

Minutes of Southbourne Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group 16th June 2014

To Review the Draft Document Consolidating Responses to Regulation 14

Attendees: Alice Smith, Bill Ferguson, Bruce Finch, Chris Bulbeck, Geoff Talbot, Jack Moss, Jonathan Brown, John Southgate, Lawrence Tirebuck, Mike Allgrove, Mike Downer, Neil Homer, Robert Hayes, Rowena Tyler, Roy Seabrook, Sandra James, Sarah Richardson, Sue Talbot.

1. Document Consolidating Responses to Regulation 14: The responses have been consolidated by RCOH and are attached as Appendix 1 to these minutes. When this document is final it becomes one of the appendices to the final plan. It is a record of the responses from statutory bodies. We have recorded the responses from local residents but they do not go onto this document.
2. All responses are with Lawrence Tirebuck, all Steering Group and Parish Councillors are advised to take the time to read them in full, as well as other group members where possible. 80% are email so these could be forwarded if required. Care must be taken to keep these within the SG and PC as these are not fully redacted. **ACTION PARISH COUNCIL, ACTION ALL** Many responses are asking questions, and would appear to expect a response, perhaps the parish council can arrange a suitable reply to these, thanking residents for taking the time to write/email in. **ACTION PARISH COUNCIL.**
3. Schedule of responses compiled by Lawrence: can be viewed by SG and PC but must not be forwarded as this is not fully redacted. Once redacted this will also be an appendix to the final plan document.
4. What responses are attached to the final plan? Usually just the summary of responses but if any particular responses are very relevant they can be included as an appendix to the final plan document. We expect to include CDC, WSCC, EH, and similar responses in full as appendices. The regulation on what is included says to keep it proportionate but the decision as to what to include and what to just summarise, is ours to make. This analysis gives an idea of whether residents are likely to vote for or against the plan when it comes to referendum. So far the responses indicate that we are meeting residents' requirements. The responses from the other organisations give a view of the technical robustness of the plan.
5. Local community responses there is a gap in the document for these to be included, and overview is to be created by Sue and checked by Sarah **ACTION SUE TALBOT AND SARAH RICHARDSON**
6. Sue Talbot's Summary of Responses Received: Appendix 2 to these minutes. 85 responses received, 50 give full support, 5 support and concerns = 65% supporting plan. 11 object, 10 say yes and no, so not clear if they support, 8 object only to Penny Lane site, which is not recommended in the draft plan, 1 objects to Woodfield Park Road development, again not part of this draft plan. All of them approved the sites put forward by draft plan, and there is very strong support for keeping development south of the train gates. There is strong support for the green ring, the idea of a road in the future to the west of Southbourne village, and pedestrian crossings over the railway line. Concerns are mainly infrastructure – GP/schools/sewerage/drainage/flooding. There are concerns over increased traffic on A259 but the representations note that this is preferable to increased traffic on Stein Road (over level crossing). Some responses do not object to the draft plan but have other issues that they would have liked included. Again all parish council members are requested to ensure that they have read all the responses received. **ACTION PARISH COUNCIL.** This analysis had been checked by Sarah Richardson for accuracy and Sarah suggested a few minor adjustments which would be edited in. Sarah said that the analysis, if anything, errs on the cautious side and that the summary that Sue has prepared summarises the support details, and gives more detail about the concerns received – so the summarised report may look as though more concerns were received than support, this is not the case, the report is prepared to highlight concerns so that we can ensure we do what we can to deal with residents' concerns. It was noted that many residents are dismayed at the number of planning applications in recent months and wondered if the neighbourhood plan was the cause of this. Some residents' responses indicate that they feel there is nothing we can do to control the development in the parish, wanted or otherwise. Most concerns are infrastructure. There are particular comments where residents are very impressed eg with the proposed improvement to infrastructure in Nutbourne.
7. GP Surgery we have written to them to advise them of the level of concern amongst residents about capacity at the surgery in Southbourne. We are waiting for a response. Previous communication has been verbal and we need a written response for the examiner.
8. Engagement with residents to date we have engaged with 1370 individuals, this is 20% of the parish, and so far the feedback from the residents to the neighbourhood plan team has been good.
9. Sewerage we know that Southern Water have put in new sewerage all the way to Thorney that would accommodate outflow from some sites, but we do not know what can be done to accommodate the extra sewerage from the Seawards sites, SW have not commented, it is not included in Seawards applications and we have no way of assessing the drainage risk of building on their 3 proposed sites.
10. CDC comments Neil Homer will amend the draft plan to accommodate the comments from CDC; they do not suggest making substantial changes to the draft plan, just amendments to wording in **ACTION NEIL HOMER.**

Housing numbers are stated “up to xx” will be amended to “xx” as this is preferred by Examiner. CDC have asked that we clarify our plans for open public space, and give more details about the proposed footbridges. We need to separate the need to safeguard the land from the need for finance, as the finance can be brought together at a later date as long as the land is safeguarded from the earliest opportunity. CDC have commented that perhaps the suggested playing field be elsewhere, this can be discussed by SG and PC but it is felt that this ought to be south of the railway line as the only field we have is already north of railway line. There is no public space south of railway line aside from the coastal paths. CDC support the principle of the green ring, perhaps we can add some clarification on design details. ACTION SARAH Neil to seek guidance from CDC as to how to reword the plan to take into account their comments. **ACTION NEIL HOMER.** Mike Allgrove confirmed that FAD policy is now withdrawn.

11. CIL/s106 we had thought that the infrastructure projects would be funded mainly by CIL but it may be that some is funded by s106 payments which are less flexible (i.e. need to be used within a set period and for set projects that are specific to the development that provides them). Our plan has been drafted assuming CIL is used. Our plan can specify the projects we want to see provided but we can be less specific about the source of funding and let CDC determine in each case if it is to be CIL or s106. We must have a list of reserved projects, keep this up to date and bid for CIL for each project. If we have a well thought out list of projects then the chance of receiving CIL is greater. For the projects in the plan it is possible that neither CIL nor s106 will be enough and we can apply for funding from various bodies, i.e. coastal communities fund, network rail and so on, depending on the project. At this point land safeguards are the top priority. It was noted that residents have commented that they do not believe s106 funds come to Southbourne parish, although we have had lots of development over the last 40 years there has been very little benefit to the community by way of public land or amenities via s106. Residents do not think CDC will provide money for projects but will take the money and use it for other things. Communication on this is attached as *Appendices 3, 4 and 5*.
12. Rail Crossings in the parish there are 3 pedestrian rail crossings and 2 level crossings. Network Rail would like to remove the pedestrian crossings for safety reasons. They may be able to access funds to help close these crossings. Network Rail comments on the rail crossing issues and they seem willing to engage with us to find solutions to the problem.
13. Nutbourne site has a proposed overflow bypass for Hambrook, 50 houses would not generate the required funds via s106, we would need to seek additional funding. This extra drainage solution is the reason that many in Nutbourne support the plan, we do not want to take it out, perhaps we can find the appropriate wording to express the issue more clearly. There is also a land ownership issue, Neil to ask Brendan to talk to Steve Jupp to investigate/resolve. Roy to create a small document reinforcing evidence of drainage issues at this site, photos etc, details of flooding, front cover to say “Southbourne Neighbourhood Plan Nutbourne Drainage Report” or similar, we can include this as evidence with the plan and on our website. **ACTION ROY**
14. Crayfern have shown on their plans a layout that facilitates the green ring and a future road to the west of Southbourne village.
15. Highways Agency generally supportive of the plan.
16. WSCC generally helpful comments
17. Wildlife Trust, Natural England generally positive, particularly about green ring as this helps avoid significant effect on the AONB. Nat England do point out it is not desirable to be losing high grade agricultural land to development, but we have nothing else to build on in this parish.
18. English Heritage comment that heritage issues are not as prominent in the SEA as they would like, but the consultants have advised this is ok, no area is given prominence, i.e. heritage or any other.
19. Developers/landowners as expected those whose sites are favoured are positive about the plan and those not favoured are critical of the plan. Airs advise that we have followed due process and the policies are robust. We may need to point more clearly to the existing evidence supporting our policies to deal with some of the points raised by developers.
20. Meeting with developers who want to present their plans to the PC and SG, this will be held as per previous events; the SG and PC will listen but no commitment or comment to the developers presentations. Set for 29th July 2014. Hunter Page (Breach Avenue), Lucan Beck (South of Kings Court), Domusea (Dunkirk) and Walsh and Co (South Lane).
21. Summary No sites need to be deleted or added on the basis of the representations received, SEA document may need to be tweaked in line with the comments received. No need for revised draft plan or further consultation. Our timetable can be left as it. We can now proceed to submission of the neighbourhood plan.
22. Next SG meeting Tuesday 1st July at St John's Church, Stein Road, Southbourne PO20 8LB at 7.30pm.

