

ANNEX B2

FERRING NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

Regulation 14 Pre-Submission Plan Schedule of Comments Received

Consultation dates: 18th February 2014 – 1st April 2014

REF	Name	Representation	Observation & Recommendation
001	Piotr Behnke / David Hammond of Natural England	<p>Revised Pre Submission Ferring Parish Neighbourhood Plan: The Neighbourhood Plan (NP) is in line with what would be expected by Natural England in terms of its approach and methodology and as such no further comments beyond those already submitted in our previous correspondence dated 5th July 2013 would be required.</p> <p>Draft Strategic Environmental Assessment: Having checked through the document and its objectives it is clear that they are in line with relevant legislation and advice . The range of policies considered and assessed are also in line with what would be expected to be covered and will hopefully allow for the outcomes to be objectively met without compromising the proposed development for the NP.</p> <p>Natural England is a statutory consultee on draft Neighbourhood Development Orders and Community Right to Build Orders and must be consulted where they are likely to affect a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) or 20 hectares or more of Best and Most Versatile agricultural land. We must also be consulted where proposals require Environmental Impact Assessment or screening for Habitats Regulations Assessments.</p> <p>Your Community Right to Build Order seeks permission for development of residential units and new community facilities.</p>	

		Natural England does not consider that this proposal poses any likely significant risk to internationally or nationally designated nature conservation or landscape sites and so does not wish to make specific comments on the neighbourhood plan.	
002	Clare Gibbons / David Nuttall of Southern Water	<p>There is no plant believed to be located within the sites.</p> <p>There are no surface water sewers available to serve the developments. Disposal of surface water to the public foul sewer will not be permitted, alternative means of disposal should be explored.</p> <p>Formal applications will be required for the connections to the foul sewer and for water supplies and for the adoption of on site sewers.</p> <p>Policy 2: Land rear of Henty Arms, Ferring Lane Page 22</p> <p>Policy 4 allocates land at the rear of Henty Arms for a housing development of up to 14 dwellings. In line with paragraph 162 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the National Planning Practice Guidance, we have undertaken an assessment of the existing capacity of our infrastructure and its ability to meet the forecast demand for this development. That assessment reveals that the local sewerage and water distribution systems have limited capacity so the development would need to make a connection at the nearest points of adequate capacity. This is not a constraint to development providing planning policy supports the provision of the necessary local infrastructure. The overloading of the sewerage system would also be mitigated by surface water not being disposed of in the sewerage network.</p> <p>If development is permitted to proceed where there is inadequate capacity in the sewerage network, then the system would become overloaded, leading to pollution of the environment. This situation would be contrary to paragraph 109 of the NPPF, which requires the planning system to prevent both new and existing development from contributing to pollution</p> <p>There is a risk that the necessary local sewerage or water distribution infrastructure will not be delivered in time to service the proposed development, unless delivery is supported by planning policies and subsequently in planning conditions. One of the core planning principles identified in the NPPF is to: <i>'proactively drive and support sustainable economic development to deliver the</i></p>	

homes, business and industrial units, infrastructure and thriving local places that the country needs'. Our approach is also supported by paragraph 21 of the NPPF, which requires that planning policies should recognise and seek to address any lack of infrastructure.

Proposed amendment

To ensure consistency with the NPPF and Planning Practice Guidance and as supported by the examiner for the Arundel Neighbourhood Plan, we propose the following criteria is added to policy 2:

- (iv) *the redevelopment will need to provide a connection to the nearest points of adequate capacity in both the sewerage network and water distribution system, as advised by Southern Water.*

Policy 3: Ferring Village Hall, Ferring Street
Page 23

Policy 3 proposes the re-development of the above site for up to 10 dwellings. In line with paragraph 162 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the National Planning Practice Guidance, we have undertaken an assessment of the existing capacity of our infrastructure and its ability to meet the forecast demand for such a development. That assessment reveals that currently there is limited spare capacity in the water distribution and local sewerage systems in the vicinity of this site, so the development would need to make a connection at the nearest points of adequate capacity. This is not a constraint to development providing planning policy supports the provision of the necessary local infrastructure. The overloading of the system would also be mitigated by surface water not being disposed of in the sewerage network.

If development is permitted to proceed where there is inadequate capacity in the network, then the system would become overloaded, leading to pollution of the environment. This situation would be contrary to paragraph 109 of the NPPF, which requires the planning system to prevent both new and existing development from contributing to pollution.

There is a risk that the necessary local sewerage and water distribution infrastructure will not be delivered in time to service the proposed developments, unless delivery is supported by planning policies and subsequently in planning conditions. One of the core planning principles identified in the NPPF is to: *'proactively drive and support sustainable economic development to deliver the homes, business and industrial units, infrastructure and thriving local places that the country needs'*. Our approach is also supported by paragraph 21 of the NPPF which requires that planning policies should recognise and seek to address any lack of infrastructure.

Proposed amendment

To ensure consistency with the NPPF and Planning Practice Guidance and as supported by the examiner for the Arundel Neighbourhood Plan, we propose the following additional criteria is added to policy 3:

- (iii) *the redevelopment will need to provide a connection to the nearest points of adequate capacity in both the sewerage network and water distribution system, as advised by Southern Water.*

Policy 4: Land at Ferringham Lane
Page 25

Policy 4 identifies the above site for future housing. In line with paragraph 162 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the National Planning Practice Guidance, we have undertaken an assessment of the existing capacity of our infrastructure and its ability to meet the forecast demand for such a development. That assessment reveals that currently there is limited spare capacity in the water distribution and local sewerage systems in the vicinity of this site, so the development would need to make a connection at the nearest points of adequate capacity. This is not a constraint to development providing planning policy supports the provision of the necessary local infrastructure. The overloading of the system would also be mitigated by surface water not being disposed of in the sewerage network.

