



Southbourne Parish Council

The Village Hall
First Avenue
Southbourne
West Sussex
PO10 8HN

01243 373 667

admin@southbourne-pc.gov.uk
www.southbourne-pc.gov.uk

Additional comments/updates from original LP Reg 19 responses. All items relate to respondent Mrs. Maria Carvajal-Neal Deputy Clerk 7805

Policy NE4 Strategic Wildlife Corridors

Reference 5240 (Mrs. Maria Carvajal-Neal Deputy Clerk 7805)

Q.119 What is meant by 'in close proximity' and in this regard would the Policy be effective?

To be properly protected Natural England proposes a buffer zone of at least 250 meters from corridors/chalk streams, rare habitats.

Q.120 Are the boundaries of the proposed Strategic Wildlife Corridors justified?

Reference 5240 (Mrs. Maria Carvajal-Neal Deputy Clerk 7805)

SPCs Neighbourhood Plan (NP) was made in February 2024. The boundary SPC created for the Ham Brook wildlife corridor (related to CDC Nutbourne to Hambrook Corridor) is much wider at its northwestern section than the CDC corridor boundaries. This was queried by the examiner of SPCs NP and SPC refer you to evidence documents:

- SPNP3 Wildlife appendix Final which specifically answered the examiners questions regarding the evidence base to justify the change.
- WC1 Wildlife corridors CDC & SPNP - It must be noted that SPC includes the CDC Biodiversity record maps as it was Southbourne Environment Group members that gathered that evidence with the former CDC Wildlife officer Sarah Hughes, so its exclusion is inexplicable.
- Nutbourne WSP Phase 2 operation watershed report: Also supports the wider NW portion as the water vole streams/ditches are part of the total catchment area of the Ham brook chalk stream, and link to another culvert under the A27 which allows for greater connectivity between Chichester Harbour and South Downs National Park.

Part of the reasoning behind this inclusion was the recommendation of the report that 4 hectares 1-meter-deep volume area needed to prevent flooding further downstream. Having these other parts of the catchment protected in the corridor could provide the means to create meandering/retention ponds etc. to assist in this endeavor.

Q.121 Are the suggested MMs necessary for soundness?

SPC queries the statement made in the Strategic Wildlife Corridors Background paper June 2024. *"As a consequence, therefore, it is considered this approach should be maintained to underpin the strategic policy. However, this does not preclude parishes from proposing their own local corridors within their neighbourhood plans."*

This raises the question of which boundary will be recognized in any given scenario. Would the LP boundary supersede the NP boundary? An overarching policy for all the corridors is too limiting as each has different aspects that need specific protection and wording.