Appendix 1.

SOUTHBOURNE PARISH NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

REGULATION 14 REPORT: JUNE 2014

Purpose

1. The purpose of this report is to summarise the outcome of the consultation period on the Pre Submission Southbourne Parish Neighbourhood Plan (SPNP) held from April to June 2014. The report makes some recommendations on how the SPNP should proceed in the light of representations made.
2. The report will be published by Southbourne Parish Council (SPC) and it will be appended to the Consultation Statement that will accompany the submitted in due course, in line with the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012.

Consultation Analysis

3. During the consultation period there were over xxxx representations made by local people, by developers/landowners and by other local and interested organisations. All of the statutory consultees – Natural England, the Environment Agency and English Heritage – have made representations.
4. In respect of the responses from the local community, the following common objections or concerns have been made:
 - xxxx
8. The local planning authority – Chichester District Council (CDC) – has provided informal officer comments. The Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group has been in regular dialogue with CDC during the preparation of the SPNP. CDC has raised a number of issues on the SPNP and has made suggestions on how the final document may be improved, including:
 - adding to the justification of Policy 1 a reference to the settlement boundary review criteria of Policy 2 of the Pre-Submission Chichester Local Plan Key Policies document (CLPKP)
 - supporting the total sum of housing proposed in Policy 2 but not stating a maximum number of dwellings in the allocations
 - clarifying how the open space requirements of Policy 2 relate to CLPKP Policy 54
 - clarifying the viability of requiring a proposed footbridge on the Loveders Caravan Park allocation in Policy 2
 - questioning the requirement for a playing field on Loveders Caravan Park in Policy 2 and suggesting that provision is rather made as part of Policy 8 at Bourne School
 - further justification for the allocation of Gosden Green in Policy 2 in relation to various CLPKP policies
 - further justification for the allocation at Nutbourne West in Policy 2 in relation to the settlement boundary criteria and suggested improvements to the policy and text wording
 - supporting the Green Ring in Policy 3 but seeking clarification on its design details and delivery
 - clarifying the wording of Policy 5 in respect of specific employment locations in the parish
 - suggesting Policy 6 on village shops cannot be applied to prior approval applications

- raising a number of issues in relation to the justification, details and achievability of the road and bridge scheme in Policy 9

9. Three other local authorities have made comments: West Sussex County Council, Hampshire County Council and Havant Borough Council. West Sussex County Council have made the following general comments:

- it is satisfied that the provisions of Policy 2 in respect of the transport suitability of the housing allocations, subject to the further technical work expected at the planning application stage
- it has not seen sufficient evidence of the impact of the level crossing on traffic generated by development north and south of the railway line
- it has suggested moving the delivery of a new pedestrian bridge from Policy 2 to a new Proposal as it cannot yet be demonstrated to be deliverable
- it has suggested moving the delivery of a new road bridge from Policy 9 to a new Proposal as it cannot yet be demonstrated to be deliverable
- it would like reference made to the National Cycle Route on the A259 and more said about how walking, cycling and public transport will be promoted
- it has made a number of suggestions for improving the wording of the Proposals in Section 5

10. Hampshire County Council raised no specific policy concerns but requires that the consideration of planning applications on the sites allocated in Policy 2 takes into account the impact on neighbouring Emsworth. Havant BC raises concerns of the lack of an employment land allocation in the SPNP and would like more details on the Green Ring in Policy 3 and of the transport provisions of Policy 9.

11. In addition, comments have been received from Network Rail, the Highways Agency, Southern Water and the Sussex Wildlife Trust. Network Rail has welcomed the awareness of the SPNP of the railway crossing issues in the parish and would like to discuss the new crossing proposals of Policy 2 and Policy 9 further. It also raises concerns about Inlands Road and would welcome proposals in the SPNP to discourage increased traffic on that road.

12. Southern Water would like Policy 2 amended to each site allocation to specifically require a connection to its network. It would also like Policy 3 amended to allow for utilities development within the Green Ring in exceptional circumstances. Finally, it would like a new policy supporting the provision of new and improved utility infrastructure. The Highways Agency has made no comments on the policies and Scotia Gas Networks has confirmed that its infrastructure can accommodate this scale of development.

13. The Sussex Wildlife Trust has welcomed the attention the SPNP has paid to biodiversity issues generally and to the importance of the Harbours SPA. It has suggested improvements to the text in various places, including supporting enhancements as well as the safeguarding of wildlife assets. It has also raised some concerns in respect of the wording of the Site Assessments report in the evidence base.

14. The Environment Agency has welcomed the location of all the site allocations of Policy 2 outside of areas of known flood risk. Natural England generally welcomes the SPNP but is concerned about the loss of higher grade agricultural land. It has also made some recommendations in respect of the SEA report. English Heritage has requested a specific policy on the historic environment of the parish and has acknowledged that the site allocations of Policy 2 contain or are within the setting of a designated heritage asset. It too has made suggestions for how the SEA and Site Assessments reports may be improved.

15. All of the main land promoters in the parish have made representations. Those promoters whom Policy 2 favours with a proposed housing allocation

have generally welcomed the SPNP and have made suggestions for how the final policy details are worded. Most often this would require adding more flexibility to allow the details of housing numbers and open space provision to be subject to planning applications to follow. Comments have also been made on how the SPNP can practically manage the delivery of the proposals of Policy 9 in respect of its financing. In doing so, all have restated that their sites remain available for development in the plan period. One – Hallam Land Ltd – has raised the point that the SPNP cannot rely upon the untested CLPKP for its housing supply justification but it has not objected to Policy 2.

16. Those promoters with land that has not been allocated have raised a number of objections:

- the sites selected in Policy 2 also impact on the Stein Road level crossing as there are facilities north of the crossing
- a site not selected has the ability to deliver more benefits than one or more of those chosen in Policy 2
- a site not selected will not have any significant impact on traffic using the level crossing based on assessment work undertaken to support current or proposed planning applications
- the plan making process has not conformed with the Regulations
- the evidence base to justify the policies is inadequate
- the sites chosen in Policy 2 are all located closer to the AONB and Harbours SPA than sites north of the railway
- the SEA has not properly evaluated reasonable policy alternatives
- the SPNP is not in conformity with the NPPF
- the SPNP cannot rely upon the untested Policy 20 of the CLPKP for justifying the total number of new homes in its housing allocations
- the SPNP should be subject to its own Habitats Regulations Assessment

Modifying the Submission Plan

17. It is clear that the proposals of the Pre Submission SPNP have secured majority support from the local community and have not received objections other than from land promoters not favoured with housing site allocations. Given the relatively large scale of development provided for in the plan compared to the existing size of the village and the historic build rate trend, this is a considerable achievement.