If development is permitted to proceed where there is inadequate capacity in the

network, then the system would become overloaded, leading to pollution of the environment. This situation would be contrary to paragraph 109 of the NPPF, which requires the planning system to prevent both new and existing development from contributing to pollution.

There is a risk that the necessary local sewerage and water distribution infrastructure will not be delivered in time to service the proposed developments, unless delivery is supported by planning policies and subsequently in planning conditions. One of the core planning principles identified in the NPPF is to: *'proactively drive and support sustainable economic development to deliver the homes, business and industrial units, infrastructure and thriving local places that the country needs'*. Our approach is also supported by paragraph 21 of the NPPF which requires that planning policies should recognise and seek to address any lack of infrastructure.

Proposed amendment

To ensure consistency with the NPPF and Planning Practice Guidance and as supported by the examiner for the Arundel Neighbourhood Plan, we propose the following additional criteria is added to policy 4:

The redevelopment will need to provide a connection to the nearest points of adequate capacity in both the sewerage network and water distribution system, as advised by Southern Water.

Policy 7: Local Green Spaces

Page 27

Southern Water understands Ferring Parish Council's desire to protect areas of open space. However, we iterate our previous comments that we can not support the current wording of this policy as it could create a barrier to statutory utility providers, such as Southern Water, from delivering its essential infrastructure required to serve existing and planned development.

Paragraph 76 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) sets out that neighbourhood plans can identify green areas of particular importance with the

intention of ruling out *'new development other than in very special circumstances'*. Paragraph 88 of the NPPF explains that special circumstances exist if the potential harm of a development proposal is clearly outweighed by other considerations.

Southern Water considers that should the need arise, special circumstances exist in relation to provision of essential wastewater or sewerage infrastructure (e.g a new pumping station) required to serve new and existing customers. This is because there are limited options available with regard to location, as the infrastructure would need to connect into existing networks. The National Planning Practice Guidance recognises this scenario and states that *'it will be important to recognise that water and wastewater infrastructure sometimes has locational needs (and often consists of engineering works rather than new buildings) which mean otherwise protected areas may exceptionally have to be considered'*.

We made similar representations in respect of the Arundel Neighbourhood Development Plan and Littlehampton Neighbourhood Development Plan. The examiner for the Arundel Development Neighbourhood Development Plan agreed that the provision of utility infrastructure can represent special circumstances. Also the examiner for the Littlehampton Neighbourhood Plan recommended changes to recognise that an exception to such a policy would be *'a statutory infrastructure provider requiring to locate essential equipment where there are no other suitable sites available'*.

Although the Parish Council is not the planning authority in relation to wastewater or sewerage development proposals, support for essential infrastructure is required at all levels of the planning system.

Accordingly, we propose the following amended wording and additional text to Policy 7

'Should the need arise, development for essential infrastructure will be supported in special circumstances, where the benefit outweighs any harm, and it can be demonstrated there are no reasonable alternative sites available.'

New policy on the provision of infrastructure

		<p>We could find no policies to provide for new or improved infrastructure to support development identified in the Neighbourhood Plan. One of the Core Planning Principles contained in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) is to <i>‘proactively drive and support sustainable economic development to deliver the homes, business and industrial units, infrastructure and thriving local places that the country needs’</i>.</p> <p>Although the Parish Council is not the planning authority in relation to wastewater development proposals, support for essential infrastructure is required at all levels of the planning system.</p> <p>On this basis, we propose an additional policy as follows:</p> <p><u><i>New and improved utility infrastructure will be encouraged and supported in order to meet the identified needs of the community.</i></u></p>	
003	Angela Atkinson of Marine Management Organisation	No alterations from feedback to 1 st consultation (27.05.13 – 08.07.13)	
004	Lucy Seymour-Bowdery of West Sussex County Council	<p>Proposal 6 in the Development Management section identifies infrastructure investment priorities as having potential for receiving contributions from the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). It should be noted that no mechanism currently exists for prioritising infrastructure needs across different public services and allocating funds to priority projects. The County Council is working with Arun District Council and other Local Planning Authorities to develop a robust mechanism and establish appropriate governance arrangements to oversee the prioritisation of infrastructure across different services. This will be important to secure delivery of priority projects and the County Council would welcome the Council’s support for establishing appropriate decision-making arrangements.</p> <p>Draft Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) As explained in my email of 20/02/2014, the County Council does not have sufficient resources available to respond in detail to Neighbourhood Plan</p>	

consultations (including SEAs) unless there are potentially significant impacts on its services that we are not already aware of, or conflicts are identified with its emerging or adopted policies. It has therefore been decided not to submit comments on the SEA.

Ferring Parish Council has prepared three Community Right to Build Orders (CRTBOs) to support the Ferring Neighbourhood Plan. This note sets out officer comments upon the proposed CRTBO documents, highlighting key issues, suggesting changes and identifying further work which the County Council is requesting is undertaken prior to these orders being made.

