

ANNEX B1

FERRING NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

Regulation 14 Pre-Submission Plan Schedule of Comments Received

Consultation dates: 27th May 2013 – 8th July 2013

REF	Name	Representation	Observation & Recommendation
001	Piotr Behnke of Natural England	<p>Natural England is a non-departmental public body. Our statutory purpose is to ensure that the natural environment is conserved, enhanced, and managed for the benefit of present and future generations, thereby contributing to sustainable development.</p> <p>You should consider whether your plan or proposal has any impacts on protected species. To help you do this, Natural England has produced standing advice to help understand the impact of particular developments on protected or Biodiversity Action Plan species should they be identified as an issue.</p>	Noted
002	Clare Gibbons of Southern Water	<p>Policy 4 & 5</p> <p>If capacity is not currently sufficient to accommodate the anticipated demand arising from the development, the development would need to connect to the local sewerage system and water distribution network at the nearest point of adequate capacity.</p> <p>It is important that this is recognised in policies that allocate sites for development because off-site infrastructure would be required, which would need to be funded by the development. This approach is consistent with Ofwat's view that the local infrastructure required to serve new development should be funded by the development. This protects existing customers, who would otherwise have to pay through increased general charges.</p>	<p>This principle applies to all development proposals and, as such, is already required by saved policy GEN9 of the development plan</p> <p>RECOMMENDED: No Change</p> <p>The Plan policies complement the policies of the development plan and NPPF. As such, provision is already made, as noted, for exceptional circumstances to justify utility infrastructure works. It is therefore not necessary to caveat all allocations and site specific policies in this way.</p>

We propose the following additional text to Policy 4 & 5:
If existing capacity in the local sewerage system and/or the water distribution network is insufficient to accommodate the proposed development, a connection must be provided to the system at the nearest point of adequate capacity, as advised by Southern Water.

Policy 8

Policy 8 restricts the use of land to the north of Littlehampton Road to agricultural, horticultural or equine uses only. We are concerned that this policy could have an adverse impact on our ability to operate and provide essential services as it effectively restricts development.

We proposed the following additional wording is included to be in line with the National Planning Policy Framework:

Development will be permitted in exceptional circumstances, for example, if it is essential to meet utility infrastructure needs and no alternative site is available.

Policy 9, 10, 11 & 12

Policy 9 seeks to extend Ferring Conservation Area. We are concerned that this policy could have an adverse impact on our ability to operate and provide essential services as it effectively restricts development.

We appreciate the intention of this policy but consider that there should be a recognition of our infrastructure and the role it plays in achieving sustainable development. One of the core planning principles cited in the National Planning Policy Framework is that planning should '*proactively drive and support economic development to deliver the homes, business and industrial units, infrastructure and thriving local places that the country needs*'. Paragraph 157 is clear about the importance of planning positively for infrastructure required to meet the objectives, principles and policies of the National Planning Policy Framework.

We proposed the following additional wording is included to be in line with the National Planning Policy Framework:

Development will be permitted in exceptional circumstances, for example, if it is essential to meet utility infrastructure needs and no alternative site is available.

RECOMMENDED: No Change

The work undertaken to make the Orders will include consulting the statutory undertakers and other consultees to ensure the development schemes are suitable and that the Orders contain all relevant S106 and planning condition required.

RECOMMENDED: No change

		<p>Policy 19 Southern Water notes the Parish Council’s intention to progress Community Right to Build Orders in relation to the three sites listed in Policy 19.</p> <p>We consider that any forthcoming Community Right to Build Orders should require the development to connect to the local sewerage and water distribution networks at the nearest points of adequate capacity.</p> <p>If the point of capacity is not located in the immediate vicinity of the relevant site, off-site infrastructure would be required to ensure that the local sewerage system does not become overloaded, and/or the water pressure is not adversely affected.</p>	
003	Angela Atkinson of Marine Management Organisation	<p>The MMO has reviewed the document and we have concerns that, given the extent of the parish stretches to the low water mean springs, no mention is made of the Marine and Coastal Access Act 2009, the Marine Management Organisation, marine planning or marine licensing, despite the National Planning Policy Framework being mentioned explicitly.</p> <p>As the marine planning authority for England the MMO is responsible for preparing marine plans for English inshore and offshore waters. At its landward extent, a marine plan will apply up to the mean high water springs mark, which includes the tidal extent of any rivers. As marine plan boundaries extend up to the level of the mean high water spring mark there will be an overlap with terrestrial plans which generally extend to the mean low water springs mark. In our duty to take all reasonable steps to ensure compatibility with existing development plans, which apply down to the low water mark, we are seeking to identify the ‘marine relevance’ of applicable plan policies. Ferring is included within the South plan area which runs from Folkestone to River Dart. Marine Planning for this area began earlier this year and the MMO will be engaging with all Local Authorities throughout the plan making process. Until such time as a marine plan is in place we advise local authorities to refer to the Marine Policy Statement for guidance on any planning activity that includes a section of coast or tidal river. All public authorities taking authorisation or enforcement decisions that affect or might affect the UK marine area must do so in accordance with the UK Marine Policy Statement unless relevant considerations indicate otherwise. The</p>	Noted and agreed