18. Without doubt, the policy wording and supporting text and the contents of the SEA will benefit improvements to aid clarity for decision makers and for local people. Of the policies, perhaps only Policy 9 in respect of the safeguarding of land west of Southbourne village for a road and bridge beyond the plan period may require a significant reconsideration for inclusion. All the other policies have been regarded as valid land use and development policies and can be retained, subject to minor modifications.

19. There are three general issues that need to be considered:

- is there are requirement to prepare a Revised Pre-Submission SPNP due to the need to include new policies or because of process failings in preparing the plan?
- Do Policies 1 and 2 of the SPNP unduly rely upon the CLPKP for their justification?
- Do the criteria chosen to justify changes to the Settlement Boundary in Policy 1 accord with saved and emerging development plan policy and is there sufficient evidence to support them?

20. In respect the first issue, the new policies proposed by the likes of Southern Water and English Heritage are not necessary as there is already provision made in the NPPF and/or development plan to ensure development proposals properly consider utility and other similar matters. A Neighbourhood Plan need not duplicate any such provision, though it may wish to restate (and refine, if desired) specific national and local policies where it is known the local community will expect to see such a policy. The SPNP has avoided duplication for the most part.

21. Challenges to the process of preparing neighbourhood plans are common but most often unfounded and based on misunderstandings of the key differences between their preparation and the making of other forms of development plan, e.g. the CLPKP. In respect of the SPNP, the evidence base is regarded as sufficiently robust to inform a neighbourhood plan. The Site Assessments report contains a detailed critique of the attributes of all the sites made available for assessment and especially in the light of the provisions of Policy 1. The Basic Conditions and Consultation Statements will provide more details of how the evidence base has been used than is appropriate in the SPNP document itself.

22. The Consultation Statement will set out how the Steering Group has informed itself of the views of the local community and of the features of the land made available for assessment. It has been very mindful of ensuring that all land promoters have been given the opportunity to provide information, both to the Group and to the wider public.

23. The CDC has commissioned the SEA and HRA work to support the preparation of the SPNP and this has been, and will be done, in line with the respective European Directives. It is noted that the HRA report is only required at the submission stage to demonstrate that there will be no significant effects on the Harbours SPA of its policies.

24. For those reasons, it is not considered that there needs to be modifications made to the SPNP that oblige SPC to prepare a Revised Pre Submission Plan for a further Regulation 14 consultation period.

25. The relationship between neighbourhood plans and emerging Local Plans has been the subject of much contention since the 2011 Localism Act amended the 1990 and 2004 Planning Acts. However, the National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) has brought greater clarity to the matter since its publication in March 2014. The NPPG requires that neighbourhood planning teams liaise with the local planning authority on the matter and benefit from the reasoning and evidence of the emerging Local Plan where relevant (ID 41-009). The SPNP has done both.

26. Policies 1 and 2 of the SPNP have been careful not to be seen to place a cap on development nor to rely upon the CLPKP Policy 20 for allocating a total of 350 homes. It is noted that this number relates well to that policy and, more importantly, to the evidence base that supports that policy (notably the Chichester SA/SEA and HRA and Settlement Capacity Profile). This summary of evidence makes it quite clear that for the coming plan period a scale of development in excess of 350 homes in this parish will not be sustainable.

27. In which case, even if the examination of the CLPKP results in CDC having to identify additional land for housing development it is doubtful that it will be able to choose this parish to assist (hence its decision to reduce the total housing numbers in Southbourne from earlier versions of the CLPKP). That said, it will be made clear in the policy that provision will be made for future reviews of the policy during the plan period to ensure that it remains in line with district-level housing policy.

28. As it is, this scale of development represents a doubling of housing delivery from 10 to 20 dwellings per annum in Southbourne village and will effectively address meeting local affordable housing need. Furthermore, and not without major importance, the local community appears to support this scale of development.

29. For those reasons, the SPNP can demonstrate that it complements the emerging CLPKP as well as be in general conformity with the saved policies of the development plan.

30. Finally, the decision to include a spatial policy as Policy 1 to restate the purpose of Settlement Boundaries in the three parish settlements and to justify where those boundaries may be redefined as proved to be very helpful. Not only does it allow for the continued supply of windfall housing schemes within those boundaries (so there is no 'cap' on total housing supply) but it also

provide the local community and land promoters with clarity on what type of development proposals will be supported and where. Its other benefit, aided by the SEA, is to enable genuine spatial growth options to be assessed, rather than the detailed attributes of individual sites. Crucially, this has allowed for a broader picture of cumulative impact to be considered in respect of the issues that matter most to local people – protecting the best things about living in the parish and making the most efficient use of existing infrastructure.

31. The result is that Policy 2 is able to focus its allocations on those sites in locations that are directed by Policy 1. In doing so, the SPNP does not need to assess the individual merits of sites that are not consistent with Policy 1 in any more detail than is done in the Site Assessments report. Put simply, given Policy 1 allows sufficient land to be identified for development in Policy 2 to meet local housing need but not to lead to significant effects on environmental designations, then there is no need to make the case for allocating any additional sites.

32. The Basic Conditions Statement will demonstrate how the five criteria of Policy 1 not only conform to national and saved development plan policy; it will also show how they relate to the settlement boundary review criteria of Policy 2 of the CLPKP.

33. For those reasons, the core policies 1 and 2 are considered to align with national and development plan policy.

Recommendations

34. It is therefore recommended that:

- The policies and supporting text are changed with only minor modifications as described above
- There are no sites deleted and no other sites allocated
- The SEA consultants also note the comments received and modify the report as necessary
- The SPNP is finalised for submission for examination, subject to the completion of the Basic Conditions Statement and Consultation Statement

Appendix 2

Southbourne Parish Neighbourhood Plan

Pre-Submission Draft Plan April 2014

First Draft Analysis of comments/representations received (alphabetical order)

NB Numbers 002 (Steve Jupp – Nutbourne agent), 008 (Paul Sansby – Portsmouth Water), 014 (Geoff Hand - Fishbourne Parish Council), 037 (John Southgate - Bourne Community College and Bourne Community Trust), 046 (Brenda and Ray Davis – landowners), 049 (Walsh – agent for land south of South View Cottages) not included in this analysis as not classified as local residents’ responses. Some addresses missing which Lawrence has on record.

First Draft - totals

- 85 valid responses
- 50 support (59%)
- 5 support with concerns (6%)
- 11 objections (13%)

- 10 yes and no/Concerns/??/other (12%)

- 8 Penny Lane (9%)

- 1 Woodfield Park Road (1%)

No.	Name	Summary of points made	Topics covered	Objection or support
	J A (Southbourne)	Plan pages 37 to38 should refer to up-to date situation concerning sewage treatment capacity in simple language. Critical issue. SoP & SEA scoping references contradict each other. Para 3.1 Vision - needs clarification and amendments, include environment in CIL provision, housing mix & design Allotments needed in Southbourne	OBJECTS TO LACK OF COHERENT REFERENCE TO SEWAGE PROBLEMS, LACK OF ALLOTMENT PROVISION, AND LACK OF REFERENCE TO ENVIRONMENT IN CIL. OTHER CLARIFICATION NEEDED	Objection
051	C B (Southbourne)	Railway is a barrier dividing the community and village has grown without proper planning. (Proposed changes to Plan worked out in considerable detail in letter and plans supplied along with list of benefits to be gained). In summary: - road bridge at east of S'Bourne - pedestrian bridge at west of S'bourne - link to A27 from village - re-open Lumley Road/Mill Lane link	SUGGESTS NEW LINKS OVER RAILWAY, BUT CONSIDERS ROAD SHOULD BE EAST OF S'BOURNE AND FOOTBRIDGE TO WEST. FULLY DETAILED LIST OF CHANGES/IMPROVEMENTS AND PLANS SUBMITTED	Objection - proposed changes suggested

