”) under Regulations 15 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 (“the Regulations”).
- 1.2. The Neighbourhood Plan has been prepared by the Parish Council, a qualifying body, for the Neighbourhood Area covering the whole of the Parish of Hunston, as designated by CDC in December 2013.
- 1.3. The legal basis of the Statement is provided by Section 15(2) of Part 5 of the 2012 Neighbourhood Planning Regulations, which requires that a consultation statement should:
 - 1.3.1. Contain details of the persons and bodies who were consulted about the proposed neighbourhood development plan
 - 1.3.2. Explain how they were consulted
 - 1.3.3. Summarise the main issues and concerns raised by the persons consulted; and
 - 1.3.4. Describe how those issues and concerns have been considered and, where relevant addressed in the proposed neighbourhood development plan

2. Background

- 2.1. The Plan will provide a vision for the future of the parish, and set out clear policies, principles and objectives to realise those visions. The policies accord with higher level planning policy principally the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the Chichester Local Plan: Key Policies 2014-2029 (CLPKP) including the saved policies of the Chichester Local Plan – First Review (April 1999) for the SDNPA area, as required by the Localism Act.

3. Process

- 3.1. In July 2013 the Parish Council resolved to embark upon the creation of a Neighbourhood Plan for the Parish.

3.2. A Steering Group was formed and Terms of Reference were agreed.

3.3 The first public consultation took place in November 2018 after the Parish Council had been made aware of plans to develop land owned by the Church Commissioners. 120 residents attended the meeting.

3.4 A number of working parties were agreed and given the task of assembling the evidence to create a State of the Parish Report. This set out the baseline for the Parish at that point in time.

4. Consultation Timeline

Letters sent to local businesses	November 2013	Invitation to participate in process
Informal Parish Meeting	23 January 2014	General discussion
Informal Parish Meeting	6 February 2014	Attended by Tom Bell CDC – brainstorm session
Parish Meeting	July 2014	Minutes state that little progress had been made
Questionnaire	Due Oct 2014 Actual April 2015	Used Survey Monkey. Had 77 paper replies and 33 online. CS finding results
Parish Meeting	January 2016	Councillors agreed to review the Local Plan to see what was required for the Neighbourhood Plan
Working Party	24 February 2016	Agreed to contact RCOH to talk about the Neighbourhood Plan
Parish Meeting	November 2016	John Doughty of RCOH gave a presentation on the N Plan. Costs of £15K. Agreed to provide the Chair with a similar plan and give us the name of the relevant CDC officer. Some concern was expressed at the cost.
Parish Meeting	November 2017	Revisited N Plan and noted no action had been taken. Agreed to set up working party and re-contact RCOH.
Various planned meetings	Jan, Feb, April 2018	Meetings did not take place
Meeting CDC re housing allocation	July 2018	Informed there would be a new housing allocation of 250 houses split between Hunston and North Mundham

Parish Meeting	September 2018	Agreed Chair would approach Maureen Chaffe to work as Administrator on the N Plan. MC agreed.
Working Group	25 October 2018	First working group held chaired by Joan Foster (Parish Council Chair)
Meeting CDC re housing allocation	30 October 2018	Hunston and North Mundham were informed that the split of the 250 allocated houses would be 200 for Hunston and 50 for North Mundham.
Public Meeting	28 November 2018	Presentation of N Plan status and plans. 110 attendees. All present able to comment and question. Largest public meeting every held in Hunston

Call for Sites Assessment Meeting	19 March 2019	
Annual Parish Meeting	22 May 2019	100 attendees
Working Party Meetings	25 October 2018	Average 5 - 10 attendees at each meeting
	10 December 2018	
	7 January 2019	
	14 January 2019	
	23 January 2019	
	11 February 2019	
	25 February 2019	
	15 April 2019	
	21 August 2019	
	1 October 2019	
	14 October 2019	
Steering Group Meetings	18 February 2019	Parish Councillors plus steering group members
	1 April 2019	
	29 April 2019	

	24 June 2019	
	5 August 2019	
	14 November 2019	
	25 November 2019	
Landowners' Meeting	10 January 2020	
Regulation 14 Consultation	May 2020	

5. Regulation 14 consultation

5.1 The Regulation 14 Consultation took place from the 18th May 2020 to the 29th June 2020. It was sent to the following list of consultees:

