

Table 1

Consultee	Section	Comment	Response
ADC	ESD2	Though the intention is understood a marginal change to the wording is required to ensure that it could enforced. It is suggested that the first paragraph of the policy is changed as suggested "Where development requires a New development within 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 this must demonstrate that the proposal: (a).....arising from the carrying out or use of the development or use of the land; and/or (whichever applicable)"	Agreed
ADC	ESD4	For ease it is recommended that the format is revised here to insert a table rather than listing the properties, as this will be easier for the reader and take up less space in the document. The last sentence of the policy and last part of the supporting text may not be suitable, so it is recommended to discuss with the Council's part-time Conservation Officer	Agreed
ADC	CLW4	As written this policy is not specific and could not be actioned or enforced. If this is a general intention it is recommended this is moved to an aspirations section	This is a Saved policy
ADC		The Plan period should be included on the front cover. The introduction seems to suggest that this is 2036 which is beyond the Arun District Council Local Plan which is 2011-20311. The NDP will therefore need to ensure that it covers the adopted Local Plan period to 2031 and whilst the NP can consider contingency policy and allocations beyond this period, it must ensure that it has its own robust evidence base for the period 2031-2036.	Agreed
ADC	2.7	Change the last sentence in para 2.7, delete ' A Sustainability Appraisal (SA)' and replace with ADC has determined that an Environmental Assessment is not required.	Agreed
ADC	Plan A	Replace this map with the area designation map which is part of that statutory determination.	Agreed
ADC	3.14	The paragraphs between 3.14 and 3.15 need to be numbered. Page 10- Hurstwood Estate. The description could be improved to make reference to the types of properties present, and the standard pallet of materials/features generally found on the estate (bar the new bungalow) i.e. render and clay tiled roofs/no pavements. Low front walling/grassed verge areas etc.	Amended
ADC	5.2	There is a contradiction in the housing section between the content of para 5.2 and the objective – in the paragraph it mentions the allocation to find is 10 (correct) and then in the objective that the Parish has been given 20. It is recommended that the text of the Objective is to be corrected to reflect the 10 but qualify that this is an "at least" figure and is expected to be tested to see whether more housing can be provided. If the 20 dwelling figure is the intended target which tests the indicative 10 target within the NP on the basis that 10 is an "at least" figure, then this should be clarified in the text.	Changed
ADC	5.7	This paragraph is misleading and needs to be rewritten. The Plan is reviewed by the Parish Council and whilst NDPs forms part of our AMR, the Parish Council is still required to monitor the Plan.	Changed
ADC	H1	The map showing the BUAB needs to be included in the Plan. The ADC policy map includes Felpham within Greater Bognor but not individually so it is important to understand this boundary delineation. It is recommended that the final criteria is amended to include the development plan so the following text : 'Where other policies within this Plan and the Development Plan indicate otherwise.'	Changed
ADC	H2	The NDP does not grant planning permission. It is recommended that the first line is altered to Residential developments on infill and redevelopment sites within the parish will be supported subject to the following If all the criteria apply in this list then add the word 'and' to the penultimate criterion. It is recommended that criteria e also include that the 30% affordable housing tenure mix is to comprise of 75% rent and 25% intermediate housing. It should also say 11 residential units or more (See ADC Policy AH SP2). ADC cannot ask for affordable housing on 10 dwelling schemes. However, the Adopted Arun Local Plan Policy H SP3 'Rural housing and exception sites' provides a route for meeting local identified housing needs via an up to date Parish 'Local Needs Assessment' where this cannot be met on other allocations which provides that as long as the site meets specific criteria including securing affordable access in perpetuity, 1 market house for 2 affordable dwelling. Consider whether this policy is needed because it does not add any detail to ADC Policy AH SP2.	Agreed
ADC	BT3	What is the evidence to support this?	Saved policy
ADC	BT4	What is the evidence to support this 20% threshold? The policy refers to 20% of the length of the retail frontage but is this to be calculated as 20% of the length in m or 20% of the number of units? It is not clear. Also Map C needs to clearly highlight the extent of retail frontage by say a line (and at a scale whereby it is easy to determine which units are within the frontage) so that it is possible to then work out whether a change of use affects the 20% threshold.	Policy reverted to saved
ADC	BT6	The last sentence in the middle para might be stronger to remove 'form' and add 'massing, scale and design'.	Changed
ADC	ESD1	Design guide – what weight does this document have – Has it been adopted by the Parish/district council? Is it part of the current consultation?	The Design Guide has been produced in consultation with the Conservation Officer at ADC but has not been adopted due to pressure of workload by the Officer.