		<p>to Westbourne</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - all with associated footways and altered bus routes linking to village - eventual closure of both level crossings. Plan appears not to be aware of Network Rail's policy to close crossings - public parking in number of places including for schools and station - enlarged village centre Main Rd/Stein Road southern end to create focus and sense of place - division of Clovelly Road industry from residential properties, with road link to A27 		
045	M B (Southbourne)	Objection to Penny Lane due to loss of farmland, flooding, impact on services, poor access, doctors will not be able to cope, schools may not cope.	OBJECTION TO PENNY LANE	Penny Lane
	M B (Nutbourne)	Supports Plan. Excellent work put in by Parish Council. Particular support for new drainage in Nutbourne as proposed.	SUPPORTS PLAN	Support
	J B (Southbourne)	Concern about pedestrian access from Loveders site to Schools, railway, Bourne College	NOT CLEAR WHETHER SUPPORTS OR OBJECTS	?
032	Mrs E B (Southbourne)	<p>Commends hard work. Supports housing sites. Supports Green Ring.</p> <p>Supports new Road Bridge at west</p> <p>Comments :-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - wants carbon-neutral homes - wants ditches and drainage in communal green areas to prevent flooding 	<p>SUPPORTS PLAN</p> <p>+ WANTS CARBON NEUTRAL HOMES AND DRAINAGE IN GREEN AREAS</p>	Support
	Mr and Mrs E B			
017	Mr J B	Object to Penny Lane proposal due	OBJECT TO PENNY LANE	Penny Lane

	(Southbourne)	to flooding and traffic		
042	J B (Southbourne)	<p>Heartening to see residents' views taken into account to influence future of village. Supports housing south of railway. Supports road bridge at west. Supports Green Ring</p> <p>Supports proposed improvement to local drainage included in Nutbourne site proposal. Supports as many as possible affordable homes</p> <p>Comments:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - higher densities would make better use of land - would personally accept more housing IF road bridge and other infrastructure in place, but not if community opposed more housing - wants carbon-neutral energy efficient housing but accepts Plan may not have be powers to achieve this 	<p>SUPPORTS HOUSING, GREEN RING, ROAD BRIDGE, IMPROVED DRAINAGE AT NUTBOURNE, AFFORDABLE HOMES</p> <p>+ WANTS HIGHER DENSITIES, CARBON NEUTRAL HOMES, WOULD ACCEPT MORE HOUSING IF COMMUNITY SUPPORTS IT AND IF INFRASTRUCTURE PROVIDED</p>	Support
036	Mr and Mrs B (Southbourne)	<p>Well presented public meetings</p> <p>Support the Plan especially housing sites south of railway with links to A259</p>	SUPPORT PLAN AND HOUSING SITES	Support
005	Mrs A B	<p>Thanks for all hard work. No objections to Plan and siting of new developments.</p> <p>Comment:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Is it possible to include new cycleways with new footpaths to encourage cyclists away from the A259? 	<p>SUPPORTS HOUSING SITES</p> <p>+ SUGGESTION FOR CYCLEWAYS</p>	Support
	J B (Emsworth)	<p>Further development in SE England not needed. Real problem is global warming and the need for infrastructure, water power, traffic, employment. Over 50% unemployment in South East</p>	REAL PROBLEMS NOT TACKLED IN PLAN	Objection

004	H B	Land north of Woodfield Park Road not acceptable for housing. Was recent tree felling intended to make development easier?	OPPOSED TO HOUSING AT WOODFIELD PARK ROAD	Woodfield Park Road
027	Mrs M C (Southbourne)	Supports Plan. Supports housing sites, good locations Supports types and mix of housing. Supports Green Ring. Supports new road at west. Supports pedestrian bridge at east but wants safety and security of school children fully considered. Wants a youth facility Thanks to all concerned	SUPPORTS PLAN +WANTS YOUTH FACILITY	Support
	Mrs C (Inlands Road)	Disappointed with Plan. Supports Loveders site. Objection to other 3 sites because outside village. Nutbourne has no facilities. Housing sites at Gosden Green and north of Alfrey Close exit on narrow road where it floods. Fails to address danger to schoolchildren and pedestrians due to narrowness of Cooks Lane and Inlands Road. No provision to improve parking around Infant & Junior Schools. Errors in brochure (unspecified) No reptiles & amphibians in Cooks Lane. No congestion at Inlands Road level crossing.	SUPPORTS LOVEDERS OBJECTS TO NUTBOURNE SITE AND OTHER TWO AS TOO FAR OUT OF VILLAGE + CONCERNS ABOUT DANGER AND NARROWNESS OF COOKS LANE AND INLANDS ROAD. LACK OF PARKING AROUND INF. AND JUN. SCHOOLS. SOME INACCURACCIES IN PLAN	Yes and No
012	Mrs A C	Thanks for hard work. Concerned about capacity of Doctors' surgery. Concerned about infrastructure esp waste water	CONCERNS ABOUT DOCTORS AND WASTE WATER	Objection
020	A C (Southbourne)	Supports Green Ring. Supports housing sites south of the railway. - Supports footbridges. Concerns:- - Cycleway needed for village. - Concern that no additional parking	SUPPORTS PLAN + NEED CYCLEWAY, MORE PARKING FOR SHOPS, AND SUPPORT FOR SCHOOLS NEEDED	Support

		<p>for shops proposed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - All schools will need financial support to meet demand with more playground space for Junior and infant schools 		
	Mr P D (Prinsted)	<p>Supports the Plan especially the housing sites, the development principles for the sites, the Green Ring, the links over the railway Line and enhanced bus services</p> <p>Wants :-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - More positive approach to business-centre (Policy 5) - Design of new sports pitches should minimise impact on rural character to west (Policy 8) - provide for future broadening of type of community facilities (Policy 10) <p>NB Error in name of Listed Building</p>	<p>SUPPORTS PLAN ESPECIALLY HOUSING SITES, GREEN RING, LINKS OVER RAILWAY, ENHANCED BUS SERVICES</p> <p>Provided +</p> <p>MORE POSITIVE ABOUT BUSINESS CENTRE, MINIMISE VISUAL IMPACT SPORTS PITCHES, PROVIDE FOR WIDER COMMUNITY FACILITIES</p>	<p>Support</p> <p>+ some concerns</p>
	S D (Prinsted)	<p>Supports Plan especially housing sites and sensible selection criteria, development principles for all selected sites, Green Ring, links over railway and enhanced bus services</p>	<p>SUPPORTS PLAN, ESPECIALLY HOUSING SITES, GREEN RING, LINKS OVER RAILWAY, ENHANCED BUS SERVICES</p>	<p>Support</p>
007	B D	<p>Thanks for hard work. Supports keeping new housing south of railway. Must be achieved to prevent further congestion at crossing gates. Should be moratorium on planning applications until Plan in place</p>	<p>SUPPORTS HOUSING SITES</p>	<p>Support</p>
	P D (Southbourne)	<p>Supports housing proposals south of Railway. Supports Green Ring.</p> <p>Concern:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Still has concerns about sewage 	<p>SUPPORTS PLAN, HOUSING, GREEN RING</p> <p>CONCERNS : FLOODING AND SEWAGE</p>	<p>Support</p> <p>+ some concerns</p>

		and local flooding on roads		
	Mr & Mrs E (Southbourne)	Thanks for work on Plan. Support for Green Ring. Concern:- - about congestion around Primary School - Is there a proposal to enlarge doctors' surgery? - Want swimming pool	SUPPORT GREEN RING CONCERNS ABOUT TRAFFIC NEAR, PARKING, AND CAPACITY OF PRIMARY SCH, AND DOCTORS CAPACITY WANT SWIMMING POOL	Support + some concerns
W8	M E (Southbourne)	Supports Plan. Some matters will need to be addressed in next Plan in 15 years time.	SUPPORT	Support
033	J F (Prinsted)	Supports Plan. Housing sites are best in circumstances. Supports bridge over railway. Supports better pedestrian access to Station. Thanks for efforts Wants :- - Flooding problems on A259 west of Prinsted and in Prinsted Lane solved - Parking for rail passengers Comments :- - sufficient parking space in new developments - new road at west will need mini-roundabout + pedestrian crossing - control of run-off from new development needs to be co-ordinated to avoid problems - 30mph limit on Main Road should be enforced.	SUPPORTS PLAN, ESPECIALLY CHOICE OF HOUSING SITES, ROAD AT WEST, BETTER ACCESS TO STATION CONCERNS ABOUT FLOODING, PARKING FOR STATION. WANTS SUFFICIENT PARKING IN NEW DEVS, SURFACE WATER CONTROLS + DETAILED TRANSPORT POINTS	Support + some concerns

