Matthew Burle

**From:** Stuart Solliss

**Sent:** 29 August 2021 18:29

**To:** Neighbourhood Planning

**Subject:** Hunston Neighbourhood Plan

Hi

I SUPPORT THE HUNSTON PLAN in principle. I do however have comments as below.

Generally, use of the word "sustainable" in planning does not relate to "that which can continue indefinitely". Globally and in UK it is clear that climate change and biodiversity loss are at a tipping point. Environmentally, much of what the UK planning system deems sustainable really is anything but.

Planners need to realise the UK already consumes the resources of about 2x its area. Growth in Population and housing really needs to be negative to achieve sustainability. This is beyond the scope of a local plan of course.

The Manhood peninsula , in great part, is forecast to go be below annual flood level by 2050. It is foolish to build any new housing South of the A27.

See https://coastal.climatecentral.org/map/12/- 0.7343/50.8044/?theme=sea\_level\_rise&map\_type=year&basemap=roadmap&contiguous=true&elevation\_ model=best\_available&forecast\_year=2050&pathway=rcp45&percentile=p50&refresh=true&return\_level= return\_level\_1&slr\_model=kopp\_2014

To the plan. There are too many "weasel word" clauses that provide possible loopholes for developers to wriggle out of complying with these policies. If the plan is used to judge planning applications, I think these loopholes need closing. Policies that use "should" need to be rephrased using "shall" or "must". "Should" is a mere suggestion, it has no place in a policy.

Example 1

Policy EH4 Watercourses

The opening up of watercourses and their banks for recreation, amenity,

biodiversity and natural flood management value is generally supported; but the culverting and the constricting of watercourses and their immediate

environs will ***generally*** not be supported ***unless circumstances dictate them to be necessary.***

change to:

Policy EH4 Watercourses

The opening up of watercourses and their banks for recreation, amenity,

biodiversity and natural flood management value is generally supported; but the culverting and the constricting of watercourses and their immediate

environs will not be supported***.*** Example 2.

Policy EH1: Protection of trees and hedgerows

Development proposals that result in the loss of or adverse impacts on trees or hedgerows of arboricultural, amenity or historic value ***should demonstrate that the benefits clearly outweigh the harm or loss.***

Development proposals, ***where appropriate***, ***should*** be designed to incorporate biodiversity within and around developments and enhance ecological networks, seeking to retain wherever possible ancient trees, trees of good arboricultural and amenity value and hedgerows to contribute to the Government’s target to halt the decline in biodiversity by aiming for a net gain for nature.

Proposals which significantly affect sites with existing trees or hedgerows should be accompanied by a survey that establishes the health and longevity of any affected trees or hedgerows and a management plan to demonstrate how they will be so maintained.

change to:

Policy EH1: Protection of trees and hedgerows

Development proposals that result in the **net** loss of or adverse impacts on trees or hedgerows of **biodiversity**, arboricultural, amenity or historic value **will not be supported.**

Development proposals **must** be designed to incorporate

biodiversity within and around developments and enhance ecological networks, seeking to retain wherever possible ancient trees, trees of good arboricultural and amenity value and hedgerows to contribute to the Government’s target to halt the decline in biodiversity by aiming for a net gain for nature.

Proposals which significantly affect sites with existing trees or hedgerows should be accompanied by a survey that establishes the health and longevity of any affected trees or hedgerows and a management plan to demonstrate how they will be so maintained.

Finally, I would like to see a policy that where any new vehicular access or minor side road crosses a **footway/cycleway/bridleway/footpath** that the **footway/cycleway/bridleway/footpath** retains a clearly marked priority. For example, I was most annoyed that the not-yet-complete Cherry Tree Close, Hunston has made yet another road crossing necessary for children walking from Hunston to school in North Mundham. WSCC allowed this. Any sane policy to encourage walking and cycling should preserve priority for non-vehicular traffic at minor crossings like this.

Regards, Stuart Solliss
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