

Table 1

Reg 14 Responses 2016					
Page/Policy	ADC Comment	Previous reference	Previous ADC comment	Examiner Comment	NP Team Comment
8	Map fuzzy		Map fuzzy		It is an ADC map and cannot be enhanced. A key has been added.
Page 10 Area 9	This cannot be called Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty as this is a national designation and there are none within the Neighbourhood Plan Area. The name of the policy based on the content included here needs changing. See suggestion under policy AREA 9.	Page 8 Area 9	None	None	Delete this policy reference - it will make no material difference to the effectiveness of the ANDP as any planning applications in that area would have to demonstrate compatibility with the aims and objectives of the National Park, the designation of which is a clear material consideration.

<p>Page 10 part 2.2 .4</p>	<p>This section has several inaccuracies and needs revising or deleting, 4th line in, the Local Plan is actually at Examination, even though it is in a suspension period. OK The revised Planning Practice Guidance para 009 is now very clear on the relationship between emerging plans. It is suggested that this is reviewed. The sentence relating to the LP allocation of Barnham/Eastergate/Westergate needs removing as it is not within the Neighbourhood Plan Area and there is no context within which it sits here. Consequent change is also need as follows: In addition to the strategic allocation t Within the emerging Arun Local Plan 20112031, the Council has identified a parish allocation of a minimum of 30 houses for Aldingbourne Parish in Policy H SP1 of the to meet local needs within the plan period. This wording itself OK.</p>	<p>Page 8</p>	<p>None</p>	<p>The emerging plan does not form part of the development plan and the Neighbourhood Plan cannot be assessed in relation to it.</p>	<p>Agreed text amended</p>
---------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------	-------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------

<p>Page 13 3.4.1</p>	<p>The description of the amount of agricultural land is not entirely accurate when compared to the Agricultural Land Classification Map on p53 and need amending slightly. The ending of the first paragraph is intended to cover the fact that I believe the original end part was intended to cover the Land East of Fontwell Avenue which is actually outside their neighbourhood plan area, so that it can be covered accurately but still included. Suggest that for clarity and consistency the existing paragraph is removed and replaced with the following. The majority of land use within the parish contains is arable farmland and as can be seen on (see Evidence Base No. 25).at page 53, the southern, western and northern part of the Neighbourhood Plan Area and areas around the settlement boundary (as contained in the Arun Local Plan 2003) of Westergate contains some of the most productive land in the District, classified as either Grade 1 or 2 agricultural land with some limited Grade 3. This is interspersed with smaller parcels of temporary and permanent pasture on the</p>	<p>Page 12 3.3</p>	<p>None</p>	<p>None and the wording has not changed</p>	<p>Amendments made</p>
---------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------	-------------	---------------------------------------------	------------------------

Page 12	Map fuzzy	N/A	N/A		Will be resolved at print stage
P14-15 Part 3.4.4 c and d	We are not aware that there are any wetlands in the south and cannot find any mapping to support this looking at the Biodiversity Report or the specific layer for Wetlands under Habitats on MAGIC. The sentence at the end of Part c needs clarification as to where this can be seen or information found. Part d should be renamed to or moved under the more generic heading of Landscape as these are not wetlands as the definition.	Page 13 3.3.3	End of first para under grasslands/roadverges:We are unaware of any surveys and this is not currently one of the areas identified as a BOA, therefore as having the characteristics for landscape scale enhancement or habitat creation. The closest is that which is significantly to the south, being Lidsey Rife BOA. As such, even as description of the area it is felt the best thing is to remove the last part, as follows: "...throughout the Parish, which might potentially be recreated in part through an appropriate reconstruction/management programme of other sites in the Parish."	The Examiner asked for one small change which has been made. No other comment was made on this.	Agreed to remove word "wetlands" and use "wet, low-lying land"