		<p>Marine Policy Statement will also guide the development of Marine Plans across the UK. More information can be found at http://www.defra.gov.uk/news/2011/03/18/marine-policy-statement/</p> <p>The MMO is also responsible for issuing marine licences under the Marine and Coastal Access Act 2009. A marine licence may be needed for activities involving a deposit or removal of a substance or object below the mean high water springs mark or in any tidal river to the extent of the tidal influence. Any works may also require consideration under The Marine Works (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2007 (as amended) and early consultation with the MMO is advised. We would suggest that reference to this be made within the plan to ensure that necessary regulatory requirements are covered</p>	
004	Lucy Seymour-Bowdery of West Sussex County Council	<p>In general, the County Council looks for Neighbourhood Plans to be in conformity with the District and Borough Councils' latest draft or adopted development plans. The County Council supports the District and Borough Councils in preparing the evidence base for these plans and aligns its own infrastructure plans with them. The County Council encourages Parish Councils to make use of this information which includes transport studies examining the impacts of proposed development allocations. Where available this information will be published on its website or that of the relevant Local Planning Authority. Following a review of the pre-submission Neighbourhood Plan for Ferring, it has been decided not to submit a formal County Council response on this occasion. We do however encourage you to informally discuss any specific issues you may have which relate to the County Council with the Principal Community Officer who deals with your area.</p> <p>Whilst the County Council supports the proactive approach undertaken to allocate sites in the Neighbourhood Plan, we are unable to comment on site specific principles at this stage.</p>	Noted
005	Environment Agency	<p>We are a statutory consultee in the planning process providing advice to Local Authorities and developers on pre-application enquiries, planning applications, appeals and strategic plans.</p> <p>Together with Natural England, English Heritage and Forestry Commission we have published joint advice on neighbourhood planning which sets out sources of environmental information and ideas on incorporating the environment into plans.</p> <p>We aim to reduce flood risk, while protecting and enhancing the water</p>	Noted

		<p>environment. We have had to focus our detailed engagement to those areas where the environmental risks are greatest.</p> <p>We are pleased to see that the proposed allocations have been directed to the areas at the lowest probability of flooding and that they are all located within Flood Zone 1.</p>	
006	Arun District Council	<p>Reference numbers for policies in the emerging local plan may change so it may be better to refer to full policy name instead of number</p> <p>Policy 2 talks of the plan retaining the existing BUAB alignment in its entirety. On the 2013 draft policies map this has been revised to include Grenyrs field and Jenkins yard sites. Further discussion is advised to ensure that the proposed BUA boundary does not prejudice the strategic policies of the local plan.</p> <p>Policy 4 this proposes a requirement for a lower affordable housing supply number than the emerging local plan. This is potentially a conflict with strategic policy and should therefore be discussed further.</p> <p>Policy 10 the policy talks about areas to be designated ASC but it is not clear if the intention is to apply ADC policy on ASC's to these areas.</p> <p>Policy 16 The FNP through the parish council should seek to nominate the buildings listed in policy 16 as Assets of community value to make this policy viable.</p>	<p>Noted and agreed</p> <p>RECOMMENDED: The built up area boundary as shown on the proposals map accords with 2014 local plan boundary.</p> <p>Policy 4 explains the rationale for requiring a lower affordable housing on the sites referred to. It accepts this is a departure from the development plan policy. Further developments appraisal work will be undertaken as part of the CRTBOs' to demonstrate the importance of maximising residual land value of the housing schemes to reinvest in delivering a new community centre for the village.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED: No change but discuss further with ADC officers as part of the CRTBO making process.</p> <p>Policy 10 proposes to ADC that it designates the areas of special character using its established criteria and process.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED: Make the policy intent and process clearer.</p> <p>Policy 16 proposes to ADC to designate the assets of community value using the localism act process.</p>