ADC	ESD4	The policy needs to show how it complies/takes into considerations the content of paragraph 197 of the NPPF regarding non-designated heritage assets. It is suggested that the policy is re-word because in its current form, it requires the applicant to demonstrate that they cannot be put to a beneficial use but it does not qualify this. The policy would also read better if the policy section at the end of the policy is at the start before the list. Have all the landowners been consulted? Where they just have numbers include a description at least.	Changed
ADC	ESD5	It is recommended that the policy also make reference to section 16 of the NPPF so say: "Proposals within or affecting the setting of the Conservation Area will be considered in accordance with ADC Local Plan policy HERDM3, Section 16 of the NPPF and the Felpham Conservation Area Character Appraisal of December 2015.	Changed
ADC	ESD6	(last paragraph)- This mentions trees on neighbouring sites, but application information and more importantly conditions can only be applied to those aspects that are needed to make development of the site acceptable in planning terms. The other main issue this raises is about whether this is possible – legal access issues. The applicant is not responsible for the trees on the neighbouring site so it is recommended that this wording is revised.	Changed
ADC	ESD7	Do all the criteria apply? If so then add 'and' on the end of the penultimate criterion. Review all the criteria based policy and evaluate this same principle is it 'and' or 'or' need at the end of the penultimate criterion.	Changed
ADC	ESD8	Burial Space – Saved Policy ESD13 from the previous Felpham made NDP. The exact text should be: Support will be given to the use of land in the parish, to increase burial space, subject to the location being appropriate and having regard to its location and the affect of the proposed development on the appearance and amenities of the locality.	Changed
ADC	GA1	This policy is welcome but it would be helpful if the plan includes a list of any specific transportation schemes covered by Policy GA1. This would allow the council to identify where there may be crossover between S106 and CIL spending. This point applies to any other infrastructure project, intended to be funded by CIL, that the emerging Felpham NDP is identifying. Please note what the CIL Guidance says regarding spending the neighbourhood portion of CIL receipts on items of infrastructure which may also be funded by S106: Do the planning obligations restrictions apply to neighbourhood funds? Regulation 123(2), as amended by the 2014 Regulations, prevents section 106 planning obligations being used in relation to those things that are intended to be funded through the levy by the charging authority. While parish, town and community councils are not required to spend their neighbourhood funding in accordance with the charging authority's priorities, we expect parish, town and community councils to work closely with the charging authority to agree priorities for spending the neighbourhood funding element. Parish, town and community councils should consider publishing their priorities for spending the neighbourhood funding element, highlighting those that align with the charging authority. Where a neighbourhood plan has been made, it should be used to identify these priorities. Arun District Council has recently consulted on its CIL Draft Charging Schedule. The council is intending to have an adopted CIL charging schedule by early 2020. The CIL Charging Schedule will include a Regulation 123 list which provides a list of infrastructure projects that will be funded by CIL. Currently, in relation to transport projects, the list states that CIL will be spent on 'public transport service improvements' and the Arundel Chord (a railway scheme). It is always possible to update this list.	The policy does not give specific projects but does identify the types of schemes.