<p>P15 3.4.8</p>	<p>As has been mentioned and provided previously this is incorrect. Article 10 of the Directive only relates to European Natura 2000 sites. The reference to Article 10 of the Habitats Directive must be removed from this section as it is factually incorrect as it does not apply to Non-Designated Sites.</p> <p>If to be included then the following amendment is recommended:</p> <p>“Article 10 of the Habitats Directive requires EU member states to consider where there is scope in their land use planning and development policies to acknowledge landscape features that may add to coherence of the overall Natura 2000 network to encourage the management of features which constitute such ecological networks and which are of major importance for wild flora and fauna. Such features are those which....”</p>	<p>Page 15 3.3.7</p>	<p>Article 10 is onwards): You have tried to apply this to the whole landscape and missed the crucial point that this is in relation to supporting or extending the European Natura 2000 network. The Directive actually states “with a view to improving the ecological coherence of the Natura 2000 network,”</p> <p>As mentioned above, we are unaware of any surveys that have been done specifically looking at the suitability within the Parish for landscape scale enhancement or habitat creation. More pointedly, that is specifically linked to features and characteristics of or linked to the designated site of Pagham Harbour and the birds that use it. Best suggestion is that the following minor amendment is made:</p> <p>“Article 10 of the Habitats Directive requires EU member states to consider where there is scope in their land use planning and development policies to acknowledge landscape features that may add to coherence of the overall Natura 2000 network to encourage the management of features which constitute such ecological networks and which are of major importance for wild flora and fauna. Such features are those which....”</p> <p>To some extent the very last sentence is almost more appropriate to be within a policy than as part of the existing situation.</p>	<p>There are no areas within the Parish that are subject to protection though designation as sites protected by EU regulations. This section could be edited to provide a description of natural habitats that local people value and wish to see retained. However, suggesting that it may be possible to consider conferring additional protections cannot be justified in the absence of evidence, which goes beyond the work undertaken as part the preparation of this Plan.</p>	<p>This is not a land use policy. It is a statement.</p>
-------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------

P16 3.4.9	<p>This finishes with "...which has in turn led to the pollution of adjacent watercourses, as evidenced by photos of manhole covers discharging sewerage near the Eastergate Stream."</p> <p>There is no evidence to support this.</p>	Page 15 3.3.8	None	None	No change to wording from previous version, and we have photographic evidence and that Southern Water are in contact with the landowner about pollution effects on crop yields and use.
Page 16 3.4.9	<p>The very end of the paragraph is more a reflection of feeling rather than fact.</p> <p>Suggested minor amendment to be made "...the impact from future development within the parish which is therefore not regarded by residents as sustainable. which is not sustainable.</p>	Page 16 3.3.8	None	None	No change to wording from previous version but change made.
Page 21 3.8.1	<p>The final sentence appears to be incorrect when looking at the Agricultural Land Classification Map. There are parts of various grades to the north but there seems to be only one patch to the south that is Grade 3. The text needs to tie accurately with the mapping.</p>	PAGE 20 3.6	None	None	No change to wording from previous version. Have changed the wording to reflect the land uses shown on page 12
Page 26 Policy H2	<p>Government intends to scrap the Lifetimes Homes Standard within the next few years defaulting to Building Regulations for prescriptive standards so reference to this should be deleted as this would not be measurable.</p>	Page 34 H3	N/A	N/A	We are aware of this which is why the Plan says "or its equivalent" so suggest we have dealt appropriately with this.

Page 27 Policy H4	The policy is seeking 40% affordable housing which is above ADC requirements. Our evidence suggests areas such as Aldingbourne may be able to sustain 40% affordable housing as the values are significantly higher than in the coastal towns. However there is no evidence to support H4.2 which does not allow mobile homes to be used to provide additional affordable homes.	N/A	N/A	N/A	Policy reworded

Page 27 Policy H5	The only issue will be this can only to apply to rented housing not intermediate or the new Starter Homes initiative. The proposed local connection criteria is particularly appropriate for developments coming forward on a rural exception site i.e. outside of the built up area boundary. This should be made clearer.	Page 37 H9	Proposes a local lettings plan for affordable homes ie.an opt out from the Choice Based Lettings (CBL) system across the district. We would not support any local lettings plan which over-rides our allocation scheme and nomination agreements for the allocation of affordable housing in the District. Whilst we appreciate the intention to provide housing to meet local needs, this could conflict with ADC policy on housing allocation which enables all households on our housing register to bid for affordable homes in our Choice Based Lettings (CBL) system. We would like to work with the parish to consider a local lettings plan to meet the particular needs of a housing development to support local employment or the sustainability of the local community but that which complements any strategic policy.	Policy H9 should be deleted 8.88 However, I appreciate that the Parish wishes to secure any affordable housing that is provided through this plan for local people. I therefore suggest that the supporting text to revised Policy H4 should include the following statement: 8.89 The Parish Council will seek to work with the District Council to ensure that affordable housing provided in the Parish is allocated to those with a connection in the local community, as far as may be compatible with its wider allocations policies.	Policy reworded
----------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------