			RECOMMENDED: Make the policy intent and process clearer.
007	Andrew Triggs of South Downs National Park Authority	<p>Type of housing identified (page 10) – while the community views are a very important consideration, reference should also be made to the findings of the Coastal West Sussex Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA). Page 14 It would be helpful to have a short para. saying the National Park Authority published its Draft Management Plan in July 2013. This sets out priorities and policies to guide the actions of the National Park Authority and its partners over the next 5 years. The end date for the SDNPA Local Plan is likely to be 2033 not 2035. I think it is important to add into this section that all public bodies when doing anything which may have an impact on the National Park (e.g. granting planning permission. Objective 2 “local demand”: it is not clear to what extent regard has been had to evidence of need in the Coastal West Sussex Strategic Housing Market Assessment or the Housing Register.</p> <p>Objective 3 – it is appreciated the intention of the Plan is to direct new housing to within the settlement policy area, however there may be some types of minor development outside the settlement policy area which may be desirable. The objective as worded would conflict with NPPF policy for the countryside and National Parks permitting some forms of acceptable development. Para. 55 of the NPPF sets out that Local Planning Authorities should “avoid isolated homes in the countryside” but lists special circumstances when it may be considered acceptable. There is also strong support in para. 28 for supporting economic growth in rural areas including the conversion and expansion of existing buildings, the diversification of agricultural and other land-based rural businesses and sustainable tourism and leisure developments. The impact development has on open countryside should be considered and additionally, in the National Park, the Park Purposes.</p> <p>The supporting text says the objectives will “enable the community to grow in a sustainable way”. This would not be possible for rural businesses if this objective was pursued; similarly it would imply any domestic extensions in the</p>	<p>Noted and agreed</p> <p>Objective 3 is an objective only and not a formal policy. The nature of the open countryside outside the built up area boundary in the parish is such that it is appropriate for the plan to contain such an objective to that it can be seen to be promoting sustainable development and be acceptable to the local community.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED: No change</p>

countryside are unacceptable.

4.1 needs to be clear there are two Local Planning Authorities: SDNPA will continue to use saved policies of the 2003 ADC Local Plan until the South Downs National Park Local Plan is adopted.

Policy 1 – supported

Policy 2 – supported – this policy is proportionate – the supporting text should make some reference to appropriate development to support rural land uses e.g. farming and forestry. There will be some kinds of development, such as extensions to rural dwellings, which cannot reasonably be accommodated within the settlement policy area.

Policy 3 (ii) 2098?! 2029? It is unclear what happens if these sites come forward for development prior to 2020?

No further comments.

Policy 4 no comment

Policy 5 no comment

Policy 6 it is welcomed that the neighbourhood plan has identified a contingency site in order to achieve the Parish allocation during the second phase of the Plan period.

Policy 7 – this is a detailed DM matter – advice should be sought from ADC regarding the policy. As worded, it appears somewhat restrictive requiring all development to address this matter whereas the supporting text refers to “relevant” development proposals. The policy may need re-wording to provide flexibility for different types of development.

Policy 8 – this conflicts with the NPPF which does allow for the change of use of buildings in the countryside. Para. 55 envisages that in special circumstances the conversion of a building to residential may “represent the optimal viable use of a heritage asset”. The question may be posed what would happen to buildings in agricultural, horticultural or equine use if they are no longer viable. The policy should be reworded to achieve an appropriate level of flexibility. It needs to be clearer what the reasoning is for including this policy – these matters are already addressed by the Arun Local Plan – is the neighbourhood plan seeking to apply policy in a different way. If so, how has this been informed by the need for a different approach in the neighbourhood compared to the district as a whole?

