



Felpham Neighbourhood Development Plan

2019 - 2031

Consultation Statement



1. Introduction

- 1.1. This Statement has been prepared by Felpham Parish Council (“the Parish Council”) to accompany its submission to the local planning authority, Arun District Council (ADC), of the Felpham Neighbourhood Development Plan 2019 (“the Neighbourhood Plan”) under Regulations 15 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 (“the Regulations”).
- 1.2. The Neighbourhood Plan has been prepared by the Parish Council, a qualifying body, for the Neighbourhood Area covering the whole of the Parish of Felpham, as designated by the Local Plan Sub- Committee of Arun District Council on 29 November 2012.
- 1.3. The legal basis of the Statement is provided by Section 15(2) of Part 5 of the 2012 Neighbourhood Planning Regulations, which requires that a consultation statement should:
 - 1.3.1. Contain details of the persons and bodies who were consulted about the proposed neighbourhood development plan
 - 1.3.2. Explain how they were consulted
 - 1.3.3. Summarise the main issues and concerns raised by the persons consulted; and
 - 1.3.4. Describe how those issues and concerns have been considered and, where relevant addressed in the proposed neighbourhood development plan

2. Background

- 2.1. The original Felpham Neighbourhood Plan (referred to hereafter as the Plan) was ‘made’ by Arun District Council on the 16th July 2014 following a Referendum at which 90.14% of residents voted in favour.
- 2.2. The Plan has provided a vision for the future of the parish, and set out clear policies, principles and objectives to realise those visions. The policies accorded with higher level planning policy principally the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the Arun District Council Local Plan 2003 as well as the Draft Arun District Local Plan 2011-2031, as required by the Localism Act.

- 2.3. Since the completion of the Plan, which was one of the first in the country, a lot has changed both in national policy terms and at a local level with the Arun District Local Plan which has now been adopted.
- 2.4. The adoption of the Arun District Local Plan 2018 required a review and where appropriate amendment of the Felpham Neighbourhood Plan to ensure the two documents are in alignment and reflect the new policies.

3. Process

- 3.1. On the 8th April 2017 Felpham Parish Council agreed that the Plan should be reviewed and where necessary, amended.
- 3.2. On the 15th May 2017 it was agreed (Minute NP11) that a group comprising of the Clerk, Councillors and lay people should be formed to review the Plan and report back to Full Council.
- 3.3. It was agreed that the Felpham Design Guide would be presented as an appendix to the revised Plan.
- 3.4. In September 2017 ADC published a paper setting out the initial proposal for considering the housing numbers to be allocated. Three methods were identified:
 - 3.4.1. Option 1 – housing numbers identified following the original method – in Felpham’s case a zero figure.
 - 3.4.2. Option 2 – housing numbers identified based on perceived sustainability of the settlements – in Felpham’s case 25 dwellings.
 - 3.4.3. Option 3 – percentage distribution based on deliverable HELAA sites – in Felpham’s case a zero figure.
- 3.5. In November 2017 the Parish Council sent a proposed timetable to ADC setting out when it proposed to submit at Reg 14. ADC responded that it would be best to wait until the Local Plan was adopted which it was hoped would happen in Spring 2018. The Plan actually adopted in June 2018.
- 3.6. An amended draft Plan was submitted to the NP Committees on the 19th November 2018 and approved to go forward to Full Council for approval and adoption.
- 3.7. At its meeting on the 17th December 2018 the Clerk and Neighbourhood Plan Advisor advised that the level of changes that had been made to the original NP document, with their only being minor amendments to existing policies (to make them more robust) and only a few additional new policies which were not significant to trigger any referendum in the future, that the meeting may wish to consider alternatives to the currently proposed public open consultations.
- 3.8. After much discussion the Committee resolved:

