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Arun District Council (ADC) Reg.16 comments

Prepared By: Donna Moles

Please note:
The comments below are reflective of the views of ADC as a Council and include representations from all Departments who have commented. The comments are to be signed off by the Assistant Director of Planning and Economic Regeneration or his nominated representative.

The Council fully supports the community’s initiative to produce a Neighbourhood Development Plan. Neighbourhood planning aims to give people greater ownership of plans and policies that affect their area. The government is clear that the intention of Neighbourhood Development Plans should be to set out policies on the development and use of land in a neighbourhood area and that the local planning authority has a duty to support production of the plan.

Our approach at this stage is therefore to make final representation on the Barnham and Eastergate Neighbourhood Development Plan to the Examiner for a forthcoming examination.

ADC comments

As part of good planning practice, ADC previously made comments on the working draft plan and pre-submission plans. Therefore the comments below are a natural progression and are on the plan proposal submission.

The following list outlines any comments we have identified in the submitted plan documents:

Submission Plan
1. It has been assumed that the bullet points under each policy headline, is also part of the policy.
2. Page 6 lists photographs that are on the next page – the list does not mention the Murrell Arms which is pictured.
3. para. 2.2.2, 3rd line should … in and around Bognor Regis. (insert Regis)
4. **Policy ES1: Applications for new development must address flooding and drainage issues** – it is unreasonable to say no to all development pending the completion of the Surface Water Management Plan for Lidsey Catchment and the Aldingbourne and Barnham Rife Strategy. What is the justification for this? The 4th bullet point is very sweeping and open. Some watercourses may not be suitable for opening up so perhaps more detail required here.

5. **Policy ES2: New dwellings code for sustainable homes** - Is Code Level 5 achievable/reasonable? If we have an application that is acceptable on all other grounds apart from this would we refuse?

6. **Policy ES4: Development within the Local Gap/Green Infrastructure Corridor will not be supported** – There may be existing buildings in the gap which wish to extend and this policy would not allow it. It would also rule out agricultural buildings which may need to be sited there.

2.10 The first sentence does not make sense and seems incomplete.

7. **Policy ES6: Building style must be appropriate to the visible historic and local context** – The policy seems to rule out modern styles which may be appropriate at times which runs counter to the NPPF, then para 2.9 counteracts the actual policy by saying that the villages have a range of design styles.

8. **Policy ES10: Increasing the energy efficiency of our buildings** - Code 5 or 6 have to be reached, what is the reasoning for them to be going in at this level? We are not allowed to be overly restrictive to development and the reference to extensions adding more than 30% triggering on-site renewables raises a few questions, such as will the methods that are mentioned in the earlier part of the justification going to be taken into account, what is the basis for the 30% or greater (inferring the last bit) and ultimately the restricting dev through requiring it point. Building Regs is the required standard CfSH is still not applicable to all new homes. The reference to ADC doc needs to be updated to Energy Efficiency & Fuel Poverty Strategy 2014-2019. Should this not also include non-listed buildings in conservation areas. Green features can damage the appearance of these attractive buildings and the conservation areas generally.

Also some things will damage/harm the historic environment and will not be supported at the application stage – this includes the use of double glazing in listed buildings. This should be clarified.

9. **Policy GA1: Developer or CIL contributions required to support the provision of a comprehensive cycle and footpaths network** - contributions from all development? Does this mean new houses and businesses or does it include extensions too? Agreements for contributions can only be entered into if it is relating to something that will make the site acceptable in planning terms, so may be difficult for individual houses or change of use possibly.

10. **Policy CLW2: Developments which provide potential new medical facilities will be supported** - as previously commented it is best for it to be opportunities from development, rather than contributions, as these may not be applicable. The need or not will be informed by the NHS to the District.