Statutory Consultees	Contact:
Chichester DC	planning@chichester.gov.uk vdobson@chichester.gov.uk
West Sussex County Council	caroline.west@westsussex.gov.uk planning.policy@westsussex.gov.uk
Natural England	enquiries@naturalengland.org.uk
Environment Agency	PlanningSSD@environment-agency.gov.uk
English Heritage	southeast@english-heritage.org.uk contact-historicproperties@english-heritage.org.uk
Highways England	elizabeth.Cleaver@highways.gsi.gov.uk
NHS	contactus.coastal@nhs.net
Southern Electric	customerservice@southern-electric.co.uk
British Gas	customerservice@britishgas.co.uk
Southern Water	planning.Policy@southernwater.co.uk
Sussex Police	contact.centre@sussex.pnn.police.uk
Historic England	martin.small@historicengland.org.uk
Marine Management	portsmouth@marinemanagement.org.uk
Homes England	enquiries@homesengland.gov.uk
Businesses in Hunston	Contact:
The Spotted Cow Public House	https://www.facebook.com/thespottedcowhunston/

Hunston Stores/Post Office	https://www.facebook.com/hunstonlondis/
Kirklands Newsagents	Main Road, Hunston PO20 1PA
Chichester Golf Club	info@chichestergolf.com
Hairbrained (Hairdresser)	1 Orchardside, Selsey Road, Hunston PO20 1PQ
Hunston Canoe Club	https://hunstoncanoecub.co.uk/contact-us/
Hunter's Lodge Riding School	https://www.facebook.com/HuntersLodgeRidingSchool/
Hunter's Lodge Car Boot	https://www.facebook.com/hunstoncarboot/
Nicholas Plant Hire Ltd	Tennessee Farm, Selsey Road, Hunston Po20 1AU
Kingsham Quarries/Dudman	Albion Wharf, Albion Street, Southwick, W Sussex BN42 4ED
Chichester Free School	office@chichesterfreeschool.org.uk
Stonepillow, St Joseph's	admin@stonepillow.org.uk
Spire Cottage B&B	jan@spirecottage.co.uk
Hunston Mill Self catering	hunstonmoffice@aol.com
Tennessee Farm – Hunston Business Park Ltd	steen@hunstonbusinesspark.co.uk
Other Parish/Town Councils	These are the surrounding councils, including Pagham and Selsey whose residents travel through Hunston
Selsey Town Council	enquiries@selseytowncouncil.gov.uk
Donnington Parish Council	donningtonpc@gmail.com
Sidlesham Parish Council	parishclerk@sidlesham.org
North Mundham Parish Council	clerk@northmundham.org
Pagham Parish Council	clerk@paghamparishcouncil.gov.uk
Chichester City Council	clerk@chichestercity.gov.uk
Arun District Council	planning@arun.gov.uk
Schools:	
North Mundham Primary School	office@northmundham.w-sussex.sch.uk
Sidlesham Primary School	office@sidlesham.w-sussex.sch.uk

The Academy Selsey	office@tas-tkat.org
Major Employers and Organisations	
Nature's Way – Media contact	StephanieJones@nwfltd.co.uk
West Sussex Growers Association	John.hall@wsga.co.uk
Chichester Chamber of Commerce and Industry	https://www.chichestercci.org.uk/contact
RSPB Pagham Harbour Nature Reserve	pagham.harbour@rspb.org.uk
Chichester Harbour Conservancy	info@conservancy.co.uk
South Downs National Park Authority	planning@southdowns.gov.uk
Landowners/Agents	
	william.fleming@southendfarms.co.uk
Genesis Town Planning	kris@genesistp.co.uk
Henry Adams	Ellie.White@henryadams.co.uk
Lichfields	tara.johnston@lichfields.u

5.2 The following summaries the efforts made by Hunston Parish Council to ensure the Public Consultation was made as widely available as possible:

Notices put up in Hunston Village Stores and Kirklands Newsagents – 20.05.20
(Appendix 1)

Notices put up in three bus shelters (Appendix 1)

Notice put up on Foxbridge Roundabout (Appendix 2)

Notice put up on lamp posts in village (Appendix 3)

Advert put in local paper 11.06.20 to publicise (Appendix 4)

Consultation Statement December 2020

All consultees with email, emailed on 18.05.20

Consultees without email, letters posted 21.05.20

Notice on Hunston Parish Council Facebook Page - <https://www.facebook.com/hunstonpc/> (Appendix 5)

Zoom public meeting held 08.06.20 (four attendees). Presentation given of the contents of the N Plan. Further Zoom meetings held on 16.06.20 (three attendees) and 24.06.20 (three attendees) Copy of Powerpoint Presentation available in background documents (Reg 14 Presentation June 2020).