CRTB Order 1: Retirement Units, rear of Henty Arms

Whilst the County Council does not object to the principle of the development, concerns are raised in respects of the proposed vehicular access arrangements located between the railway and the southern side of the Henty Arms PH.

The County Council has previously raised concerns with the proposed vehicular access arrangements and sought a Stage One Road Safety Audit (RSA). A Stage One RSA has been undertaken and submitted directly to the County Council. This has raised a number of concerns with the access arrangements. These concerns cannot be designed out or resolved through details secured via condition. In light of this, concerns remain with the access arrangement shown. This raises a question mark over the deliverability of this proposal in its current form. At this stage, the County Council cannot support the access arrangements as shown. If this proposal is to be taken forward, an alternate access arrangement would need to be investigated.

The internal arrangement and narrow access road will make servicing problematic. Discussions should be undertaken with the waste collection department at Arun District Council. Given that it is currently unclear as to whether an acceptable solution is possible, a condition will not be suggested at this stage.

This CRTBO correctly identifies FP2121 as being within the proposed development site and that it has a dual status given its inclusion on the Highways List of Streets and Gazetteer as E3259/53005. Diversion will be required under either Town & Country Planning Act 1990 s257 or Highways Act 1980 s119, the

former being more expected. In due course therefore, should CRTB01 be made, the applicant would have to make an application for diversion. It is usual practice for applications arising from the grant of planning consent to be made to the Local Planning Authority, which would act as Order Making Authority, and would be obliged statutorily to consult the County Council.

Condition 2.1.15 is welcomed so as to protect public access rights during development until such time as any Order to divert those rights is confirmed, if indeed it is capable of confirmation.

CRTB Order 2: Retirement Units, Village Hall

It appears that the existing vehicular access arrangement is being retained (or relocated very slightly) to accommodate the proposed retirement units. In light of the scale and nature of the proposal, the suggested conditions suitably cover everything apart from parking. The following additional condition should be added:

‘No part of the development shall be first occupied until car and cycle parking spaces have been constructed in accordance with plans and details submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. These spaces shall thereafter be retained at all times for their designated use.

Reason: To provide car-parking space for the use.’

CRTB Order 3: New Community Centre

The site benefits from existing vehicular access points onto Rife Road and Greystoke Road. Alterations will be required to both accesses, namely to increase the width of the Rife Road access and provide the proposed dropping off arrangement onto Greystoke Road. In principle these alterations are acceptable. In light of the nature of the proposal, the revised access arrangements should be Safety Audited. A condition should also be added to ensure the car parking is provided prior to the first occupation of the development.

The following additional conditions should be added:

‘A Stage One Road Safety Audit and Designers Response in accordance with the WSCC Audit Policy, must be provided prior to any development commencing. No development shall thereafter commence until plans and details

		<p>incorporating the recommendations given in the Stage 1 Road Safety Audit and accepted in the Designers Response or as otherwise agreed with the Local Highway Authority have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure safety of proposed vehicular access arrangements.</p> <p>No part of the development shall be first occupied until car and cycle parking spaces have been constructed in accordance with plans and details submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. These spaces shall thereafter be retained at all times for their designated use.</p> <p>Reason: To provide car-parking space for the use.'</p>	
005	Environment Agency	No alterations from feedback to 1 st consultation (27.05.13 – 08.07.13)	
006	Donna Moles at Arun District Council	<p>Foreword: The majority of this could be written in a more positive tone. In the penultimate para should it really be mentioning about the plan being “of necessity defensive..”? It runs the risk of falling foul of the positive approach to planning required in the NPPF, and is in many ways at odds with the very positive plan content – you might like to consider a slightly more subtle approach.</p> <p>2. Strategic Environmental Assessment: End of para 1.6 – suggest this is amended as follows:“ ..published alongside as part of the Pre-Submission...”</p> <p>3. Land Use Policies: Para 4.2 – ultimately policies that are saved from the 2003 Plan will be replaced by the emerging one or not replaced, therefore the last sentence needs amending.</p> <p>4. 2.14 – this data seems very outdated (1/4/11). Is this a typing error?</p> <p>5. 4.17 – its seems odd to require the value of the site to be recovered by a s106 agreement when its owned by the PC – isn’t ownership an easier route to achieve the same ends?</p> <p>6. 4.28 – may not be deliverable in view of new PD rights for converting redundant agricultural buildings to dwellings.</p> <p>7. Policy 4: It is noted that the policy for Ferringham Lane (policy 4) is limited to</p>	

an ‘enabling’ policy, and therefore is in some doubt as to its deliverability, but you have included this in the third 5 year period of the plan, where it is acceptable for proposals at an early stage of formation to be considered. Providing this is reviewed at subsequent plan reviews, and alternatives are identified if it became clear that it is not going to be deliverable, this is acceptable. You may want to add something to that effect for completeness.

8. Policy 8: a similar issue may arise with the policy to resist change of use to dwellings as the government is consulting on the option of changes of use from retail to dwellings being PD.

9. Policy 10: It is suggested that the location of the replaced allotments is outlined to strengthen the policy.

10. Development Management: Last sentence of 5.3 – This is a reasonable thing to want to achieve but clarity is needed over how you would be expecting this to work.