Page/Policy	Comment	Previous reference	Previous ADC comment	Examiner Comment	NP Team Comment
Page 29 Policy H8	The ADC Local Plan 2011-28? 31? has a policy related to external space. This policy lacks ability to be used in its current form.	H7	The second half of this policy could be tied in with the National Space Standards.	Suggested new wording which has been used	The ADC Pan is only emerging. Clapham Examiner allowed previous wording. Leave it as is.
Page 31 Policy EH1 Map F	The map labelled as Built up Boundary Map is Map F. OK It seems to be defining three areas (appear to be Westergate; Eastergate and Barnham) of which two are outside of the neighbourhood plan area. The map should only be focused on that within your neighbourhood plan area. le it is OK ! The second part of this policy needs to be more positively framed. What is ... <i>in respect of the control of the countryside..?</i>	EH6 Page 29	“Development outside of the BUA boundary of Westergate , as defined in the ADC Local Plan 2011-2031 will not be permitted.	Amend policy _ Policy EH6 Proposals for development within the built up area boundary defined on the Proposals Map will generally be permitted, subject to meeting the requirements of other policies set out in the Plan. Proposals for development outside the built3up area boundary, that do not accord with development plan policies in respect of the control of the countryside, will be resisted.	It is clearly Map E in my version. The key has been enhanced. It is an ADC map.

<p>Page 31 Policy EH2 Map A</p>	<p>It is unclear how sites adjacent to these are to be treated. For example where one is identified on the boundary between two sites, does this mean that any application on either side would not be acceptable?</p>	<p>EH1</p>	<p>The creation of woodland is a significant project both in terms of resource and time – these have to be suitable and take time to establish. Further, if the woodlands are within the pink edged areas and are supposed to be the green hatched areas this needs to be identified on Map A, as there is currently no label (if this is a correct assumption). The first paragraph of this policy does not seem to be a policy, but more of an overall intention and should be removed. It is recommended that the first paragraph is shifted to the supporting text and includes the following alteration to be a more accurate reflection of the situation. “...create green infrastructure corridors and woodland within the parish,....”</p>	<p>Examiner amended wording but did to comment upon the Map</p>	<p>How does the LPA deal with sites adjacent to a LB? Clearly if an application crossed the identified corridor we would expect the LPA to consider how the corridor could be maintained, that is the purpose of the policy. Additional justification added.</p>
--------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

<p>Page 32 Policy EH3</p>	<p>All the land will be either Grade 1,2 or 3 so this policy needs to be revised or deleted as it basically is a policy against development and does not accord with the NPPF. This countryside policy seeks to prevent all development and doesn't allow for those things allowed by Arun Local Plan Policy GEN3/Emerging Local Plan CSP1 (agric, forestry, recreation, waste, farm diversification, road schemes).</p>	<p>Page 34 H1</p>	<p>This policy does not include anything with regard exceptions, so their suggested allocations would conflict with this policy. It is suggested that a minor amendment is made to this policy as follows: “...Natural England (See Map B), apart from that identified on the proposals map for housing.”</p> <p>Where has the ALC map (Map 2) been sourced from? This does not align with the MAGIC maps for ALC, which is available from www.MAGIC.defra.gov.uk . Clarification required. The policy wording should also be better aligned with Policy SO DM1 Soils in the ALP to allow for more flexibility. A criteria based approach is considered to be more appropriate.</p>	<p>Rewording of policy provided</p>	<p>Policy should be in bold. Redrafted</p>
--------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------