- 3.8.1. that the public open consultations to be carried out at two venues in the Parish not go ahead,
- 3.8.2. that the consultation process be carried out through Survey Monkey, and
- 3.8.3. to facilitate maximum input opportunities for residents to be involved and to comment on the reviewed document through Survey Monkey, the following mediums would be used to promote and advertise the survey:
 - Facebook
 - Twitter
 - Local newspapers
 - Parish Council web site
 - Felpham in Focus
 - Parish Council Noticeboards
 - Static displays x2 in different parts of the Parish.
- 3.9. It was further agreed that the public would also have the opportunity to comment and have input on issues outside of the NP that may be considered for inclusion in the existing Community Action Plan. On the 12th February 2019 the NP Committee resolved to approve the NP survey and for the consultation to proceed.
- 3.10. In February 2019 ADC granted planning permission for 18 dwellings on land at Stanhorn Grove which completed the housing allocation for the Parish.
- 3.11. At the April 2019 meeting the NP Committee were advised that the survey period had expired and 34 responses received. 4 through social media and 30 via the website. None of the questions received an overall negative response. Many comments were made, some of which related directly to the NP, but mostly they were Community Aspirations and would be channeled through that process (survey results can be viewed in the Evidence Base 2019). The Committee resolved to submit the NP to consultation under Regulation 14.
- 3.12. The Plan was advertised for 6 weeks in accordance with the Regulations. The period ran from the 15th April to the 28th May 2019.

4. Regulation 14 responses

- 4.1. Responses were received from ADC, Natural England, WSCC and Highways England.
- 4.2. The responses were analysed and the Plan amended accordingly (see analysis at Appendix A).
- 4.3. On the 9th July 2019 the NP Committee resolved to approve/adopt the Neighbourhood Plan and Design Guide and pass it to Full Council on the 3rd



September 2019 after which the Regulation 15 consultation period would commence.

Image 1 NP Poster

Press Release

In July 2014 the residents of Felpham voted at Referendum to make the Felpham Neighbourhood Plan part of the development plan for the area. Since that time the Plan has been used by Arun District Council when considering planning applications in Felpham.

The time has come to review and update the Plan to bring it into line with the newly adopted Arun District Local Plan.

Residents of Felpham are being asked to complete a survey to show their support for the revised Plan and to make suggestions about further policies.

Chairman of the Parish Council, Cllr David Smart said " we really want to hear from residents about the changes we are proposing to the Neighbourhood Plan. Please get involved and have your say."

The Plan survey period runs for the whole of March and can be found online at www.felphampc.gov.uk/NP or by collecting a paper copy from the Parish Office at Meaden Way or by asking any Parish Councillor.

Ends

Image 2 - Press release published on the Bognor Post and Bognor Observer

The Felpham Neighbourhood Plan

The Felpham Neighbourhood Plan was adopted as planning policy by Arun District Council in 2014 following a Referendum of residents.

The Plan in 2019

Now that the Arun District Local Plan has been adopted our Plan needs to be updated to reflect both the ADC policies and changes to national planning policy.

We are seeking your views on the amended Plan. We want to know what is missing, what issues are important to you and whether you feel you can support the revised Plan.

Some policies have changed very little and some not at all. We have identified this against each policy. The current and proposed Plans can be viewed here:

[Current Adopted Plan](#)

[Proposed Consultation Draft Plan 2019](#)

[Design Guide](#)

Complete the survey

It is important that you read the policies before completing the survey. Once you have done so please [go to the survey](#) which will open in a new page. The survey closes on the 31st March 2019.

Image 3 - Website advertisement

Appendix A

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 be 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

Consultee	Section	Comment	Response
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 2011-2031. 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

Consultee	Section	Comment	Response
ADC	5.2	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	Changed
ADC	5.7	<p>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.</p>	Changed
ADC	H1	<p>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.’</p>	Changed

Consultee	Section	Comment	Response
ADC	H2	<p>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 ...</p> <p>If all the criteria apply in this list then add the word 'and' to the penultimate criterion.</p> <p>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.</p>	Agreed
ADC	BT3	What is the evidence to support this?	Saved policy

Consultee	Section	Comment	Response
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.