11. Proposal 2 Ferring Conservation Area: Only the LPA is able to do this and there is a formal process that has to be gone through. Whilst it is acknowledged that the polices state that the NP proposes that the LPA considers the alteration of the existing conservation Area boundary, and the designation of new Areas of Special Character, a separate process will need to be initiated to ensure that such actions take place. This will have to be undertaken in accordance with the Conservation officer.

12. Proposal 3 Areas of Special Character: Are you sure you want this to all be one policy or should it be split into two, considering that you wish two to be designated and one is considered as Conservations Areas as well.

Ferring Beach & Patterson’s Walk: para 5.23 – surely this should be mouth of the River or Rife, or corrected to whichever is applicable.

13. Proposal 4 Assets of Community Value: This policy should either be removed or revised to read differently. At the moment it reads like these buildings have been designated and they have not. ADC welcomes the initiative of adding these buildings as assets of community value, but the parish council should ensure they register the buildings using the ADC procedure to mitigate any unwanted circumstances in the future. The NDP group through the parish council should seek to nominate the buildings which they wish to be listed as Assets of Community

14. Proposal 5 Patterson’s Walk: This references the Proposals Map but cannot find a label showing Proposal 5, needs adding. Footpaths are a County Council matter rather than the LPA.

15. All references to the Submission Arun Local Plan 2014-2029 should be changed to the exact submission which was used. In this case it probably is the Summer 2013 version. The current one is Publication Version of the Local Plan (Regulation 19) Excluding the Spatial Portrait, Employment & Enterprise, Housing Allocations, Transport, Monitoring and Implementation sections.
16. Specific to list under para 2.29 the Infrastructure Provision & Implementation has not been agreed. In addition there is also a new gap Angmering to Worthing.
17. The Evidence Base docs are not online or submitted so no way of knowing if they have been done and this will be needed for the examination. This seems especially important considering the fact that it is mentioned in terms of the Local Green Space supporting text.
18. P35 5.25 relating to Patterson's Walk: It is clear the Parish are not supportive of cycling in this area which may conflict with future intentions to look at the feasibility of a cycle route in this area.

Comments on Ferring NP 2014-2029 Draft SEA (Feb 2014)

NTS

- Under 4th bullet may wish to add the following to take account of the current situation with the emerging Local Plan.
 "In addition, policies within the Publication Version of the Local Plan (regulation 19) Excluding the Spatial Portrait, Employment & Enterprise, Housing Allocations, Transport, Monitoring and Implementation section (February 2014), have been approved and are therefore material considerations for the determination of planning applications."
- Bullet point 5 – the second of the list was not in the State of the Parish report therefore this should be removed.
- On the last bullet point (page 2) This report can only cover those sites or areas that are designated already not intended ones. To be entirely reflective this sentence should be removed as follows:
 "...The village also contains three potential candidate Areas of Special Character, for which the Neighbourhood Plan makes specific proposals to the District Council for future designation. In addition..."
- Comments on the framework (mentioned on p3 and p12)
 1. Historic Environment -
 - (a) As the first objective includes '...make accessible for enjoyment..' how is it intended this will be monitored? Suggest the following indicator may reflect this if continues to be included, although there could potentially be issues in terms of

data, especially if these are privately owned:
 “Increased/Decreased access to historic assets”
 (b) In addition, it is suggested the following is included so that progress/trend can be seen:
 “No. of heritage assets”
 2. Designated environmental sites -
 (a) as the indicators both mention local as well as nationally designated sites it is suggested
 that the second indicator against the biodiversity sub-objective of the Arun Sustainability Framework, could potentially be more useful, which is:
 “Number of development (over a certain size) incorporating biodiversity enhancement/proportion of development area set aside for enhancements” or
 “number/condition of species or habitats”
 3. Flood Risk – it is suggested that this is changed both so that it reflects the national statistics available and also due to the fact that hectareage does not equate to number of dwellings (e.g. a small site may have a high number amount of housing but a large site may have only a small number of dwellings). Change to:
 “No. of properties at risk from flooding”
 • First bullet on page 4 – considering what this is saying, what measures are there within the plan to ensure that this happens, as otherwise it suggests there may be potential for detrimental impacts. Or what mitigation might there be?
 Section 2 – Background to Strategic Environmental Assessment
 • Para 2.1 Following minor correction needed:
 “..UK law under the EA Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes
 Section 4 – the relevant aspects of the current state of the environment and the likely evolution thereof without implementation of the Neighbourhood Plan
 • Para 4.1 - As mentioned under NTS there is no BOA at Ferring Beach, it does not have a classification in terms of nature conservation
 • Para 4.2 – It is suggested that the following is added to the end of this sentence for ease “Details on these can be found in the Ferring Neighbourhood Plan: State of the Parish Report” (refer to first point under Section 5 to ensure consistent approach)
 Section 5 – the environmental characteristics of areas likely to be significantly affected
 • Para 5.1 - Suggest that the first sentence is amended as follows to ensure consistent approach. “...of the parish are identified in the Neighbourhood Plan and are listed in 4.1 above with more detail provided in the Ferring

Neighbourhood Plan: State of the Parish report, as well as included in the Neighbourhood Plan.”

Section 8 – the likely significant effects on the environment

- Para 8.12 – where is the evidence to back the statement in this para that “..it will have a negative impact on designated environmental assets at this assumed scale and in these locations.” This site is in the south west of the village and is the furthest it could be from the Rife which is the closest designated site.

(General comment: The intent is understood but you need to point towards evidence to back it up. This would be in addition to the other reasons.