048	Mr and Mrs F (Suthbourne)	Support Plan. (Object to Seawards 3 current applications, prematurity, highway safety, would collectively destroy Green Ring aspirations)	SUPPORT PLAN	Support
	B F	Objects to Penny Lane	OBJECTS TO PENNY LANE	Penny Lane
050	D and L F (Southbourne)	Support Plan. Comment:- - Dangerous situation at mini-roundabout at A259/Stein Road needs considering	SUPPORT PLAN Comment:- DANGER AT MINI-ROUNDAABOUT AT A259/STEIN ROAD	Support
	P F (Southbourne)	Supports Plan. Thanks for hard work	SUPPORTS PLAN	Support
018	K G	Thanks for hard work. Fully supports all Plan proposals including housing proposals	SUPPORTS PLAN	Support
016	P G (Southbourne Ave)	Objects to Penny Lane proposals due to loss of fields, traffic, access, use of Southbourne Ave as short cut and needs re-surfacing. Should be more parking for shops in Southbourne	OBJECTS TO PENNY LANE PROPOSALS + SHOULD BE MORE PARRKING FOR SHOPS IN SOUTHBOURNE	Penny Lane
001	P G	Well intentioned but nothing ever done in response to residents' comments. At Sadlers Walk in Hermitage no improvements made to make access safe, people visiting Emsworth park there, footways muddy and not maintained. Nothing will be done until there is an accident	CONCERNS ABOUT SAFETY IN SADLERS WALK	-
039	H G (Prinsted)	Supports Plan especially the requirement for community facilities to serve new housing. Hopes developers will not be allowed to pre-empt Plan.	SUPPORTS PLAN	Support
022	J G (no address)	Supports Plan. Supports housing south of railway. Supports Green Ring. Hopes developers will not be allowed to pre-empt Plan	SUPPORTS PLAN ESPECIALLY HOUSING SOUTH OF RAILWAY AND GREEN RING	Support
028	D G (Southbourne)	Supports Plan. Plan reflects wishes of community. Plan mitigates challenges posed by the District Council housing proposals for 300 new houses. Supports housing south of railway. Supports Green Ring. Hopes developers will not	SUPPORTS PLAN ESPECIALLY HOUSING SOUTH OF RAILWAY AND	Support

		be allowed to pre-empt Plan		
	T G (no address)	Objects to road bridge proposal. Objects to lack of high sustainable building standards. Objects to lack of acknowledgement and/or requirements to resolve known sewage and drainage problems. Serious omission in Plan.	OBJECTS TO ROAD BRIDGE, LACK OF HIGH SUSTAINABLE BUILDING TARGETS AND FAILURE TO DEAL WITH SEWAGE AND DRAINAGE PROBLEMS	Objection
043	R H (Prinsted)	Reluctant to accept need to build 350 houses but supports Plan as best option. Supports housing south of railway. Supports footbridge at the west, safer for access to Bourne College. Comment:- - Pedestrian footways on level Crossing are too narrow	SUPPORTS PLAN Comment:- PEDESTRIAN FOOTWAY ON LEVEL CROSSING TOO NARROW	Support
030	O H (Prinsted)	Supports Plan	SUPPORTS PLAN	Support
	D H (Southbourne)	Thanks for work. Supports housing sites. Supports Green Ring. Supports new sports pitches. Supports footway to Station. Objects to lack of link to A27 Comments: - Hopes Green Ring will be maintained, details important - lack of information on new infrastructure - Could footbridge link to Station? - Aim to reduce closure times on rail crossings	SUPPORTS PLAN Objects to lack of link to A27 Comments on detailed matters	Yes and No
009	J H	Objects to Nutbourne housing site. Nutbourne is not a sustainable location. Will encourage car use. Cooks Lane in Southbourne is the best location, close to station and amenities	OBJECTS TO NUTBOURNE SITE SUPPORTS COOKS LANE, SOUTHBOURNE	Objection

W2	K H (Southbourne)	Supports Plan. Evening meeting very positive.	SUPPORTS PLAN	Support
W3	K H (Southbourne)	Fully supports Green Ring.	SUPPORTS GREEN RING	Support
021	P H (Southbourne)	<p>Objects to housing west and south of A259</p> <p>[Refers to previous letter :-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Stein Road level crossing is a bottleneck - more employment needs to be encouraged but Clovelly Road inadequate, traffic and lack of parking - parking for commuters needed - prefers housing sites south of Cooks Lane and Loveders with a bridge over the railway line - land at Gosden Green and north of Alfrey Close is suitable for industrial development allowing Clovelly Road to be re-developed for housing eventually] 	SUPPORTS LOVEDERS HOUSING SITE	Yes and No
	A H (Suthbourne)	<p>Supports bridge over railway. Supports no development south of the A259. Presentation at meeting good. Thanks for hard work</p> <p>Comments:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - would bridge open up land to north for development? - would bridge extend to A27? - no public amenity space in village and this is needed so could Parish Council buy land for this purpose 	<p>SUPPORTS PLAN</p> <p>+</p> <p>COMMENTS ON DETAILS</p>	Support

	T and S H (Southbourne)	Support Plan. Support strategy of housing south of the railway. Support developer funding for road and footbridge over railway. Well put together plan and support proposals	SUPPORT	Support
	S H (Southbourne)	Supports Green Ring. Supports reduction of Bourne College catchment area. New road and bridge should be built before Care Home as Alfrey Close not suitable as access and developers should pay for it and for extensions to sewage facilities and doctors surgery. Comments:- - Plan does not refer to Care Home and permitted assisted living units - should be housing at north of Southbourne linked to A27	SUPPORTS GREEN RING SUPPORTS ROAD BRIDGE OBJECTS TO OMISSION OF HOUSING AT NORTH END OF VILLAGE + LINK TO A27	Yes and No
	Miss K J (Southbourne)	Full support for Plan. Supports housing sites. Supports road bridge. Supports flooding improvements and Parking for existing houses on A259 associated with Nutbourne Site. Supports Green Ring. Hopes developers will not be allowed to pre-empt Plan. Comment :- - Prefer not to move library into and extend Village Hall NB Error on pages 13 and 14 ref inland Road name.	FULLY SUPPORTS PLAN	Support
040	S J	Dismayed that process allows developers to submit applications which can be dealt with while Plan is being prepared. Believes that housing sites accord with community wishes. Concern:- Considers Plan should contain clear financial assessment of proposed new	HOUSING SITES ACCORD WITH COMMUNITY WISHES CONCERNED ABOUT	Concerns

		infrastructure, timing and delivery eg Primary Care . Considers existing inadequacies will get worse. Doubts CIL will adequately address this.	PROCESS AND INFRASTRUCTURE. WANTS CLEAR ASSESSMENT OF INFRASTRUCTURE, INCLUDING TIMING AND DELIVERY.	
	Mrs K (Hermitage)	Objects to proposed Penny Lane site already has flooding problems. Wants light controlled pedestrian crossing on A259 near Penny Lane	OPPOSED TO HOUSING AT PENNY LANE	Penny Lane
	D and S K (Hermitage)	Broadly support the 4 housing sites. Supports no housing in AONB and some housing between A259 and railway. Comments:- - Maybe want some housing between railway and A27. - Housing preferred north of A27 - Long term connection to A27 would be achievement for community.	BROADLY SUPPORT N of RAILWAY PREFERRED. Link to A27 LONGER TERM	Support
019	D K (Hermitage)	Thanks for impressive hard work. Supports the Plan. Supports keeping development out of the AONB	SUPPORTS PLAN	Support
	E L-B (Southbourne)	Concern whether doctors and pharmacy will cope	INFRASTRUCTURE CONCERN	Objection
044	M L	Objects to any housing at Penny Lane due to access, flooding, social and transport problems.	OPPOSES PENNY LANE	Penny Lane
	N M (Hermitage)	Bridge essential. Concerns:- - need to establish true capacity of Thornham WwTW and no sewer seepage - what is true impact of development (traffic, schools, medical, shops) - need a new single community	SUPPORTS ROAD CONCERNS ABOUT SEWAGE, FLOODING, SERVICES, COMMUNITY CENTRE	Yes and No