All attendees were in favour of the Neighbourhood Plan as presented. Concern was expressed at the increased traffic and inadequate sewerage. Support was given to the chosen sites and to any build being to the highest environmental standards. Strong support was expressed of the aim of the Parish Council to preserve the character of Hunston and to prevent coalescence with North Mundham or Whyke.

5.3 Roundup of the 11 responses received and the actions taken by the PC following the Reg 14 consultation - the actual responses can be viewed in the online evidence base. Not all statutory consultees responded however this is consistent with responses received by our administrator on other Neighbourhood Plans.

CDC	Policy and Response	SG comments
The Plan is not clear if it is aligning with the 2014-29 or the 2019-37 Plan	The PC was told by CDC on the 30th October 2018 that they should prepare a NP to include an allocation of 200 homes. They were told that the Reg 14 stage had to be completed by June 2019. The PC commenced work on the Plan immediately. It is not possible to just stop once started and as CDC has still not, at October 2020, published any revised figure for the parish, work has continued.,	It is not unusual for a neighbourhood plan to proceed ahead of the Local Plan. Basic Conditions are measured on the adopted Local Plan not the emerging Local Plan and there is an expectation in the adopted Local Plan (I believe) that Neighbourhood Plans will allocate sites to meet some of the housing requirement. Insert the details about the CDC allocation into the Plan

Statutory Consultees	The consultee list is that set out in the legislation. The period of time allowed for comments was six weeks as required by the same legislation. The addresses used are ones regularly used by other PC's (we reviewed other lists to find the addresses). WSCC has responded so clearly they received the consultation.	NFA needed as we believe the consultation met the legal requirements. CDC does not publish a clear list of addresses and there is no detail on their website that one should be requested. CDC also needs to reflect that they are a body corporate and if one section receives the consultation it should share it with all those inside the organisation that need to see it.
Plan period should be to 2037	If that is what CDC require we are happy to amend	Amend the Plan accordingly
References to SDNPA are out of date	Change where necessary	There is only one reference which is to the CDC saved policies
Website link missing	Link is in the online version but greys out when printed	Make the link clearer
Page 8 planning [policy context	The initials RNPPF have been used to make the distinction between the old and new version. CDC do not agree with this.	Remove the reference
2.2.3 the Plan should be aligned with the 2037 Plan and the word District removed	We had assumed that the new Plan was a District wide Plan.	Make the requested changes
Page 9 references to the adopted Local Plan should be removed	Basic Conditions are measured on the adopted Local Plan not the emerging Local Plan	Do not amend
Page 10 - no reference made to the Portsmouth to Arundel canal	It is known that the line of the canal is preserved	Add a note to the Plan
Page 19 Climate Change - provide the source of the sea level rise figure	Source was Climate Central	Add the source to the report
The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment 2018 should be referenced	Add a reference here and to the background documents list	Add references
Page 21 3.4.25 the Plan should have used the CD HER and make mention of the rich heritage	The Plan makes mention of the heritage assets but will add more	The CDC Heritage records have to be paid for so we will continue with the West Sussex Record which have been provided as a map layer.
Page 22 3.5.7 200 is not the agreed housing number	See comments in first para	No action needed
Page 24 the parish was not instructed to prepare a NP	This is untrue. The PC was told to create a NP and to have the Reg 14 ready by June 2019	No action needed
Page 27 3.8.1 reference to the closure of Rumboldswyke should be removed	This position has changed during the Plan process	Change the reference

Section 4.2 the community aspirations need to be consistently marked	Section B to E need to be amended	Amend sections B to E
Page 32 NPPF check references are to the latest version	Checked and they are	No action needed
Remove references to the current Local Plan	How can we. It is the only extant Plan	No action needed
Policy SB1 the map needs a different title and tourism and recreation need explaining	The wording of the policy is consistent with that agreed by CDC and the Examiner of the Boxgrove NP	Review the policy and amend Map D
EH1 the third para could be worded more clearly	The wording of the policy is consistent with that agreed by CDC and the Examiner of the Boxgrove NP	No changes needed