Additionally you need to be able to robustly defend this as we know there is interest in that site from Persimmons)

- Para 8.26 & 8.27 – the first sentence of the second para does not mention what the environmental issues that need addressing are. Assuming that they are the design and form mentioned at the end of the previous para, what specifically is so detrimental about them? This should really be based on the built environment and specifically the heritage assets or historic environment as these are what are contained in the framework they have set out.

Section 9 – an outline of the reasons for selecting the alternatives dealt with

- Though this section is vastly improved it is felt that either an additional sentence or paragraph is needed to cover how the Plan policies are expected to do this. Would suggest that you consider what the answers would be to the following questions:

(a) What about when the 2003 LP no longer applies? And/or

(b) Are there any issues that the current don't address? Such as any new legislative requirements since 2003

- Para 9.4 – would suggest that the following minor amendment is made to this as it needs to be a final conclusion:

“In which case, tThe assessment..”

General points on SEA

All references to the Intended Full SA should be changed to the Arun District Council Sustainability Framework. The actual framework outlining the indicators was not actually included within this doc but one of the earlier ones.

CRTBO 1: Land Behind the Henty Arms

2.0 The Order

- Due to the size of the site, over 0.25ha, it is important that the various environmental conditions within the next section are adhered to.

2.1: Conditions (p7-8)

- 2.1.2 – at the end of this it mentions Policy 15 but there is none within the revised Pre-Sub plan, this needs correcting.

In addition the policy numbers under the reasoning have the same issue

- 2.1.14 & 2.1.15 – This perhaps need mention of County, considering that they are the Highways Authority
- 2.1.17 – the national timescale for the Code has been that Level 4 should be achieved from 2013. Though the dates set were for RSLs there was only grace of a year for private developers. As such this should be corrected to the correct level or potentially only linked to the national timescales.

3.2: The Design Process (p13-14)

- Last sentence of the summary(p13) – this point is replicated at the end of the next paragraph, it is suggested this is removed

First para of summary (p14) – It would appear from looking at the site on Planweb that to be able to access where the development is proposed would require an extension of the existing footpath and access.

Minor correction towards end of same para – suggest that the following minor amendment is made “..impacts of the railway do not may preclude..” as without a noise assessment how could this be stated.

- 2nd para of Site layout – this mentions the garden walls supporting a green roof. Is this going to be practical considering the fact that generally the weight of a green roof will increase by approximately 3 times in weight when it rains?

CRTBO 2: Village Hall

2.1 Conditions (p8)

- National timescales for achievement of the Code for Sustainable Homes requires that Level 4 is reached from 2013 onwards. Even if consider a private developer it is still expected to be achieved the following year. As such this needs to be amended to Level 4.

3.2 The Design Process (p18-19)

- It would seem helpful to have a rough outline of the existing buildings on Figure 18:Constraints Plan, for ease and emphasis that these are existing constraints relating to the site.
- Design Concept: Site layout – at the end of the first para it is felt that as the distinction between public and private on Figure 16 is shown outside the site that this causes confusion and so this should remain as a point but these labels should be removed from the Figure and text.

It is suggested that the 4th & 5th paras where they refer to ‘focal point at the end

of the northern shopping parade' and 'end of the southern shopping parade' needs to be revised for clarification. Though it is understood that this is in terms of the relationship to neighbouring sites, this does not seem obvious and gives an impression that shop units are part of the scheme.

Figure 16: Concept does not seem to include number 9 referenced at the end of para

5. Though obvious the pedestrian link mentioned at the end of para 8, is not included on Figure 16.

Figure 16: Concept – the building identified as 7 appears as a separate building whereas the text suggests that this is simply a feature of the roof plan. Either connection is required on Figure 16 or text needs amending.

5.0 Heritage (p27)

- The following wording at the beginning of the last sentence “..located the opposite, and opposite, and opposite and south,..” does not make sense and so suggest it is amended.

CRTBO 3: Community Centre

1.0 Introduction (p4)

- At the end of section 1.0.3 it mentions a basic conditions statement and consultation statement as sections 5 & 6, however these are not included in the document.

In addition, these do not seem to be available and should they have been or is it fine for them to be produced alongside the final versions of the documents when submitted?

- 4th para of 1.0.4 – The first sentence of this para does not seem to make sense. Suggests there is a point being made but not clear what this is.

2.0 The Order (p6)

- In the 2nd para this mentions that there will be two access points, a new drop off and parking area, as well as an access from Rife Way and emergency access point to the recreation ground. As such it may be helpful for Fig 1: Site as existing to identify the road names so that the existing relationships are clear.

- Due to the size of the site, over 0.25ha, it is important that the various environmental conditions within the next section are adhered to.

3.2 Design Process (p15-16)

- Wonder whether the points relating to 6* and 8* could be amalgamated, considering both dealing with issues more over the relationship with the existing structure on the recreation ground.