11. **Policy EE2: Retain existing employment land in employment use** - 1 year marketing required before vacant unit allowed change of use – currently we look for 6 months so a year may be excessive. It also makes reference to “no interest in acquisition has been expressed". Does this mean that if interest has been expressed but not taken forward then application would be refused? Suggest a wording change to aid clarification.

12. **Policy HDQ2: Local Connection** - This policy conflicts with ADC policy. ADC only has a local connection criterion for rural exception sites so this would not be supported by ADC.

14. **Policy HDQ8: Provide a good quality private outdoor space** – The idea of this policy is supported but the policy is a little vague.

15. There is no mention of delivery of affordable housing as part of the delivery within the plan, which is a concern.

16. **page 46 Appendix A**- refers to 100 new homes required in the plan period 2014-2019 but is actually **200 new homes required in the plan period 2014-2029 in total less planning permissions since 31st March 2013**. This is not clear here.

17. **page 54** – it should be noted that the BEW site was shown as a potential strategic allocation in ADC last consultation on the emerging Local Plan and it remains an option under consideration but also fails para.77 of the NPPF to be designated as local green space.

18. Murrells Field in particular does not seem to be mapped correctly, the Local Green Spaces cannot cover built development such as the terraced houses at the front of the site.

19. **Land South of Barnham Road (new local green space designation in Reg.15)** – The recommendation is that this should not be designated as local green space as it fails all of paragraphs 76 and 77 of the NPPF.

20. **Land North of Barnham Road and east of Fontwell Avenue**- The recommendation is that this should not be designated as local green space as it fails para. 77 of the NPPF on 2 points: ‘where the green area is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty, … and where the green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land.’

21. Appendix F Open Space – Marshall Close Play Area, Holmdale Play Area, Cedars Play Area are all non-priority sites as identified in ADC play strategy, therefore equipment will be removed and not replaced when it reaches the end of its useful life. This has already occurred at Garden Crescent. The value of Cedars and Holmdale in particular as ‘useable’ open space once play area equipment is removed is limited. I believe the plan does acknowledge the play strategy. There is also a larger grass recreational space at Marshall Close which I don’t think has been referred to.

**Consultation Statement**

1. Section 9: Responses to Regulation 14 Consultation; ADC’s representation at Reg.14 in November 2013, is not represented in this table. It should be noted that Arun District Council made representation via email on 22nd November 2013 as document with 18 points. The comments were as a consultee and from all departments of the Council. It is expected that at least see a summary of the 18 comments made by ADC would be part of this table.

2. Consultation representation is very important and although ADC is aware of the consultation done by the group, perhaps documentation of this could have been more detailed. The document does not clearly address the requirements of the Regs. Part 5:15 (2) which lists what a consultation statement should include.
Basic Conditions Statement

1. The designated area map would benefit from being turned through 90 degrees so that it can be bigger and more legible.

2. Para 4.1 states ‘… the Neighbourhood Plan policies are in general conformity with the strategic intent of the 2003 Plan …’ but does not give any further information on how.

3. As part of conclusion that the plan is in general conformity with the strategic policies contained in the Development Plan for the area, it would be useful to outline that the development plan consists of the adopted Arun District Council Local Plan 2003 (saved policies), the adopted West Sussex Minerals Local Plan July 2003 (saved policies) and the West Sussex Waste Local Plan Revised Deposit Draft July 2004.

4. The conformity table is confusing as the 2\textsuperscript{nd} column should be 2003 ADC policy reference but include mostly emerging ADC Local Plan summer 2013 policy numbers and at times NPPF. It appears this column should be ADC Local Plan summer 2013 and the 2003 Local Plan column is missing.

Arun District Council fully supports the plan and the fundamentals of the policies drafted but our comments highlight any potential issues or conformity issues such as BEW site being designated as local green space and Policy HDQ2:Local Connection. It does not purport to decide on whether the plan meets the basic conditions, that is for the independent examiner to decide.

Comments Approved by Assistant Director of Planning and Economic Regeneration or the nominated representative:

____________________________________

Signed on: ____________________________