		<p>centre</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - ensure surface water drainage <p>adequate</p>		
035	T and A M (Prinsted)	<p>Recognition of level crossing pinch-point is important. Support new bridge at west of village and access avoiding Alfrey Close. Concerned about loss of grade 1 agricultural land. Support improvement of drainage at Nutbourne. Support Green Ring provided not fouled by dogs and faeces bags. Commend work of Parish Council.</p> <p>Would not object to small amounts of development south of A259 away from Harbour by infill or where uses no longer viable.</p>	<p>SUPPORT</p> <p>+ SOME SMALL INFILL SOUTH OF A259</p>	Support
025	E M (Southbourne)	<p>Local lady is asking for Referendum date, and how housebound will get to poll. One person per road to co-ordinate/communicate</p>	-	-
026	E M (Southbourne)	<p>Supports housing sites. Must avoid north of railway. Support Green Ring to include variety of green spaces. Supports road and footbridge over railway.</p> <p>Concerns:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - wishes biodiversity to be valued - all proposals must protect and enhance environment - needs policy to control light pollution - needs design policy, retain trees and hedges, include nestboxes - needs policy on satellite dishes - needs inclusion of floral planting to uplift areas in village 	<p>SUPPORT HOUSING SITES, GREEN RING, BRIDGES OVER RAILWAY</p> <p>+ POLICIES ON BIODIVERSITY, MORE ON ENVIRONMENT, LIGHT POLLUTION, DESIGN, SATELITE DISHES, FLORAL PLANTING</p>	<p>Support</p> <p>+ more policies</p>
047	Mr and Mrs M (Southbourne)	<p>Support housing sites, the lesser of two evils. Thanks for Plan.</p> <p>(Opposed to development of Breach</p>	SUPPORT	Support

		Avenue site)		
031	N M (Southbourne)	Supports size and choice of housing sites. Significant problems at Stein Road crossing must not be made worse. Supports Green Ring. Supports footbridge over railway. Supports variety in house designs. Hope the Plan contains development. Thanks for work on Plan.	SUPPORT	Support
038	E and K M (no address)	Want link to A27 (disappointed that Alfrey Close appeal lost)	OBJECT	Objection
034	L and F L (Southbourne)	Support housing sites. Support green Ring. Support bridges over railway. Thank you for time and effort and noting our comments in earlier consultations.	SUPPORT	Support
041	M O (Prinsted)	Support housing sites. Support footbridge and road bridges over railway, hope not too delayed. Concern:- Surgery stretched. No position to comment on schools.	SUPPORT + INFRASTRUCTURE CONCERNS	Support
015	G P	Thanks for hard work. Fully support all the housing proposals as being the best sites	SUPPORT HOUSING SITES	Support
	F R (Hermitage)	Good meeting. Supports new road over railway. Supports housing sites. Supports pitches but mitigate pollution from road. Concerns:- - Local flooding - need unbroken cycleway north side of A259 Emsworth to Chichester - what plans to link to A27 - infrastructure - fibre optic network needed - developers must not be allowed to	SUPPORTS NEW ROAD, HOUSING SITES, ALL-WEATHER PITCHES + CONCERNS ABOUT INFRASTRUCTURE. LINK TO A27, A27 CYCLEWAY	Support

		pre-empt Plan		
006	A R	Plan concept is sound but needs some fine tuning. Will Junior School cope? Can funds be secured to expand/improve library? Is current Village Hall adequate? Drainage concerns. Boots pharmacy needs expanding, how about new shop adjoining Farm Shop? Can doctors provide extra partner required?	PLAN CONCEPT SOUND CONCERNS ABOUT INFRASTRUCTURE QUERIES	Support
W7	S R (Prinsted)	Disappointed at the concept of developing green spaces. Serious drainage problems are not being addressed and increasing the population locally without improving infrastructure first could be disastrous. Harbour not being properly protected and water not clean enough to swim in. Housing sites are best of series of bad options.	DISAPPOINTED AT LOSS OF GREEN SPACES. CONCERNED ABOUT WASTE WATER PROBLEMS, INFRASTRUCTURE MUST BE IMPROVED BEFORE DEVELOPMENT. HOUSING SITES ARE BEST OF A SERIES OF BAD OPTIONS	Concerns
W6	R S (Nutbourne)	Fully approves of the Plan. Hope it will address needs for affordable housing. Concern:- - sewage capacity described in MWH report 2010 contradicts headroom capacity indicated by Southern Water, Trust that MWH will be commissioned to update report with regard to Thornham WwTW.	SUPPORT PLAN Concern: CONCERN ABOUT SEWAGE CAPACITY	Support
011	C S	Housing –opposed to Penny Lane. Would support large sites accessed by new road linking A259 and A27 paid for by developers.	A27 LINK REQUIRED OBJECTS TO PENNY LANE	Objection + Penny lane
013	A S	Supports Plan and in accord with views of many residents Supports housing south of railway and Green Ring. Concern:- - Would like swimming pool - Infrastructure especially waste water being discharged into	SUPPORT + SOME INFRASTRUCTURE CONCERNS	Support

		Chichester Harbour		
023 & W5	J S and S R (Prinsted)	<p>Thanks for work on Plan. Support Green Ring.</p> <p>Concern :-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - access to A259 from Alfrey Close will cause problems. Traffic calming and policing of 30 mph limit required. - traffic increases and effects on A259 junction with a27 at Chichester. - are 350 houses still needed as permission recently granted for small sites. 	<p>SUPPORT FOR GREEN RING</p> <p>CONCERNS ON A259 TRAFFIC AND QUERY WHETHER 350 HOUSES STILL NEEDED</p>	Support
029	J S	<p>Excellent work and supports the Plan.</p> <p>(NB Suggests an executive summary and one page of conclusions should be prepared for Referendum)</p>	SUPPORTS PLAN	Support
024	A S (Southbourne)	<p>Broadly in favour of Plan. Supports housing sites and any action to reduce congestion at crossing gates. Supports green ring, pedestrian bridges over railway, facilities for young people, more public open space (free of charge), protection of AONB and wildlife. Would oppose any loss of public open space, loss of retail units to residential, and buildings being higher than neighbouring ones. Wants new buildings to be in keeping with high percentage of affordable housing.</p>		Support
010	J S (Fishbourne)	<p>Impressed by housing allocations and proposals for long term bridge west of Southbourne. Also suggests ways of securing Footbridge east of Southbourne.</p>	<p>SUPPORTS HOUSING SITES AND ROAD/BRIDGES STRATEGY</p>	Support
	F J S(Southbourne)	<p>Supports housing sites south of railway. Crossing gates cause traffic problems. Developers should not be allowed to pre-empt the Plan.</p>	SUPPORT	Support
003	J S-M	<p>Something needs to be done to solve the traffic and parking problems caused by dropping off- collecting from the Primary School in roads around the Primary School</p> <p>including Stein Road and Lodgebury Close, Southbourne</p>	<p>CONCERNS ABOUT CONGESTION AT PRIMARY SCHOOL</p>	Object