- Point 10 of site concept – It does not appear from Fig 12 that there would be much room for parking for disabled, especially as these require larger spaces.
 - 3.2 – p13. This states ADC owns the rec and leases it to the Football Club which is misleading. The Football Club has a license to use specific areas of the Glebelands for organised matches and training purposes, and a lease on the pavilion. 3.3 p19 shows area 10 designated as a junior football pitch. This is not strictly the case as the license the Football Club has with Arun makes no allowance for use of this area, although they do use it on an informal basis.
- 3.3 Project Proposals (p19-24)
- 7 as identified on the illustration and from reading the note underneath would appear to be a long way from the building for disabled people and would mean that an access from Rife Way would be required, otherwise this could not be considered to be onsite provision.
 - Site Plan – though the idea of a planted roof is interesting, can it be shown this will be feasible, due to weight being approximately 3 times when wet and especially with the costs for maintenance, could this cause issues for viability?
 - First Floor Plan – this seems to be missing the labels for P and V

Other comments

- CRTBO 2 :2.1.16 and CRTBO 3 – 2.1.14 – It is important to note that ADC supports the CRTBO but it should not be written you as to mislead readers into assuming it has been approved by ADC. This is not our role.
- It also reads that you are asking ADC to perform the role of determining the level of contributions to support the building of community centre. This is not for ADC to do as it would be contrary to the principles of CRTBO's. It is recommended that you are specific regarding the levels of contributions that are required. This is within your remit.
- How (if at all) are you dealing with a contribution to AH – if you are not proposing to do this then you need to say in the doc and why. Parking levels look low and spaces standards may be an issue. It is recommended that these be reviewed. Has the parish engaged with the neighbours?
 - CRTBO 1 – same point about AH. Have you consulted Network Rail (see 2.1.10) – Again why submit to us?
 - On 2.1.20 see comments above.

007	Andrew Triggs of South Downs National Park Authority	<p>Page 3 – <i>“in order to be able to influence the type of housing built and ensure it is in line with resident’s wishes and needs, the proposed sites must be owned by the Parish Council or by the community.”</i> This statement sits somewhat oddly in a planning document – it has the effect of suggesting planning policies have minimal or no influence on privately owned sites. It also raises concern whether the plan making process has adequately considered the role of reasonable alternative sites which may/may not be more sustainable. Site ownership normally is just one consideration taken into account when allocating land (site owners’ can provide clarification of the availability of a site contributing to confidence a site is deliverable); however, there are a great many other valid planning considerations which would be expected to form a judgement on the suitability of sites. As worded, this statement could be challenged by landowners/developers concerned about an undue bias built into the neighbourhood plan. It will be important that the submission version of the plan is supported by robust evidence of individual site assessment and a clear explanation of the methodology employed.</p> <p>Page 3 <i>“we have extended further protection to the village through a modest extension to the conservation area”</i> - this is outside the powers of a neighbourhood plan. The LPA would need to exercise powers conferred to it through the Planning Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act 1990. This appears to be what Proposal 2 envisages.</p> <p>Page 11 Improving the quality of access e.g. rights of way and pathways – it is unclear whether any of SDNPA’s Rangers have been consulted. If not, we would be happy to facilitate a meeting. This could examine the potential to improve connectivity/links with SDNP.</p> <p>Para. 2.21 replacement of saved policies – except in the National Park where the saved policies will continue to be used until replaced by the SDNP Local Plan. It would be clearer if this was stated in para. 2.21 rather than para. 2.23.</p> <p>Para. 2.23 The Issues and Options report was renamed the “Options Consultation Document”. SDNPA published this for a period of 8 weeks of consultation from February to April 2014.</p> <p>Para. 2.27 at the end of the first sentence please add (excluding SDNP).</p>	
-----	--	--	--

Para. 2.32 please note the following changes/corrections relating to the now planned evolution of the SDNP Local Plan: The Authority intends to publish a first draft of the Plan in 2015 (the Preferred Option) and hopes to submit it to the Secretary of State in 2016 and adopt the Plan in 2017. The plan period is likely to be 15-20 years from the date of adoption but this is still to be confirmed.

Vision – this is broadly supported. It would be considerably better if the last para stated has conserved and enhanced the most sensitive South Downs landscape – “not impacted” is a somewhat ambiguous terminology – it could be argued that impacts are good / neutral or bad.

Objective 2

It is not clear whether the 50 new homes are over and above existing permissions.

Objective 3

The statement “*No development outside the existing built up area boundary*” would appear to be at odds with policy in the development plan. Policy Area 10 of the Arun District Local Plan 2003 sets out the limited circumstances in which development would be permitted in the strategic gaps identified on the Proposals Map (land between Worthing and Ferring and East Preston and Ferring). Proposals in these areas require rigorous examination – the policy sets out criteria for development (of which all three would be expected to be met).

These kind of statements have been unsuccessful at other neighbourhood plan examinations. The very strong protection afforded to the strategic gap boundary has been challenged through reasonably recent appeals (FG/23/10 and FG/108/11). The Inspector for the Greenyers Field proposal considered that the boundaries have “become out-of-date as they need to take account of development needs arising from the South East Plan (or as otherwise assessed once that plan is revoked).”

Para. 4.5 seems to envisage an active redrawing through the neighbourhood plan as it acknowledges the consented schemes have rendered the 2003 boundaries out-of-date. While it is appreciated the gaps are considered very important to the local community, their long-term protection can only be assured through the

production of sufficiently robust evidence. The value of a statement such as “*even modest incursions...*” (para. 4.6) depends greatly on strength of the evidence to support such a contention (this would include matters such as landscape character). It should be clear whether this section is a community aspiration or whether it is intended to become part of the statutory policy framework – its identification in supporting text could unfairly raise expectations for the neighbourhood plan. I appreciate the timescales of the emerging Arun Local Plan and FNP are at the heart of how the neighbourhood plan elects to address such an important consideration.