<p>EH3 the wording of the policy is unclear</p>	<p>Policy could be strengthened.</p> <p>CDC comment that the Manhood Peninsula Report is not detailed in the policy and is unclear in its requirements. It is a report commissioned by WSCC which sets out actions to be taken to alleviate flood risk.</p>	<p>Amend policy to read:</p> <p>New development, within areas at risk from flooding, will not be permitted unless it is supported by a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment which provides clear evidence to demonstrate that the proposal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a). Would not give rise to additional risk of flooding, either to the development site or to other land, arising from the carrying out or use of the development; • b). Would make appropriate provision for accommodating the surface water and foul water arising from the development • should take account of the Manhood Peninsula Surface Water Management Plan Final Report 2015 <p>Planning permission should only be granted for new development subject to a condition that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • no development shall commence until full details of the proposed drainage schemes for surface and foul water (including details of their routing, design, and subsequent management and maintenance) have been submitted to and approved by the planning authority and • no building shall be occupied until the drainage schemes have been implemented in accordance with the approved details.
---	---	---

EH5 policy should require it to be demonstrated that development on lower quality agricultural land is not possible.	Current wording - Development of poorer quality agricultural land has been fully considered	Change para to read - Development of poorer quality agricultural land has been prioritised
EH6 add a Plan	Add a plan	Add a plan to the document
EH7 not reasonable to require light not be turned off at midnight as they may be on a sensor	Lighting sensors have timers. If the sensor is set to react when someone approaches that is OK.	The policy wording has been tested in other Plans
EH8 needs a distinction between conservation of natural and historic assets	Change the heading to conservation of the natural and historic environments	Policy EH8 Conservation of the natural and historic environments Add sites or areas containing archaeological interest
EE2 policy is badly worded	The wording of the policy is consistent with that agreed by CDC and the Examiner of the Boxgrove NP	No change required
EE4 potential conflict with other Plan policies	Suggested that a line is added to reflect other plan policies	Don't agree
LC3 how would viability be proved?	Need to add marketing information	Amend policy to add marketing requirement. No assets have been listed as the policy relates to any future assets that the PC may wish to add.
LC4 policy would exclude the upgrade of the playing fields	Policy wording needs to reflect possible future upgrades	Amend the policy
LC5 village facilities omits the PH	Add figures from the survey	Amend the policy
H1 Map not clear, site is outside of and detached from the settlement boundary and question if the site can contain the development.	Map shows the site clearly. The site lies outside of the settlement boundary but there are no sites inside the boundary. A settlement boundary can only be amended through a NP. There is a line of housing at the end of the current settlement boundary and this proposal merely extends that line of housing further south. The Steering Group are working with the site owners agents who have provided evidence that the site can contain the necessary development if required to do so	Amend the maps. Seek a development masterplan from the developers agent.
criterion 2 a masterplan must be approved by the LPA prior to a planning application being submitted.	A NP sits alongside the Local Plan and it is a given that Local Plan policy must be complied with	No change required

Criterion 3 the new Local Plan revisions will supersede this	That may well be the case but the Local Plan review is not complete and the revised policies not available to the NP steering group. If the Local Plan policies are stronger then doubtless the LPA will apply them. Use BREEAM HQM	Change the policy wording at e and f to “ New development must attain a HQM five star rating at final stage certificate. Add to supporting text - The Home Quality Mark (HQM) is a customer- focused, third-party assessment and certification scheme. It recognises new homes where performance meets best-practice standards that are often significantly above those required by regulation. It defines a rigorous, evidence- based, relevant and independent voluntary standard for new homes, and is built on tried and tested processes commonly used in the UK and the rest of the world.
Point 7 terminology change	Social rent should be changed to read affordable housing to rent and starter home changed to entry level homes	Amend the Plan accordingly
H1.2 cycle network connections	Add the words ‘connect to the cycle network’	Amend the Plan accordingly
H1.3 plan shows one site text refers to three	Amend the map to show three connected sites	Amend the Plan accordingly
H1.4 typo	Change affects to effects	Change wording
H2 policy last clarity and could be clearer	The wording of the policy is consistent with that agreed by CDC and the Examiner of the Boxgrove NP	No change required
H4 use term settlement boundary not BUAB plus m minor comments on policy clauses	Amend the wording to clarify some of the points raised	Change the plan
GA1 reference to CIL	The policy wording sets out how CIL will be spent	Move the wording to the supporting narrative
GA1.2 move supporting text to H1	Suggested that GA1.2 be added to H1	Agreed
GA2 some text could be part of the policy	Remove the electric charging point bullet. Move the bullets into the main policy text	Amend the Plan accordingly
GA3 policy should be rewritten to allow for shared surface areas	The policy doesn’t mention shared surface areas	No change required
GA4 remove reference to CIL	Move the references to the supporting text	Amend the Plan accordingly