Consultee	Section	Comment	Response
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

Consultee	Section	Comment	Response
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

Consultee	Section	Comment	Response
ADC	GA1	<p>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.</p> <p>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?</p> <p>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</p>	<p>The policy does not give specific projects but does identify the types of schemes.</p>

Consultee	Section	Comment	Response
ADC	CLW1	<p>Saved Policy CLW1 from the previous Felpham made NDP. The exact text should be:</p> <p>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.</p>	Agreed
ADC	CLW2	<p>Saved Policy CLW2 from the previous Felpham made NDP. The exact text should be:</p> <p>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.</p>	Agreed
ADC	CLW3	<p>Saved Policy CLW3 from the previous Felpham made NDP. The exact text should be:</p> <p>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.</p>	Agreed

Consultee	Section	Comment	Response
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	<p>Saved Policy CLW5 from the previous Felpham made NDP. The exact text should be:</p> <p>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)</p> <p>Appendix A - Assets of Community Value</p> <p>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</p>	Agreed

Consultee	Section	Comment	Response
ADC	CLW6	<p>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.</p> <p>26.Policy CLW6: Local Green Spaces - Saved Policy CLW6 from the previous Felpham made NDP. The exact text should be:</p> <p>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.</p>	Agreed
ADC	CLW7	<p>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.</p> <p>Saved Policy CLW67 from the previous Felpham made NDP. The exact text should be:</p> <p>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.</p>	Agreed

Consultee	Section	Comment	Response
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

Consultee	Section	Comment	Response
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

Consultee	Section	Comment	Response
Southern Water	CLW6	<p>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.</p> <p>and the Pre-Submission Draft Regulation 14 Neighbourhood Plan (April 2019), which reads: Policy CLW6: Protect Local Green Spaces. SAVED</p> <p>The LPA has designated areas shown in Map D as Local Green Space in accordance with paragraphs 99-100 of the RNPPF. Proposals for redevelopment of land identified as Local Green Space will not be supported.</p> <p>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</p>	<p>This is our error and the Plan now shows the saved wording.</p>

Consultee	Section	Comment	Response
WSCC	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 – ‘There are four <i>three</i> local schools: Felpham Community College, Downview Primary, and Bishop Tufnell <i>Primary</i> . Infant and Bishop Tufnell Junior ’. This will also need to be updated to reflect the all-through primary on page 48 Section 11.	Changed
WSCC	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

Consultee	Section	Comment	Response
WSSC 2	CLW7	<p>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.</p> <p>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 compromise the Council's ability to meet this need.</p> <p>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</p> <p>Suggested amendment to resolve concern</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>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.</p>

5. Examination

Following advertisement at Reg 16 the Plan passed to independent Examination. The Examiner identified that the Plan had not been properly completed as it did not contain a Modification Statement the advertised at Regulation 14. The Plan was therefore returned to the Regulation 14 stage and advertised from the 20th January to the 2nd March 2020. The NP team took the opportunity to update the Plan to include comments received from the Examiner and the LPA. No new policies were added.

6. Comments received following revised Reg 14 Consultation

Consultee	Comment	Response
West Sussex Cycle Forum	<p>I support the NP as revised. In particular I support the fine words about improving, enhancing etc the infrastructure for walking and cycling in the parish. The Plan says that connectivity is generally poor - 3.24 There is a cycle path along parts of the B2259 but in general the provision of cycle ways is poor with little connectivity. The provision of cycleways is actually better than many other places although there are significant gaps. The point is to make walking and cycling so attractive that people use their feet or their bicycle for shorter journeys or as part of a longer one instead of using the car. This means a positive and proactive effort to enhance and improve connectivity from/to for example the 820 homes on Blakes made with the two primary schools and the one secondary school. The schools are expanding hugely and the sooner that pupils and their parents get into the habit of walking and cycling to school the better-so it means working with the schools. It means better links to and from the village shops and the leisure centre. It means better links to Middleton, Yapton, Bersted and Bognor.</p>	Noted