Policy 9 – no comment

Policy 10 – no comment

Policy 11 – this policy could benefit from its own map showing the location of

		<p>the buildings and structures of special character. It would be helpful if any map showed which are in Arun District and SDNP. Otherwise no comment.</p> <p>Page 27 – top para. missing word “merit” after architectural. The full title of the Supplementary Planning Document in the supporting text should be referenced.</p> <p>Policy 12 – typo: recreational should be recreation. No comment.</p> <p>Policies 13-15 – no comment.</p> <p>Policy 16 – It is welcomed that the role of the local authority in formally designating assets is referenced. The policy should, however, say Arun District Council in this instance rather than the Local Planning Authority – the SDNPA does not have powers to maintain such a list. The final paragraph should say placed “on sale”.</p> <p>Policies 17-18 – no comment.</p> <p>The Proposals Map on Page 48 is extremely fuzzy and the key could not be read when I viewed the document as a pdf.</p> <p>Policy 19 – no comment.</p> <p>Policy 20 – no comment – in 2nd para. of supporting text there is a typo in final sentence: should say “part of the making”.</p>	
08	Martin Small of English Heritage	<p>in section 2.2, but are there any 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 section 2.5, I would suggest that the list of “especially important” policies in the Arun Local Plan should include SP24 Historic Environment, DM25 Listed Buildings, DM27 Conservation Areas and DM30 Sites of Archaeological Interest. Locally Listed Buildings or Structures of Character is actually Policy DM26 and Areas of Special Character Policy DM8.</p> <p>I 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 ? I 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 4, the Village Hall site, is opposite the Grade II listed Landalls Vine</p>	

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.

In Policy 5, 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.

Policy 9: we welcome the review of the Conservation Area and would 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. Arun District Council's Conservation Officer is better-placed to consider whether the proposed additional areas merit inclusion than English Heritage. Is there a Conservation Area Appraisal or Management Plan ? The former should be a precursor to any proposals for extension.

Policy 10: 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 English Heritage.

Policy 11: we welcome the Council's initiative in identifying buildings that they consider merit designation as Buildings or Structures of Local Character, although I am not in a position to make any comment on the choice of buildings and structures.

In Policy 12, 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 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.

In Policy 13, we welcome the requirement that the design and/or use for changes

		<p>of use will cause no significant harm to a Building or Structure of Special Character.</p> <p>In Policy 14, 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.</p> <p>In the Strategic Environmental Assessment, in the table after paragraph 9, 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.</p> <p>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.</p>	
09	Ian Moody of Worthing Borough Council	No specific comments at this, however would like to be kept informed of policy 6	
10	Ed Miller of Conservation Group	Conservation Group Committee members have been pleased to take part in the formulation of the Neighbourhood Plan and to have seen the production of the Pre-Consultation Draft. The Committee has had several discussions on the Draft, and I have led several discussions on it at our monthly Members' meetings, as well as e-mailing some 150 of our members who have given me their e mail address. I think I have been able to correct some misunderstandings by a few of our members and I have	

encouraged everyone to read the Plan itself, by downloading it from the Parish Council website or collecting a paper copy from the Parish Office. Following all this, we had a final discussion at our Members' meeting on 28 June, at which I sought the Group's endorsement of the Draft Plan. The view I put to them was that although there was no objective need for any further sites to be allocated to meet Ferring's housing needs (there being sites already consented for over 80 dwellings), Arun District Council's Draft Local Plan required 50 sites from Ferring in the plan period and it was extremely unlikely that any Ferring Neighbourhood Plan which did not meet this requirement would be acceptable to Arun, and it would not go forward to the Planning Inspectorate.

The Group accepts this position and has therefore concentrated on the type and location of the dwellings to be built on the 50 sites. We agree that the sites must be within the present built-up area and we think the Allotment site and the Village Hall site are not only in the right central location but make it possible to provide housing types tailored to needs of existing Ferring residents – making it possible for older residents to down-size but remain in the village. We also recognise the opportunity this part of the Plan offers to provide a new and better allotment site and a new Community Centre.

In the second half of the planning period we agree with the earmarking of the Benton Weatherstone and Gem/UK garage sites for the balance of the sites to be provided. The current use of these sites is no longer appropriate in a congested residential area and it would be right to encourage their future use for housing.

On behalf of 850 members of Ferring Conservation Group, I can therefore confirm our agreement with, and approval of, this Pre-Submission Draft Plan. We look forward to further involvement in further stages of the Plan's progress.