Proposals Map	Amend the key and add the settlement boundary	
Map C add cycle routes	Find a map layer with cycle routes and route 88	Amend the map
Map D add new development area	Map needs to reflect the new development sites	Amend the map
Lichfields	Policy and Response	SG Comments
The Site Allocation	<p>“The allocation makes use of partly brown field sites and is capable of accommodating all 200 homes”. Comment that a very limited amount of the land is brownfield and that there is confusion as to the number of houses that can be built</p>	<p>We do not agree that the land is arable. There is some grazing at the Village Dairy. Farmfield has been unused for years and the grass would not be suitable for arable or grazing. There is some grazing at Ridgeway, but this is a small percentage of the site. We agree that there was a lack of clarity for the number of houses on the three sites, which we will correct. As the sites are being developed jointly, they are able to meet the 200 houses requirement.</p>
	<p>“The allocation protects the open landscape and important views to the east of the Parish” The site is poorly located in relation to the existing village, in our view the CCE site is much better located. Sensitivity of the landscape value</p>	<p>All sites are within the current boundary. Residents considered that they desired to protect the green fields to the east of the B2145 through the village and between Southover Way and Hunston Copse. The context of views, the Conservation Area and preserving good arable land were considered important. We will ensure that this is reflected.</p>
	<p>"The allocation protects the view into and out of the Conservation Area". Open spaces around the proposed housing will preserve the green setting</p>	<p>Do not agree with this assessment.</p>
	<p>“The allocation protects Bremere Rife an important habitat for water voles protected by the Wildlife and Countryside Act”. View that a green buffer and SUDS would protect the Rife.</p>	<p>Do not agree that building 200+ houses and new access roads over the Rife will be a net biodiversity gain</p>

	<p>“Allocation of the sites should be capable of delivering benefits in the form of improvements to the footways”. CCE would be capable of delivering improvements</p>	<p>Whilst, CCE will be able to create footpaths from their development, they will all be to the east of the B2145 and would need to cross the B2145 to access the footpaths to Chichester. The Greenway project from Selsey to A27 contains a cycleway and footpath from Green Lane across farm land to the sites at Ridgeway etc and then around the back of Oakview to join the Tramway footpath. This would then continue to the Canal and a new cycleway across fields to Chichester Free School and the A27. This would not require any crossing of the B2145 and would be much safer.</p>
	<p>“Allocation of the sites is likely to result in journeys on foot around the village ...”</p>	<p>It is valid that this will apply to the CCE site, however access to Chichester will require crossing the B2145.</p>
	<p>“Retaining the robust landscape boundary ...”</p>	<p>The proximity of the CCE site to Meadow Close, Southover Way and Foxbridge where there are less established trees and hedging, does not necessarily support this view.</p>
<p>Conclusions on Site Selection Rationale</p>	<p>“No further detail is provided as to how the sites scored and what the key criteria is”</p>	<p>This information is contained in the supporting documents.</p>
	<p>“No assessment made of whether the sites are deliverable and development...”</p>	<p>The landowners have made it clear that the sites are deliverable</p>
<p>Genesis Town Planning - Clients Rebecca Newman-Smith, Leon Zijl and Mr and Mrs Lomas</p>	<p>Policy and Response</p>	<p>SG Comments</p>
<p>Para 3.5.7</p>	<p>Housing - Paragraph 3.5.7 (page 23) - To be consistent with the Chichester Local Plan Review 2016 - 2035, should refer to “Hunston has a housing requirement for a minimum of 200 homes designated by the Local Plan Review 2016 - 2035: Preferred Approach”</p>	<p>See previous notes about the Local Plan</p>