Consultee	Comment	Response
Environment Agency	Further to your consultation below I wanted to reconfirm our advice to you in May 2019 that based on the level of development proposed through your Plan we have no detailed comments to make.	Noted
Southern Water	I confirm we have reviewed the Plan and have no comments to make.	Noted

Arun DC	<p>Para 2.8: it is noted that the parish council considers that the modifications and new policies contained in this modifications proposal are not significant or substantial enough as to change the nature of the Neighbourhood Development Plan and therefore the Plan would require examination but not a referendum. However, please note that comments below do not include Arun District Council's statement on whether or not the authority considers that the modifications contained in the modification proposal are so significant or substantial as to change the nature of the neighbourhood development plan which the modification proposal would modify. This is a requirement at Regulation 17 as part of the submission to examination when the submission proposal has been received.</p>	Noted and plan amended
Arun DC	<p>Para 3.29: This paragraph needs updating to reflect the current speed restrictions in place in areas like Flansham Park. Recommend that this paragraph is updated.</p>	Noted and plan amended

Arun DC	<p>Policy H2: Windfall Sites (e) refers to provision of affordable housing on sites over 11. The NPPF 2019 Annex 2: Glossary amends the definition of 'major development' to read 'where 10 or more homes will be provided'.</p> <p>Recommend that the figure in Policy H2 should be amended to 10.</p>	Noted and plan amended
Arun DC	<p>Policy BT8: This policy should be deleted or moved to the aspirations section as this is not a land use policy which the Plan can deliver.</p>	Policy Deleted
Arun DC	<p>Policy ESD6: the policy should be cross referenced to para 197 of the NPPF as this refers to a balanced judgement being required when considering the scale of harm to a non-designated heritage asset such as covered by the policy. There is no reference to 'significant public benefits' in para 197.</p> <p>Recommend that this policy title is amended to: Protection and enhancement of wildlife OR ecological networks</p>	Noted and plan amended

Arun DC	<p>Policy ESD9: This policy can be strengthened by being clear that it is a net increase in biodiversity. Within the policy it refers to ecological networks – where are these networks shown? It also talks of development which significantly damages these – what criteria is to be used to judge or define ‘significant’? Recommend that this policy is amended to: Development proposals must be designed to incorporate net (increased) biodiversity within and around developments and enhance/improve linkages with and to existing biodiversity/ecological networks, ... Recommend the phrase ‘will be refused’ is deleted and replaced with ‘will not be supported’</p>	Noted and plan amended
---------	---	------------------------

Arun DC	Policy ESD12: The policy cannot grant planning permission so re-word the first sentence. Recommend text as follows: Planning permission will be granted Proposals for energy generating infrastructure using renewable or low carbon energy sources to serve individual properties to groups of properties will be supported provided that: Again final bullet point (e) needs to be re-worded because the policy cannot deal with planning conditions. Recommend this final bullet point is re-worded	This is a Saved Policy previously agreed by the LPA. As the LPA has stated that any change to the wording of the policy means it cannot be saved the PC does not wish to make an amendment.
Arun DC	Policy ESD13: 'Affect' to be replaced with effect.	Noted and plan amended
Arun DC	Map D - Local Green Spaces - Policy CLW6 – Church Field: why are references made in the text to: saved local plan policies, the SHLAA 2012 update etc.? Recommend that this paragraph is updated to provide clarity because these documents are superseded.	As the LPA has stated that any change to the wording of the policy means it cannot be saved the PC did not wish to make an amendment. Noted and plan amended
Arun DC	Map D - the map needs to be corrected because it does not seem to replicate the previous map although Worms Wood is still included in the preceding list.	Worms Wood has been removed from the Plan
Arun DC	Map E has moved	Corrected

Arun DC	Map F missing	Corrected
Arun DC	It is noted that the Parish has counted the 18 dwellings which received planning permission at Land at Stanhorn Grove as its housing allocation of at least 10 dwellings. Whilst this can count as your housing allocation, this is not considered to be positive planning and it is important to note that your housing allocation figure is a minimum.	Noted

7. The Plan was submitted at Regulation 15 on the