Para. 3.5 whether the plan does contribute to sustainable development

It remains a concern that the plan seeks to exempt the two allocations with the greatest likelihood of delivery from contributing towards affordable housing. It is arguable such a strategy will exacerbate local housing need and is contrary to the ethos of a National Park where the provision of affordable housing is a primary consideration ahead of market housing.

This appears to conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework which states local planning authorities should “use their evidence base to ensure that their Local Plan meets the full, objectively assessed needs for market and affordable housing in the housing market area” (para. 47). It also states local planning authorities should “deliver a wide choice of high quality homes, widen opportunities for home ownership and create sustainable, inclusive and mixed communities...plan for a mix of housing based on current and future demographic trends, market trends and the needs of different groups in the community (such as, but not limited to, families with children, older people, people with disabilities, service families and people wishing to build their own homes)” (para. 50).

While the Parish’s ambitions to enhance local community provision are to be commended, it must be a concern many other parishes could follow such a path using a neighbourhood plan to justify that the enhancement of local community facilities takes precedence over the delivery of affordable housing. One wonders to what degree consideration of local housing need in the Parish or this part of Arun District more broadly has influenced the policy formulation.

Not all the references in Para. 4.18 would appear to provide definitive support for the type of local tailoring envisaged – e.g. para. 205 of the NPPF requires local planning authorities to consider the impact of planning obligations on development proposals. No evidence has been presented to suggest that affordable housing would be unviable on these sites because of market conditions (of changes thereof) or extant obligations have made consented schemes unviable.

Para. 3.6 while SDNPA tentatively supports the monitoring arrangements, how this operates in practice will need to be agreed between the Authority and FPC.

Policy 6: Land North of Littlehampton Road

“Measures are proposed to improve the screening of the development in the setting of the National Park”

While it is welcomed that the setting of SDNP is acknowledged by this policy, there is a concern that excessive use of screening could itself harm the setting of the National Park by introducing lots of artificial “green curtains” which can appear to be an unnatural feature (see below).

This policy needs to be informed by a reference to and a full appreciation of local landscape character (this is a richer consideration than merely views into and from SDNP: e.g. para. 4.28 of FNP – the visual impact of development is just one part of the setting’s value). Regard should be had to the West Sussex Landscape Character Assessment which provides a high level assessment relevant to the whole of the parish.

“The land is primarily open countryside, as it forms the lower, south-facing slope of Highdown Hill” – this is too brief a statement to provide adequate justice to the landscape’s intrinsic value. There is a danger here the policy has not sufficiently considered the effects on landscape quality.

There is scope to enhance the landscape coverage through greater consideration of the component landscape areas – what are their individual qualities? Regard should also be had to the component areas of landscape character immediately adjoining this site within SDNP (please refer to the South Downs Integrated

		<p>Landscape Character Assessment, available on our website).</p> <p>New development should conserve and have a positive impact on the landscape character. Features which contribute to its distinctive character and cultural heritage include trees, woodlands, hedgerows, watercourses, ancient trackways, historic field patterns, historic landscapes and the character and significance of rural buildings.</p> <p>Therefore, the siting, location and design of any new developments are important factors to consider carefully in order harm to the landscape character.</p> <p>You may wish to provide further guidance on when screening might be acceptable: for example, “where screening is desirable, possible and appropriate, woodland and hedgerows are particularly effective in mitigating for visual impact, when they are sensitively designed with native species and in a layout which is consistent with the surrounding landscape character.” Conditions can be imposed to ensure that appropriate structure planting is created and maintained.</p> <p>High quality design is equally important in achieving good integration into the existing fabric of the landscape and settlement pattern. Advice should be sought from Arun District Council’s design officer.</p>	
08	Elizabeth Cleaver of Highways Agency	<p>Highways agency response 01.04.14</p> <p>Having reviewed the revised NP Pre-Submission document, we are content that the NP is generally consistent with the emerging ADC Local Plan with 50 new homes.</p> <p>The impacts of the proposals in the NP on their own are likely to impact adversely on the SRN. However, our main concern is the cumulative impact of development proposals in the emerging District Local Plan.</p> <p>CRTBO’s Given the size of the development proposals and their distance from the SRN we do not consider that these proposals would have a severe impact</p>	

		on the SRN. The agency will offer no objection to your proposals.	
9	Martin Small of English Heritage	<p>English Heritage welcomes the identification of the designated heritage assets in the parish in paragraph 2.8, but mention should be made existing non-designated assets such as buildings and structures of special character, entries on the Historic Environment Record for West Sussex etc, mention of which would help describe the character of the parish ?</p> <p>In paragraph 2.29, we would suggest that the list of “especially important” policies in the Arun Local Plan should include SP24 Historic Environment, DM8 Areas of Special Character, DM25 Listed Buildings, DM26 Locally Listed Buildings or Structures of Character, DM27 Conservation Areas and DM30 Sites of Archaeological Interest.</p> <p>We welcome the references to “attractive environment” and “distinctive character of the village” in the Vision as set out in 3.1, but perhaps “its historic buildings and other features” could be added to the last sentence ? We welcome Objective 3 for its reference to heritage assets and the proposed measures relating to Areas of Special Character and Buildings and Structures of Special Character.</p> <p>Policy 3: the Village Hall site is opposite the Grade II listed Landalls Vine Cottage. Any development of this site should respect the significance and character of this designated heritage asset and a reference to this requirement should be included within the policy text.</p> <p>Policy 4: the land at Ferringham Lane as shown on the Proposals Map is actually partially within the Ferring Conservation Area, although the majority of the site abuts the Conservation Area. Any development of this site should conserve and preferably enhance the Conservation Area, and a reference to this requirement should be included within the policy text. (Such a requirement is required in paragraph 8.18 of the Strategic Environmental Assessment).</p> <p>Policy 7: the open spaces identified form part of the setting of the Conservation Area and, in the case of the land known as “Little Twitten”, part of the setting of</p>	