Policy EH8 - Conservation and Heritage (Page 38)	To avoid confusion it would be better if references to landscape, natural beauty and wildlife were removed from the policy and listed in a separate standalone policy. This would leave Policy EH8 to deal with Listed Buildings, Conservation Areas and Historic buildings/structures	Consider how the policy may be changed
Policy EH8.1 (page 38)	Evidence Base 5 and 6 should read Evidence Base 6 and 7)	Agreed
Paragraph 5.7 (page 45)	Should include a reference to the housing allocation for the parish being a “minimum”..	See 42 above
Policy H1 - Housing Sites Allocation (Pages 45 - 47)	Criterion 3 (f) states that where achievable this should be by 'meeting the relevant design category of Buildings Research Establishment BREEAM building standard “excellent”. ... Suggest BREEAM is delete4d and replaced with 'Code for Sustainable New Homes”	See comments above relating to HQM
Comments on Basic Conditions Statement	Paragraph 4.1 (Page 4) refers to the Arun Local Plan ... This should be replaced with “Chichester Local Plan: Key Policies 2014 - 2029 adopted in July 2015	Agreed
WSCC Property Department	Policy and Response	SG Comments
EH10 policy will stop development on WSCC land	The map is produced by CDC	Find out where the map came from and what evidence base it uses.
WSCC Services Officer	Policy and Response	SG Comments
The Plan will need to be tested and refined through the Development Management process	Development is accounted for in the CDC Transport Study	Noted
Para 1.1 needs reference to the WS Waste Local Plan 2014 and the Joint Minerals Local Plan 2018	The Parish is safeguarded under Policy M9 of the JMLP and could be subject to a minerals or waste resource assessment	Research needed
RNPPF	Change the references	Amend the Plan accordingly
3.8.1 the school will now remain open	Change the reference	Amend the Plan accordingly
Vision A amend to public bridleways	Upgrade public footpaths to public bridleways	Amend the Plan accordingly

H1 reference should be made to minerals safeguarding	Suggest adding - A mineral resource assessment is undertaken to ascertain whether economically viable sharp sand and gravel resources are present and whether prior extraction is practicable, as required by Policy M9 of the West Sussex Joint Minerals Local Plan - to the supporting text	Amend the Plan accordingly
Insufficient capacity in local schools	Not something the NP can influence. Needs to be agreed between CDC and WSCC	Reflect the comments in the supporting text
GA1 consider horse riders	Rename policy - Public Right of Way (PROW) Network Opportunity to upgrade other paths	Research needed
Proposals Map unclear	Amend the map to show three connected sites	Amend the Plan accordingly
WSCC Cllr Fitzjohn	Policy and Response	SG Comments
Consider removing the housing from the NP due to the lack of education provision	Not something the NP can influence. Needs to be agreed between CDC and WSCC	Reflect the comments in the supporting text
Mr Osborne	Policy and Response	SG Comments
Page 30 does not reflect page 46	Use BREEAM standards	Change the policy wording at e and f to “ New development must attain a HQM five star rating at final stage certificate. Add to supporting text - The Home Quality Mark (HQM) is a customer- focused, third-party assessment and certification scheme. It recognises new homes where performance meets best-practice standards that are often significantly above those required by regulation. It defines a rigorous, evidence- based, relevant and independent voluntary standard for new homes, and is built on tried and tested processes commonly used in the UK and the rest of the world.
Southern Water	Policy and Response	SG Comments

<p>3.4.18 Flood risk and drainage amendment proposed</p>	<p>In February 2017 it was reported that stormwater, which is a mix of rainwater and screened wastewater, raw sewage is being discharged every five weeks on average. High flows caused by heavy rainfall are diverted into storm settlement tanks to prevent overloading of Untreated sewage from the Treatment Works in Summer Lane. If the capacity of these tanks is subsequently exceeded as a result of prolonged heavy rainfall, the excess stormwater weirs off the top through mesh screens before it is discharged into the Pagham Rife from where it flows into the Harbour. Pagham Parish Council member Cllr Phil Hailey reported that “Since 2011, Southern Water have had to inform the Environment Agency 55 times of a discharge into Pagham Rife of untreated or partially treated sewage. Southern Water have said they have no issues with the proposed houses here because they would not cause the treatment works any problems but, clearly, there are big problems already.”</p>	<p>Amend the Plan accordingly</p>
<p>Policy EH3 and H1 supported but amendment requested</p>	<p>Amend to add point 12 to H1 and to EH3 -</p> <p>12. no building shall be occupied until the sewerage network reinforcement scheme has been implemented in accordance with the approved details.</p>	<p>Amend the Plan accordingly</p>
<p>N Mundham PC</p>	<p>Policy and Response</p>	<p>SG Comments</p>