ADC	CLW1	Saved Policy CLW1 from the previous Felpham made NDP. The exact text should be: New, converted and extended independent living and care homes will be supported provided that the design and scale of development is in keeping with the character of the location and that the impact on the residential amenity of surrounding residential properties is acceptable.	Agreed
ADC	CLW2	Saved Policy CLW2 from the previous Felpham made NDP. The exact text should be: Existing recreational space, including school playing fields and land used for outdoor sport and recreation should not be built on, except for buildings which would enhance sporting or recreational activities on the land. Proposals for the development of such buildings will be supported provided that their scale and design would be in keeping with the character of the location and that the impact on the amenity of surrounding properties would be acceptable.	Agreed
ADC	CLW3	Saved Policy CLW3 from the previous Felpham made NDP. The exact text should be: Proposals which would result in harm to, or loss of, allotments will not be permitted unless replacement provision would be made, of at least similar quality, convenience and accessibility for the existing plot holders.	Agreed
ADC	CLW4	Have these additional health care facilities been identified?	No but any new facilities would be support if appropriate to their location
ADC	CLW5	Saved Policy CLW5 from the previous Felpham made NDP. The exact text should be: Proposals that will enhance the viability and/or community value of the properties registered as Assets of Community Value will be supported. Otherwise, proposals that result in either the loss of the asset or in significant harm to the community value of an asset will not be permitted, unless it can be clearly demonstrated that the operation of the asset, or the ongoing delivery of the community value of the asset, is no longer economically viable, typically because the site has been marketed at a reasonable price for employment or service trade uses for six months at least and that no sale or let has been achieved. (See Appendix A for list of assets) Appendix A - Assets of Community Value Felpham Post Office and Stores Felpham Sailing Club The Boathouse Cafe Felpham Memorial Village Hall The Scout Hall The George Inn The Fox PH The Thatched House The Old Barn The Southdowns PH	Agreed
ADC	CLW6	This refers to the LPA having designated these, this is not correct; it is through the making of the NDP that these are designated. This should be supporting text and the actual saved policy wording shown as the policy. 26.Policy CLW6: Local Green Spaces - Saved Policy CLW6 from the previous Felpham made NDP. The exact text should be: The Parish Council has designated the areas shown in Map D in the appendices as Local Green Space. Proposals for development of land designated as Local Green Space will not be permitted except in very special circumstances.	Agreed
ADC	CLW7	This refers to the LPA having designated these, this is not correct; it is through the making of the NDP that these are designated. This should be supporting text and the actual saved policy wording shown as the policy. Saved Policy CLW67 from the previous Felpham made NDP. The exact text should be: The Parish Council has designated the areas shown on Map E of the appendices as Local Open Space. Proposals for development of land designated as Local Open Space will not be permitted unless such development would promote or enhance the use of the land as Local Open Space.	Agreed
ADC	Map D	Local Green Spaces – this is a saved policy, the mapped areas need to be identical to the mapped spaces on Map D from the previous Felpham made NDP the areas mapped do not appear to be identical to the map in the original document. Can you please provide officers with a map with corresponding numbers of the areas to the list identified on the green areas so that this can be clarified or just use the same map. It is a saved policy.	Agreed
ADC	Map E	Local Open Spaces - This is a saved policy, the mapped areas need to be identical to the mapped spaces on Map E from the previous Felpham made NDP. The areas mapped do not appear to be identical to the map in the original document. Can you please provide officers with a map with corresponding numbers of the areas to the list identified on the green areas so that this can be clarified or just use the same map. It is a saved policy.	Agreed
Southern Water	H1	Southern water supports the clause included within this policy facilitating the provision of essential wastewater infrastructure outside the built up area boundary. This is in line with National Planning Practice Guidance (ref: 34-005-20140306) which states that 'it will be important to recognise that water and wastewater infrastructure sometimes has particular locational needs (and often consists of engineering works rather than new buildings) which mean otherwise protected areas may exceptionally have to be considered'.	Noted