<p>Page 33 Policy EH5</p>	<p>This policy is not deliverable in its current form, second para. should be amended 'Any Where applicable Planning permission for new development will ... The end of the penultimate paragraph of the policy mentions approved SUDS being recorded on the flood risk register. This is no longer the process and the County Council have not decided if they may do this or not but it has been suggested that they would not. As has been mentioned before in comments how do you expect to "enforce riparian responsibilities", when this tends to mainly lie with powers of higher statutory bodies (EA and County)?</p>	<p>Page 27 EH3</p>	<p>This is not adding any localised requirement. It mainly replicates requirements in W DM3. 2nd bullet - Given the content of the first sentence, it is recommended that if retained it should be amended as follows: "Sustainable Drainage Systems (SUDS) will not be acceptable where appropriate, but not where the winter water table is less than 0.7 of a metre below ground level...." The last sentence should also be removed as this is not a policy matter but simply reiterating process under County's remit. If wished to be retained then needs shifting to supporting text somehow. 3rd bullet – this mixes information from 2 emerging ALP policies W DM2 and W DM3, but does not provide any localised difference or focus 4th bullet – what powers are they going to use to enforce riparian responsibilities, when this tends to mainly lie with powers of higher statutory bodies (EA and County)? Overall, easiest thing could well be for this to be the amended second and last. the amended second and last. revised to only two main bullet points, the amended second and last. Paragraph EH3.2 This paragraph needs to be revised to reflect the current situation.</p> <p>Currently there are inaccuracies with the content of the paragraph above (EH3.1). It is recommended that this paragraph is removed or</p>	<p>I therefore recommend that the policy should be modified as follows:</p> <p>Policy EH3: New development in areas at risk from flooding will not be permitted unless it is supported by a site specific Flood Risk Assessment which provides clear evidence to demonstrate that the proposal:</p> <p>a) would not give rise to additional risk of flooding either to the development site or other land arising from the carrying out and use of the development;</p> <p>b) would make appropriate provision for accommodating the surface water and foul water arising from the</p>	<p>Through collaborative working. Suggest we refer in responding to the fact that serious concerns about the "silo" approach taken by different authorities to their own areas of responsibility were raised again by parishes at the recent JDAC flood seminar. The issue of riparian enforcement is not relevant as it states that the PC supports the goal of this means that it supports the relevant agencies. Important that SUDS are properly maintained so reword to a policy that says "must be accompanied by a management plan to be approved by the LPA prior to the commencement of development".</p> <p>Agreed to take out flood risk reference.</p>
-------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

<p>Page 35 Policy EH7</p>	<p>Considering the need to diversify supplies and if clearly supported as part of a business plan, different energy sources will be more suited or appropriate at sites in agricultural use. This would be too restrictive as currently written. Suggest the last bullet is amended as follows: “proposals for energy generating infrastructure on land in agricultural production or Grade 1 or 2 agricultural land, where supported or part of a business case will not be supported.</p>	<p>Page 30 EH7</p>	<p>The policy should ensure that the settings of heritage assets are not harmed. The last point of this policy could be restrictive as it would not allow for any technologies that a farm may wish to use or could be complimentary, such as anaerobic digestion.</p>	<p>Examiner said the policy was clear and well set out.</p>	<p>The policy has not changed from the previous version. Amendments made.</p>
--------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

<p>Page 35 EH8</p>	<p>The last two paragraphs are not appropriate for the policy and should be moved to supporting text or to a proposal section.</p> <p>The concept of the policy is supported. However, as the policy is currently written it should be enhanced to offer protection to the assets. For instance the policy could state:</p> <p>“Development proposals relating to the buildings of local character listed above will be expected to retain their significance including their contribution to local distinctiveness and demolition or alteration of part or all of them will be resisted unless it can be demonstrated that it will not harm their significance or they cannot otherwise be put to an alternative beneficial or viable use.</p> <p>References to the use of Article 4 Directions should not be included within the policy. Move to text so not bold.</p> <p>This should be included in a section related to community proposals.</p> <p>The additional properties the plan considers should be identified as Buildings or Structures of character should also be included in a section related to community proposals</p>	<p>Page 31 EH8</p>	<p>suggests a degree of control on non-listed buildings which is similar to that for listed buildings. This should be qualified. The issue of using Article 4 Directions will require some thought and should not be viewed as a given. They will need to be implemented by the District Council should they be deemed the appropriate vehicle and are not the remit of a neighbourhood plan.</p>	<p>Wording change which has been used.</p>	<p>Disagree. This is a development plan doc and these would affect development in the immediate vicinity of these buildings. It is correct for a NP to propose additions for the LPA to consider. The LPA is not at all proactive in amending and updating such schedules. The reference to Art4 is merely a proposal for the LPA to consider.</p>
-------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Page 36 Policy EH9	Recommendations for new conservation Areas/Areas of special character should be identified within a Community proposals section (and the supporting text), and not a policy within the plan. This is not a policy based issue. Again the last two paragraphs of this is not appropriate as policy wording and particularly the last seems to identify new areas not known to be identified before. Either the last two paragraphs need to be moved to the supporting text or to a proposal section	Page 32 EH9	Minor amendment required to ensure clarity: “The Parish Council proposes ...Hook Lane be appraised by the LPA.....”	Suggested removal	Policy amended
Page 37 EH12	The protection of flint walling is supported from a conservation perspective. The policy wording does not make reference to the provision of new walling as mentioned in paragraph EH12.2	N/A	N/A	N/A	Good point. Add to policy.
Page 39 GA2.1	No map D				Added