11	Derek Bell, Resident	<p>I think the first issue is in the foreword by the Chair of the Parish Council which mentions that the suggested target of 50 more dwellings contained in the Arun Local Plan (which according to paragraph 1.5 is still emerging) is unpopular with the majority of residents and in fact, a clear majority of the respondents to the comprehensive community survey (69%) have indicated that 50 additional dwellings for Ferring were too many. It continues that this is unavoidable but it should not be just accepted and the Arun District Council should be advised that enough is enough and further development (other than infilling where possible) is going to cause hardship and ruin the aspect of a very distinctive and envied village.</p> <p>Paragraph 2.5 reflects that the vision of the Arun Local Plan 2014 – 2019 is to protect and enhance local character and identity. In respect of Ferring it states that its rural area will retain its character with limited new development to meet its need. Paragraph 3.2 is applauded that conserving the relaxed and attractive environment has been achieved through the limited release of land for development, which has allowed for some new housing to meet the needs and demands of the local community but also has maintained the distinctive character of the village.</p> <p>Page 40 is telling everyone that the village hall site is one of the only two options that meet the criteria set down for provision of the 50 houses accepted by the parish council. Policy 16 recognises the village hall as an acknowledged importance to the life and enjoyment of the community. The village hall site is referred to as owned by the community, this is better explained in Policy 4 that the site is owned and operated by a charitable trust having been gifted to the local community in 1924 for the benefit of Ferring villagers. Policy 4 supports the redevelopment of the village hall site when at this stage it is not proved that it is the wish of the residents of Ferring to do so. The parish council is said to believe that it would not be possible</p>	
----	-------------------------	---	--

for the community to generate the significant funding required to upgrade and operate the present village hall. It would be very interesting to know the reaction of the Management Committee to this suggestion. Most, if not all, of the societies using the village hall have themselves donated money over the years towards various projects including the extension when it took place. Policy 11 obviously does not include the village hall site because it is the intention of the parish council to redevelop it. When the village hall was extended it was said to be the finest parish hall in the vicinity and it is still the envy of other local areas. Page 41 then states that the village hall is of no special architectural merit but has no credit been given to the fact that it is part of the accepted colour of the village and the envy of other surrounding areas and is an integral feature of a very attractive village?

Paragraph 3.2 includes the objective to secure a new multi purpose community centre. This could destroy the character of the village, exacerbate the car parking problems and limit the facilities and space needed by the various societies which would use it. Policy 14 envisages the bringing together in a new centre many community facilities even including a doctors surgery and a library but it does not appear from what is written that a proper feasibility study has been undertaken to show that it is practical and this policy seems rather premature. A new multi purpose community centre could be a major unwanted intrusion into the area suggested without a study having been taken to show that there will not be an adverse effect on the present residents in the area from noise and car parking in particular or that the local societies will be able to function properly in it and that there will be limited access to public transport.

Policy 19 relates to the proposal to make a Community Right to Build Order for the village hall site which assumes that any objections made by the Ferring residents will be ignored. Paragraph 1.2 appears

		<p>that neighbourhood planning gives communities direct power to deliver the sustainable development they need. Is there then a need therefore for the communities to own the sites to control development? Paragraph 2.4 does not mention the the reasons for refusal of development on the Coopers Garage site in recent years, this site is directly comparable to the village hall site. Policy 20 envisages using a residual development value of the village hall site of £400,000 as a major contributor to help finance the proposed community centre, what a boost for the parish council’s project!</p> <p>I have taken the opportunity to set out the above paragraphs to summarise the various references in the Plan in order to indicate how my thinking that the provision of 50 more dwellings in the plan must be resisted and that the village hall should remain in its present position in an attempt to preserve the inheritance enjoyed by all the residents in Ferring to the envy of the public at large.</p>	
12	Gavin Smith Benton Weatherstone Ltd	<p>Following my email of 27 June 2013 and subsequent telephone conversation with Carole Robertson as Managing Director of Benton Weatherstone Ltd I would like to register my feelings with regards to a number of statements in policy 5 of the Ferring Parish Neighbourhood pre-submission plan.</p> <p>The statement that our site “has a reasonable prospect of becoming available during the latter half of the plan period” is misleading. Having traded since 1970 we have no plans to close down which is exactly as the statement implies. This is potentially damaging to our business and has already resulted in enquiries as to the date of our closing down sale. I would request that this particular comment is removed.</p> <p>The statement “Its value as an employment site is limited” is very unpopular with our 19 staff some of which are residents of the village, the balance local to the area. We must be considered an important part of the employment numbers in the village.</p>	

With regards to the statement that our business “service a wider market area than Ferring and would therefore be better suited closer to the A259” I feel the point is missed that although we do deliver outside of Ferring every resident and business in Ferring relies on services from the wider area driving into the village. This statement must therefore be of no value.

With regards to the policy making a “signal to the landowners/occupiers” we accept the sentiment however would prefer the plan to indicate a mutually beneficial site from which we can continue our businesses.

I hope my opinions can be taken into account when finalising the plan.