Southern Water	ESD2	Southern Water supports the inclusion of clause (b) of policy ESD2. In addition, we would expect surface water to be separated from the foul drainage system, following the drainage hierarchy as set out in Building Regulations Approved Document H3(3).	This would be dealt with by the B Regs
Southern Water	CLW6	We note this is a saved policy from the current Felpham Neighbourhood Plan 2013- 2029. However we would point out a discrepancy in the text between the current Neighbourhood Plan 2013-2020 which reads: Policy CLW6: Local green spaces The Parish Council has designated the areas shown in Map D in the appendices as Local Green Space. Proposals for development of land designated as Local Green Space will not be permitted except in very special circumstances. and the Pre-Submission Draft Regulation 14 Neighbourhood Plan (April 2019), which reads: Policy CLW6: Protect Local Green Spaces. SAVED The LPA has designated areas shown in Map D as Local Green Space in accordance with paragraph 99-100 of the RNPPF. Proposals for redevelopment of land identified as Local Green Space will not be supported. Despite its inclusion in the 2019 Pre-Submission plan as a SAVED policy, the wording clearly differs between the two policies. In particular, the Pre-Submission policy CLW6 omits 'except in very special circumstances'. Without this, Southern Water cannot support this policy as it does not meet the Basic Conditions necessary for a NDP, as it is inconsistent with the Revised National Planning Policy Framework, which states in paragraph 101 that 'Policies for managing development within a Local Green Space should be consistent with those for Green Belts'. Paragraph 143 adds that within Green Belts, development 'should not be approved except in very special circumstances' and Paragraph 144 recognises that there may be 'very special circumstances' where other considerations outweigh potential harm of a development. Policy CLW6 as worded in the Pre-Submission version of the NDP does not allow for such exceptions to be made. Having regard to the above, SAVED policy CLW6 should reflect its original wording, including an allowance for exceptional circumstances. If the Parish Council wishes to amend the wording, the policy should not be marked SAVED, thus enabling representations to be made by consultees and for these to be considered by the relevant councils and examiner as appropriate.	This is our effort and the Plan now shows the saved wording.
WSSC	Para 3.31	Bishop Tufnell Infant and Junior Schools are now called Bishop Tufnell Primary School, and is an all through primary. This will therefore need amending – <i>There are four three local schools: Felpham Community College, Downsview Primary, and Bishop Tufnell Primary. Infant and Bishop-Tufnell Junior</i> -. This will also need to be updated to reflect the all-through primary on page 48 Section 11.	Changed
WSSC	Design Guide page 22 Principle 9a	The requirement for on-site parking on all development maybe over restrictive. It also does not align with the text of Policy GA4 of the Reg 14 Neighbourhood Plan. It is recommended that this principle is removed.	Noted
Env Agency		No detailed comments	Noted
Highways England		No detailed comments	Noted
Natural England		No detailed comments	Noted
WSSC 2	CLW7	The school fields at Bishop Tufnell School, Downsview Primary and Felpham Community College are operational school playing fields under the ownership of West Sussex County Council. The fields are an integral and functional part of the schools. Furthermore, the Council, as Education Authority, has a statutory obligation to ensure that every child living in West Sussex is able to access a mainstream school in the county. Should there be a future requirement to create additional spaces at any of the schools in the planning area this would be in accordance with statutory obligations and a local green space designation would serve to demonstrate the Councils ability to meet this need. In this instance, we therefore wish to object to proposals that Bishop Tufnell School, Downsview Primary and Felpham Community College playing fields are included as local green space, for the reasons set out above, namely that they are already protected due to their status, and that there may be a future requirement to increase the capacity of the schools Suggested amendment to resolve concern To remove the school fields at Bishop Tufnell School, Downsview Primary and Felpham Community College from the list of proposed designated areas of Local Open Spaces within the proposed Neighbourhood Plan.	WSSC did not comment when consulted at the time of the original designation despite being consulted under Reg 14 and Reg 16. This is a saved policy.