	G T (Prinsted)	Supports the Plan and its strategy. Strong support for the housing provision and sites, the housing layout concepts, the Green ring, the safeguarding of land for the elevated pedestrian and vehicular crossings of the rail line and the implementation proposals.	SUPPORT	Support
	S T (Prinsted)	Supports the Plan policies. Proposals and projects. Supports the four housing sites, safeguarding of land for a new road bridge and a footbridge and the closure of the potentially dangerous at-level crossings this should facilitate. Supports the green Ring and the new sports pitches. Satisfied the 106 and new CIL mechanisms are capable of providing necessary infrastructure.	SUPPORT	Support
	Mr and Mrs T (Hermitage)	Concern over all proposed housing and effect on schools and doctors' services. Objects to Penny Lane due to narrow access road, hold-ups arising from parked cars, consequential difficulties for emergency services access, and local flooding.	OBJECT TO ALL NEW HOUSING DUE TO INFRASTRUCTURE PROBLEMS. PARTICULAR OBJECTIONS TO PENNY LANE	Object Penny lane
	A and A T (Southbourne)	Support the housing sites due to the problems caused by the Stein Road level crossing. Concerns:- - about schools and doctors coping - that developers will build on land land north of the railway - support more sheltered housing	SUPPORT + INFRASTRUCTURE CONCERNS AND WANT MORE SHELTERED HOUSING	Support
	C W (Southbourne)	Supports Green Ring, especially as it would help prevent flooding. Supports housing south of the railway	SUPPORTS HOUSING SITES AND GREEN RING	Support
W1	B W (Stein Road)	Thanks for hard work. Supports Plan	SUPPORTS PLAN	Support
43 & W4	A W (Southbourne)	Supports Plan. Supports housing sites, bridges over railway and Green Ring. Concern:- - concern about slow worm	SUPPORTS PLAN + SLOW WORM PROTECTION	Support

		protection		
	Mrs B W (Southbourne)	Fully supports Plan. Supports housing south of railway line due to problems at level crossings and local congestion. Thanks for hard work.	SUPPORTS PLAN	Support
	Mr B W (Southbourne)	Supports Plan. Supports locating housing south of railway line, level crossing causes congestion and Cooks Lane is used as a rat-run. Thanks to Parish Council.	SUPPORTS PLAN	Support
	S and S W (Hermitage)	Object to housing at Penny Lane due to surface water flooding, narrow access road and reducing footway width as developer proposes will reduce safety. Displaced parking may use Southbourne Avenue.	PENNY LANE	Penny Lane
	Mr and Mrs W (Southbourne)	Thanks for hard work. Support housing sites south of the railway line. Loveders is a good site, would like Inlands Road widened. Support off-road parking for existing houses as part of housing scheme in Nutbourne. Support Green Ring.	SUPPORT PLAN	Support
	Name withheld therefore invalid	Comments noted purely for information		
	Unhappy Sally	- plan not family friendly - Housing – sites should not be in Nutbourne or on outskirts or Southbourne but all should be in Southbourne near to schools, doctors, amenities.		-
	Gina (Penny Lane)	- 150 houses in Southbourne not enough and most will be too expensive for her. Wants to be nearer schools and doctors. - Nutbourne too far away.		-
	ANON	- Confusion about Gosden Green on maps	-	-

	ANON	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Concern about capacity of schools, doctors, chemist - Development in Cooks Lane will increase bottle neck and rat-run 		-
	Hermitage resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Would like to know what are NP objections to Penny Lane site - Would like to see gardens and balconies - Green Ring will not solve all pressure on Harbour - Dog owners should be more responsible about collecting up mess - Crop spraying near housing should be prevented 		-

DRAFT

Appendix 3

Email from Sandra James

Given the content of the meeting last night I would now like to formally state the concerns I expressed during last evening but which I also included when responding during the N.P Consultation process:

1. Developers are currently submitting plans which as of now will only be capable of tapping into **Section 106 monies**, any **CIL money** and its process will not be available until after April 2015.

This is arguably another 'flaw' in the way in which the timelines for the production of the SHLAA's, Local Plan, N.P and financing has been developed.

Put simply community aspirations that are being stated for infrastructure improvements will not necessarily be capable of being provisioned since Section 106 monies have clearly defined boundaries on their usage - being very specific on what projects they can and can't cover.

2. Only after April 2015 will CIL monies start to replace Section 106, and it is then that finances may then become viable for infrastructure projects which have been identified by residents.

3. I believe it would wholly be disingenuous if these facts were not pointed out to residents, who are expressing certainly through myself as County Councillor concerns on existing infrastructure provision, as distinct from accentuated infrastructure pressures which will likely occur through future additional homes.

4. During the N.P Consultation process I indicated that whilst the N.P had in my view accounted for people's views in terms of their involvement, this was caveated by my on-going concern regarding improvements in infrastructure. The group has consistently worked to identify these concerns expressed from residents and as such the residents are looking for how these infrastructure concerns can be remedied, certainly not exacerbated.

5. I have recommended formally in my N.P Consultation response that for every area of existing infrastructure concerns that this should be financially assessed 'as best as existing knowledge permits'; the source of financing for improving these infrastructure provisions identified together with the associated timeframes, and a clear understanding of who is responsible and over what time (WSCC,EA, Primary Care, private enterprise et al). The answer last night is that we don't have control over this – well the residents of Southbourne should also have this made very clear to them.

6. I am concerned that with Section 106 monies being the basis for planning applications currently that this could drive a perverse argument that more homes are needed over and above the existing pressures on Southbourne in order to solve any deepening of infrastructure concerns because further new homes are capable of tapping into CIL contributions.

7. My belief is that Southbourne residents are 'expecting' support to take the identified number of homes from the Local Plan, however they do not expect their existing infrastructure to be either worsened or pressurised further.

8. I maintain that it is right to point out to Southbourne residents the distinction between Section 106 financing and CIL financing so that they are aware of these two financing routes for future infrastructure provision- they can then make a further decision based on this guidance (see point 10). Currently this is completely missing from the N.P.

9. CDC can of course ask Developers for additional voluntary contributions, which should also include land to try and which can mitigate the timelines between Section 106 and CIL. I hope they will pursue this mandate with vigour but of course there is no statute covering this or obligation on developers.

10. The N.P referendum will mean that every household in Southbourne is given the right to vote on the N.P

Would you kindly ensure these observations are formally recorded.

Best wishes Sandra

Cllr Sandra James

Member of West Sussex County Council – Bourne Division
and Deputy Leader of the Opposition at WSCC

E-mail: Sandra.james@westsussex.gov.uk

WSCC Lync telephone: 0330 2224529

Appendix 3

Email from Sandra James

Given the content of the meeting last night I would now like to formally state the concerns I expressed during last evening but which I also included when responding during the N.P Consultation process:

1. Developers are currently submitting plans which as of now will only be capable of tapping into **Section 106 monies**, any **CIL money** and its process will not be available until after April 2015.

This is arguably another 'flaw' in the way in which the timelines for the production of the SHLAA's, Local Plan, N.P and financing has been developed.

Put simply community aspirations that are being stated for infrastructure improvements will not necessarily be capable of being provisioned since Section 106 monies have clearly defined boundaries on their usage - being very specific on what projects they can and can't cover.

2. Only after April 2015 will CIL monies start to replace Section 106, and it is then that finances may then become viable for infrastructure projects which have been identified by residents.