3.4.18 additional narrative provided	Add the text to 3.4.18	Add - The sewage discharge from Hunston is pumped to North Mundham through a rising main, which runs underground from the pumping station at the south-western corner of the recreation ground next to the children's playground. In June 2020, a failure of this main caused significant pollution of the grazing land through which it runs, making the field unsuitable for grazing and the hay crop unviable. The sewage discharge from Hunston joins the collected discharge from North Mundham and is pumped by a further rising main to the treatment works at Pagham. Evidence of surcharging (sewage upwelling through the manhole covers) after heavy rain indicates that the pumps at North Mundham are already running at or beyond capacity. The fact that Hunston's sewage is pumped to North Mundham helps to ensure that it is removed from Hunston, but there is no guarantee that this will not be to the detriment of North Mundham residents unless the capacity of the pumping station at North Mundham is adequate to handle the collected discharge from both parishes.
EH3 suggest adding text	Add - Manhood Peninsula Surface Water Management Plan Final Report 2015, or its update or replacement'.	Amend the Plan accordingly
EH4 supported and amendment suggested	Suggest some additions to the policy to support good design of development and associated watercourses for recreation, plus biodiversity and natural flood management value.	Change wording
EH10 supported but amendment suggested	Need to look at the Biodiversity Opportunity Area which passes through the Parish along the Bremere Rife and strengthen the wording	Change wording
H1 the plan only identifies 180 homes not 200	Developer has indicated that 200 are viable	Need to check the detail

Site Assessment Report fails to provide a sound argument for the choices	Review the site assessment report. It is suggested that the Plan should identify a long term strategy for future proposed housing. This is not a requirement of the NP process	Review the site assessment process and the SEA scoring
Henry Adams on behalf of Spiby Partners	Policy and Response	SG Comments
Comments about the housing allocation from CDC.	The PC were given the figure of 200 by CDC. They have acted in good faith and worked to that figure. CDC repeatedly now state that the figure is not agreed but consistently fail to produce an accurate allocation.	Only options are to continue with the Plan and a figure of 200 or to produce the Plan with no housing allocation and then redo it when one is known
H1 - housing will be completely detached from the village	Difficult to understand this comment. The settlement boundary does for some unknown reason, not include the line of houses to the south and fully connected to the village. The proposal merely continues that line. The CDC HELAA allocates the land as developable.	No change required
H1 - the site does not make use of 'brownfield' land but is arable / grazing	We do not agree that the land is arable. There is some grazing at the Village Dairy. Farmfield has been unused for years and the grass would not be suitable for arable or grazing. There is some grazing at Ridgeway, but this is a small percentage of the site. We agree that there was a lack of clarity for the number of houses on the three sites, which we will correct. As the sites are being developed jointly, they are able to meet the 200 houses requirement.	No change required
H1 - question the connectivity of the site	The site is 900m from the shop and PH and 400m from the playing field and village hall. Development anywhere in the village will increase traffic as all employment opportunities lie outside of the parish. The Selsey Greenway will abut the western edge of the development	Add connectivity to the Greenway into either H1 or GA1
Land east of Foxbridge Drive not in proximity to heritage assets	Not true. The whole of the Northern edge is situated within the line of the Portsmouth to Arundel Canal which is a protected historic asset	

Site lies outside but adjoining the settlement boundary	The site abuts the boundary at only one point on the Western edge.	
Connections to the cycle network	The site can access the National Cycle route 2	Agreed
Benefits to the community	The proposed development is on 3 hectares of the 4.25 h site. The land is agricultural and currently represent an open field landscape. It has medium landscape sensitivity and encroaches into the separation area between the parishes and could image views of Chichester and National Route 2	See Site Assessment. No housing numbers are included in the representation.
Map D BUAB	Incorrectly drawn. Needs to include th areas east of Lowlands	See CDC Site Allocation 2019 Inset Map 12 and amend the boundary
Site Assessment Report fails to provide a sound argument for the choices		Review the site assessment process and the SEA scoring
Separation from settlement edge is not true.	<p>Agree that the site borders the end of Farm Close and Foxbridge Drive but that is only approx one fifth of the site boundary. The rest of the site abuts the open fields west of Oakdene and is very much detached from the BUAB</p> <p>There is no mention in the document about where access to the site would be gained from. Access to the north is not possible due to the historic canal route and access via Foxbridge Drive would have a major impact on the homes in that road and the adjoining roads</p>	Review the site assessment process and the SEA scoring. Look in particular at access
Henry Adams on behalf of Jameson Family	Policy and Response	SG Comments
Comments about the housing allocation from CDC.	The PC were given the figure of 200 by CDC. They have acted in good faith and worked to that figure. CDC repeatedly now state that the figure is not agreed but consistently fail to produce an accurate allocation.	Only options are to continue with the Plan and a figure of 200 or to produce the Plan with no housing allocation and then redo it when one is known