<p>Page 40 Policy GA4</p>	<p>This is not a policy and could not be applied to the determination of applications. Further this is in clear contradiction to at least one strategic objective and policy of the ALP 2011-2031. This policy should be deleted.</p>	<p>Page 41 GA4</p>	<p>This policy is not written akin to a land use policy at the moment. Also there is no definition as to what “supported clearly by the community” is – does this imply a percentage of votes? You may want to relate this to the policies in the emerging local plan. As currently written this policy would be in contradiction with the strategic objectives and policy of the Arun Local Plan 2011-203.</p>	<p>Delete</p>	<p>We cannot delete because community asked for it. Policy amended</p>
<p>Page 41 GA5</p>	<p>A minor amendment is needed to the first paragraph of this policy for clarity. The second paragraph is not policy but more a proposal and needs to be discussed with WSCC as the Local Highway Authority. It is recommended that the minor amendment below be made for clarity and that the second paragraph is moved into a new proposals section. “Proposals for development which would enable or assist with traffic calming and reduction in traffic congestion and plus parking in the Parish will be supported.”</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>Suggest leave it in the narrative. “and/or” instead of “plus”.</p>

<p>Page 41 GA5.3</p>	<p>This should be moved to a new proposals section as supporting text for the second part of the recommendation for policy GA5. Suggest that it is moved to new proposals section as supporting text to the proposal for designation of quiet lanes by Local Highway Authority</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>Agreed and amended</p>
<p>Page 42 EE1.2</p>	<p>The reference to the policy relating to Woodgate Crossing is now inaccurate plus there is no evidence to support this position as outlined under the comments given above on para GA4.2 and 4.3 above. Suggested that the following amendment is made: "...Passing trade is also important as out of town shopping makes it hard for small local shops to compete. Any proposal to close the level crossing at Woodgate would not be supported (see Policy GA3) as OK at this point. Any removal of through traffic would be removed from Westergate Street which would be likely to have a significant impact on the shops, restaurant and Public House which rely upon passing trade."</p>				<p>Policy amended</p>

<p>Page 42 EE2</p>	<p>This contrary to NPPF/PPG support for economic development. Any application should be judged on merits – i.e like scale, impact, benefits. There is no evidence present to support reasons in the supporting text and could prevent expansion of existing business in the parish. It is recommended that the policy is deleted.</p>	<p>Page 42 EE2</p>	<p>No comment</p>	<p>No change to policy except for moving of the last sentence to the section relating to assessment of residential development proposals.</p>	<p>Supporting text added</p>
<p>Page 46 EE10</p>	<p>This states that “Proposals for the redevelopment or change of use of land in Agricultural/ Horticultural/Horsicultural employment use will not be permitted.” It would appear to contradict Policy EH3 (page 32) which resists development on land Graded 1, 2 and 3a and would appear to allow development on agricultural land graded 4 or 5 (but wouldn’t if Policy EE10 then kicks in). This policy should be deleted.</p>	<p>Page 45 EE12</p>	<p>This policy conflicts with ADC housing and employment policies so this needs to be re-worded or deleted.</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>Deleted</p>