a Grade II listed building. These open spaces are likely to contribute to the character of these designated assets and possibly their significance, and English Heritage therefore welcomes their protection under this policy.

Policy 8: we welcome the requirement that the design and/or use of proposals in a defined village centre will cause no significant harm to a Building or Structure of Special Character.

Policy 9: the site of the proposed Ferring Community Centre forms part of the setting of the Conservation Area. Any development of this site should conserve and preferably enhance the Conservation Area, and a reference to this requirement should be included within the policy text, notwithstanding the Council's intention to progress this scheme through a Community Right to Build Order.

Proposal 2: we welcome the review of the Conservation Area and support the inclusion of additional areas if they clearly merit inclusion within the Area because of their special architectural or historic interest, bearing in mind paragraph 127 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The suggested inclusion of modern development is a concern to us, although we have not assessed the merit of these areas ourselves - Arun District Council's Conservation Officer is better-placed to consider whether the proposed additional areas merit inclusion than English Heritage.

We welcome the proposed new Conservation Area Appraisal, which should be accompanied by a Management Plan. Ideally, this exercise should have been undertaken prior to the finalisation of the Neighbourhood Plan so that it could have informed the policies and proposals of the Plan, but it can inform a future review.

Proposal 3: we welcome the recognition of the special history and character of Little Paddocks, The Poplars and Ferring Beach and Patterson's Walk. However, again, Arun District Council's Conservation Officer is better-placed to consider whether Little Paddocks and The Poplars merit designation as Conservation Areas than ourselves.

In the Final Plan, on which we were consulted last year, we welcomed the

Council's initiative in identifying buildings that they consider merit designation as Buildings or Structures of Local Character, although we were not in a position to make any comment on the choice of buildings and structures. It is a pity that there is not a stronger reference to these Buildings and Structures in the Pre-Submission Plan.

The Evidence Base is Annex A should include the Historic Environment Record.

In the Strategic Environmental Assessment, in the table after paragraph 8.2, the measures should include the numbers of all heritage assets in the parish and the proportions of those assets at risk as percentages of the total numbers of each asset in the parish.

In the table after paragraph 8.6, we would suggest that the impact of Strategic Objective 2 on the SEA Objective for the historic environment should be assessed as unknown as the impact will depend on the form and design of the proposed housing. The impact of Strategic Objective 4 on this SEA Objective could, however, be assessed as positive, as historic properties may be at risk from events associated with the effects of climate change.

Policies 3, 4 and 9 should be assessed as having an unknown rather than neutral impact on the historic environment as again the impact will depend on the form and design of the proposed housing, without the additional caveats regarding the listed cottage opposite the village hall site or the Conservation Area for land at Ferringham Lane and the proposed site of the community centre that we suggest above. However, the impacts could be positive if those caveats are included.

The Evidence Base is Annex A should include the Historic Environment Record.

We have no objections to the proposed Community Right to Build Orders and welcome the reference to the listed buildings near the Village Hall in the Order for the Village Hall and the references to the Conservation Area in the Order for the Community Centre.

10	Elliot Stamp of Network Rail	<p>Network Rail is potentially concerned by the current location of the planned access road for the proposed residential development located at Land Rear of Henty Arms. This site is identified in Policy 2 of the Neighbourhood Plan and the Community Right to Build Order 1.</p> <p>The current location of the proposed access road south of the Henty Arms is adjacent to a level crossing. Network Rail is currently investigating the potential impact that this may have on the level crossing.</p> <p>A site meeting between Network Rail's local level crossing manager and a consultant from rCOH Ltd, who is working on the 'Road Safety Audit' for the site has recently taken place and further discussions, are planned.</p> <p>Network Rail would like to work with Ferring Parish Council in relation to this aspect of the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>	
10	Ed Miller of Conservation Group	<p>The only reservation I have on the policy is, I think minor: the inclusion of a possible inclusion of replacement library and GP surgery provision in the new Community Centre. It seems to me that both require large floor space, which add inordinately to the scale of the Community Centre and in the case of the Library invites WSCC to plan for the removal of the present building.</p> <p>Our Conservation Group committee discussed the draft NP and CRTBOs again last week. We confirm my previous endorsement of the draft but wish to note two further points. The first is the obvious problem of the site for replacement allotments. If Persimmon will not make any land available (or would only make it available with an unacceptable <i>quid pro quo</i>) and Ferring Country Centre or Osborne Caravan Centre cannot provide, the only alternative I can think of is unused land at Ferring Nurseries.</p> <p>The other point is also familiar to you - the difficulty of access to the proposed development on the allotment site. I am forwarding some notes and drawings by our Committee member Margaret Bruml, suggesting that only an access to the north of the Henty Arms is practicable.</p>	