H1 - housing will be completely detached from the village	Difficult to understand this comment. The settlement boundary does for some unknown reason, not include the line of houses to the south and fully connected to the village. The proposal merely continues that line. The CDC HELAA allocates the land as developable.	No change required
Housing site proposal	This site was not put forward through the Call for Sites. The number of dwellings proposed is 10. The land is agricultural and currently represent an open field landscape. It has medium landscape sensitivity and encroaches into the separation area between the parishes and could image views of Rochester and National Route 2	No change required but could be added to the site assessment report. Check the point about it having previously been given to the PC

5.4 Hunston has an extremely active Parish Council with well-established links with residents. During lock-down 1 due to Covid 19 the Parish Council ensured that despite being unable to meet with residents, they were kept fully informed of the Plans progress. 36 volunteers were identified, who supported 20 vulnerable residents. The Chair is very aware that there is still a percentage of elderly residents who are not on-line, and just before lockdown 1 was able to organise a hand delivery to every house, giving contact details on-line and by telephone.

Building on this, residents are kept in touch with Neighbourhood Plan developments on an informal basis. Regular questions are raised by interested villagers and answered to the best of the Council's ability. This is a Parish where relationships are an important part of communications.

Appendix 1: Notice in two shops and three bus shelters

HUNSTON PARISH COUNCIL
NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

PUBLIC CONSULTATION (Regulation 14)

Running from May 18 to June 29

GO TO

www.hunstonparishcouncil.org.uk

We have put together our draft plan for everyone to comment on.

PLEASE TELL US WHAT YOU THINK

You can comment on the website.

We are holding three Zoom meetings to talk through the plan.

Monday 8 June, Tuesday 16 June, Wednesday 24 June – all at 18.30

If you would like to attend, please email clerk@hunstonparishcouncil.org

If you are not online please ring the Parish Clerk on 01243 789039 and she will send you a copy – it is 65 pages long!

Appendix 2: Notice on Foxbridge Roundabout at entrance to village

HUNSTON

NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

PUBLIC

CONSULTATION

SEE PARISH COUNCIL WEBSITE

www.hunstonparishcouncil.org.uk

Appendix 3: Notice put on lamp posts through village

**HUNSTON
NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN
PUBLIC
CONSULTATION
www.hunstonparishcouncil.org.uk**

Appendix 4: PUBLIC NOTICE HUNSTON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN – PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION

As part of the requirements of the Localism Act 2011 and Regulation 14 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012, Hunston Parish Council is undertaking Pre-Submission Consultation on the Draft Hunston Neighbourhood Plan (HNP). We are hereby seeking your views on the Draft HNP. The plan can be viewed at www.hunstonparishcouncil.org or hard copies are available on application to the Parish Clerk. The pre-submission consultation commenced on the 18th May 2020 and the closing date for representations is 29th June 2020. Representations can be made online via the website or in writing to The Parish Clerk, Hunston Village Hall, Selsey Road, Hunston PO20 1AW

Appendix 5: Facebook post:

A DRAFT Hunston Neighbourhood Plan has now been published on the Hunston Parish

Council Website: www.hunstonparishcouncil.org.uk

The plan has taken 18 months of hard work by the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Committee to put together but this next stage is the most important part of all!

WE NEED YOU TO TELL US WHAT YOU THINK OF THE PLAN.

What do you support or disagree with?

Have we made any mistakes?

What have we missed?

There are three ways for you to comment:

1. Email clerk@hunstonparishcouncil.org
2. Write to Parish Clerk, Hunston Village Hall, Selsey Road, Hunston, PO20 1AW.
3. Click on the link on www.hunstonparishcouncil.org.uk/nhp

COMMENTS NEED TO BE RECEIVED BY 29 JUNE.

PUBLIC MEETINGS

We are holding three Zoom meetings to talk through the plan.

Monday 8 June, Tuesday 16 June, Wednesday 24 June – all at 18.30hrs

Consultation Statement December 2020

If you would like to attend, please email clerk@hunstonparishcouncil.org
If you know someone who is not online please ask them to ring the Parish Clerk on 01243 789039 and she will send a copy – it is 65 pages long!