<p>Page 49 LC6 Page 58-64 Schedule B</p>	<p>The Council are still unable to agree to the designation of Site 12 as shown on the Local Green Space Map as this would be contrary to the strategic site identified for BE and therefore contrary to paragraph 76 of the NPPF. This should be deleted from the list and the map amended.</p>	<p>Page 47 LC6</p>	<p>No. 12, east of Ivy Lane and south of the sports centre, is within the outlined strategic allocation for Barnham, Eastergate, Westergate in the emerging ALP 2011-2013. As such, allocation of this site as LGS, is contrary to paragraph 76 of the NPPF, requiring them to be <i>“consistent with the local planning of sustainable development and complement investment in sufficient homes, jobs and other essential services.”</i></p> <p>Further, this paragraph also states that they should be capable of enduring beyond the plan period and for the same reason, it would fail against this requirement. Though there are small areas and numbers up to 17 marked on the accompanying map, the list contained in the Schedule only goes to No. 13.</p>	<p>See report</p>	<p>Part of this land is not in the control of the LPA as established at the Hearing, it is an allotment. The Examiner was clear that it should be a Local Green Space. Examiner said in report the top half could be LGS and the bottom half LOS ie areas identified on map were OK. Allotments about to be leased from ADC therefore do qualify as LGS. At hearing into first LP, the map was discussed. LP suspended therefore not now contrary to strategic site. Agreed: To say examiner said should be LOS, but feel historic informal community use merits LGS, explain this also fits with Visioning Statement for strategic site of separation between settlements and country park in this location, therefore not contrary to Strategic site, which is in any case (as pointed out earlier by ADC) not a current development plan policy.</p>
<p>Page 50 Policy LC9</p>	<p>There is nothing to identify the land being referred to and as this is the scheme approved at appeal this cannot be implemented. This policy should be deleted.</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>Deleted</p>

Housing	<p>Suggest at end of 2.2.4 add “Two sites were considered as part of extensive public consultation on the first draft ANDP and a site allocated which had local support and allowed for future expansion at future review of the ANDP. However, this was rejected by the Examiner. 349 houses were allowed on Appeal during the final stages of ANDP preparation, which provide 11 times the parish allocation and includes one of the two sites identified. Therefore no further site allocation is made in this Plan. It is anticipated that windfall sites within the settlement boundary will provide small additional housing numbers.</p>				Agree

<p>Page 40-41 GA4.2 4.3</p>	<p>The Council cannot agree with the majority of statements in these paragraphs beyond “pre-judge the outcome,” for the following reasons. The priority of the A29 realignment scheme to the wider Coastal sub-region plus WSCC has increased and Network Rail have had a long standing commitment to trying to close level crossings. As the beginning of GA4.3 goes on to state the Neighbourhood Plan cannot set the strategic considerations for the wider area – of which this is one. Finally the content of the final paragraph is incorrect. Disagree – it reduces access for the numerous businesses in the south of the parish. The whole reason for the A29 realignment is to provide greater access to Bognor Regis and the enterprise sites, so this is to promote and encourage business, which is totally in line with the NPPF and the point identified. Further it is expected that access to the shops etc would be retained – this is merely an aspiration at present, there are no plans for a road bridge at this point.</p> <p>If this is to be retained it is recommended that these paragraphs be amended as follows:</p> <p>“If the proposed A29 realignment is completed it does not follow that the Woodgate Crossing would be closed. A separate statutory process would be required. Closure of the crossing is a lower</p>				<p>Policy strengthened</p>

<p>Luke Beck Response</p>					<p>Say ANP is silent on allocating land for housing, but we can only take into account allocation given for parish, which has been more than met. There are a number of misunderstandings about the biodiversity corridors: eg They claim that the biodiversity corridor covers the full extent of their clients land, which is an excessive claim. We are not saying the arable land is BAP land, it forms part of the land required to create a biodiversity corridor. As explained to the Examiner previously it is only narrow in some places because it has been built on already, it needs to be wider to serve its purpose and it is based on surviving areas of historic landscapes in the parish identified from the tithe map which are being connected together for biodiversity in accordance with NPPF and Natura aims. These are not all botanically or wildlife important sites but potentially offer such. Feeding areas for bats are important. Restricting the biodiversity corridors to the field margins defeats its purpose in ensuring adequate movement of species in the site and the way it can be enhanced in the longer term. It is a short sighted view of the site. The Ecological study is therefore typical of the kind of study provided for a developer.</p>