3. I believe it would wholly be disingenuous if these facts were not pointed out to residents, who are expressing certainly through myself as County Councillor concerns on existing infrastructure provision, as distinct from accentuated infrastructure pressures which will likely occur through future additional homes.

4. During the N.P Consultation process I indicated that whilst the N.P had in my view accounted for people's views in terms of their involvement, this was caveated by my on-going concern regarding improvements in infrastructure. The group has consistently worked to identify these concerns expressed from residents and as such the residents are looking for how these infrastructure concerns can be remedied, certainly not exacerbated.

5. I have recommended formally in my N.P Consultation response that for every area of existing infrastructure concerns that this should be financially assessed 'as best as existing knowledge permits'; the source of financing for improving these infrastructure provisions identified together with the associated timeframes, and a clear understanding of who is responsible and over what time (WSCC,EA, Primary Care, private enterprise et al). The answer last night is that we don't have control over this – well the residents of Southbourne should also have this made very clear to them.

6. I am concerned that with Section 106 monies being the basis for planning applications currently that this could drive a perverse argument that more homes are needed over and above the existing pressures on Southbourne in order to solve any deepening of infrastructure concerns because further new homes are capable of tapping into CIL contributions.

7. My belief is that Southbourne residents are 'expecting' support to take the identified number of homes from the Local Plan, however they do not expect their existing infrastructure to be either worsened or pressurised further.

8. I maintain that it is right to point out to Southbourne residents the distinction between Section 106 financing and CIL financing so that they are aware of these two financing routes for future infrastructure provision- they can then make a further decision based on this guidance (see point 10). Currently this is completely missing from the N.P.

9. CDC can of course ask Developers for additional voluntary contributions, which should also include land to try and which can mitigate the timelines between Section 106 and CIL. I hope they will pursue this mandate with vigour but of course there is no statute covering this or obligation on developers.

10.The N.P referendum will mean that every household in Southbourne is given the right to vote on the N.P

Would you kindly ensure these observations are formally recorded.

Best wishes Sandra

Cllr Sandra James

Member of West Sussex County Council – Bourne Division
and Deputy Leader of the Opposition at WSCC

E-mail: Sandra.james@westsussex.gov.uk

WSCC Lync telephone: 0330 2224529

Appendix 4

From Bruce Finch

I think Sandra is entitled her views of course and it's quite correct that they are formally recorded.

I think that earlier in the NP process we made a reasonable assumption that the entirety of the time period of the NP would be covered by CIL (a reasonable assumption since CDC had intended CIL to be in place by Nov 2014; a matter of public record in their briefing on the subject. It's still true of course that the majority of the plan by time will be covered by CIL, just not the initial months

As a matter of fact I think that Sandra's comments both restate the obvious inaccurately (that every household in Southbourne gets a vote in the NP referendum – actually it's every voter, household suffrage went out in 1918 ☐), the timetable issue is a red herring and her logic is flawed because it misses the central element of the NP whilst over concentrating on the differences between CIL and S106.

If there is no NP for Southbourne then the developers will have a much easier ride in getting development approved given the presumption in favour of sustainable development in the NPPF. Therefore there will be more CIL and in the short term the opportunity to generate more S.106 money but at the costs of more housing, situated where developers prefer rather than where we want. We know that this is true because of the planning expressions of interest we have seen. So Sandra misses the point completely by getting into an argument about the difference between S106 and CIL which implies that there is some type of choice to the electorate in terms of 106 or CIL, which there isn't. She also makes a wholly misleading comment about CIL in 2 – CIL will be available for infrastructure projects across CDC and will be used just for that, Strategic sites will be considered particularly favourably and the best way of accessing that provision will be to have a list of projects ready to go (as we have)- I have spoken to the Chief Planning Officer about this several times.

The real issue is getting the NP approved as quickly as possible to gain control over development (which will come anyway) and making sure that whilst S106 is still in place we focus on the detail (as Geoff and Sue have helpfully explained) with CDC to ensure land remains a key element. The broader argument surely remains

- Some development is inevitable in Southbourne given national policies
- The NP gives us control over managing that development. If we don't exercise that control the likelihood is that it will be foisted onto us
- The pressure that development places on existing infrastructure, be it education, sewerage, traffic etc is well understood and being articulated in the Neighbourhood Plan and was discussed at all public meetings and the consultation
- There are two routes dealing with this in the planning process: 1) S106, a long established part of the planning process which aligns infrastructure quite specifically by site and for the remaining months until April 2015 will need careful management to maximise benefit. Thereafter Community Infrastructure Levy, effectively a tax on the developer, will be managed to maximise benefit to the Parish. In preparation for this the Parish Council is already running a list of projects from which the community will benefit. Parishioners are welcome to contribute to that. A focused effort will be made in engaging CDC to ensure we get the best provision for the community.
- The Parish will also aim to access all other types of funding for parish support from other government agencies, WSCC etc to make sure that the provision of the right infrastructure remains a number one priority in managing future development in Southbourne
- The best way to make sure that the right infrastructure is ready for any new development in Southbourne is make sure a NP is in place so that we can manage what the development is, where it is and what extra burden it will place on the infrastructure we have. Without the development will happen anyway, we lose that control and our input to the infrastructure decisions (and anything else) will be considerably reduced.

Southbourne

Chichester District Council

Tel: 07751351903 | Fax: | bfinch@chichester.gov.uk |

www.facebook.com/ChichesterDistrictCouncil | www.twitter.com/ChichesterDC

Appendix 5

Email from Mr & Mrs Talbot

As we see it, the key to this is that the Neighbourhood Plan will, when approved, **provide/safeguard land** within the development sites to begin achieving what the community wants. The land is the fundamental requirement. However, if we do not get this earmarked now (within planning applications) by the District Council for the purposes we want, we will not be able to secure the open space and recreation facilities the Parish needs, the Green Ring or the bridges over the railway. As Bill said, once the Plan is approved and the use of the land secured, the Parish is able to apply for funding from many other sources than just 106/CIL. These are what will really help us implement what the Parish wants, it is very unlikely that CIL alone was ever going to provide enough money.

We have known for some time that CIL would not come in until April 2015, and this was clear when the Parish Council CIL list of local projects for funding was drafted by the Neighbourhood Plan CIL Sub-Group (Jacky Grant, Alice Smith, Bill Ferguson, Geoff and me), agreed by the Parish Council and sent to CDC on 23rd April this year (attached). It was always likely that applications would come in before April 2015 and therefore we would initially be relying on 106 Agreements as a source of funding, with the accompanying limitations. However, as was said at the meeting last Monday, 106 can be used to fund infrastructure directly and reasonably related to a proposed development, and the money needs to be spent within 5 years.

The District Council can secure from Seawards (if the applications are approved) the laying out of public footpaths, the landscaping (tree and shrub planting etc.) and equipping of open space for

recreation and amenity use (forming the first part of the Green Ring) within the development sites, and also the reservation of land for a footbridge pad. Arrangements for funding future maintenance of open space for a specified period can also be included. Ownership of public amenity land can be transferred, once the required works are seen to be completed satisfactorily, to the District or the Parish Council for future maintenance.

It is worth noting from the current CDC planning application web site how much money is being requested, for example, by the County Council for County Services. For all three applications this is Primary School £503,123, Bourne College £587,278 (all education money is calculated on basis of the calculated number of new pupils arising from development and cost of new places - they cannot ask for money under S106 to make general improvements to schools), Library £55,007 and Fire and Rescue £5199 + Highway/transport requirements. Total £1,150,607 + whatever is contributed to Highways/transport. There will be requirements from other public authorities too. I suppose this could provide re-assurance for local residents concerned about these elements of infrastructure. The waste water treatment issue will have to be dealt with differently because despite what we may say, Southern Water, the EA and the Local Authorities have to recognise that there actually is a problem before there will be any requirement to up-grade/enlarge current services.

Hope this helps
Sue

DRAFT