

Neighbourhood Plan team response to comments received from CDC.

The consultation period ended 15 days ago. It will be for the Examiner to decide if your comments can be taken into account at this late stage. It is yet another example of the delays introduced by CDC at every stage of the plan process.

We have been working with CDC for many years on our Plan and most of the comments now made have never been made before. This lack of consistency is not helpful.

Most of the policies as written have been agreed with at least two previous Examiners. As planning is based on case law it is only to be expected that the NP team would look to use policies previously agreed by Examiners.

We note that you agree that the Plan meets the Basic Conditions and can go forward for Examination.

Responding to some specific points:

Section 2.1.2 specifically references SDNPA.

Page 20 : Section 3.7 : as stated in response to the Reg 14 comment this building is held in trust and therefore the AOCV legislation does not apply to it. It cannot be sold or have its use changed.

Page 24 : this is deliberately written. The parish wants to ensure that after the plan is completed it continues to be a an attractive etc.

Para 4.2 : the document is a community plan. It is essential that the community feels that issues it has raised as important have been acknowledged. They have said that seeing their issues identified as recognised in this way helps them to understand the process. The document is after all a working document for the parish.

Page 28 : the existing settlement boundary map was issued by CDC. It has not been updated or amended by CDC. The development is not an allocation made by the NP. When is CDC going to issue an amendment. No mention of this was made in the previous responses from CDC.

Page 29 EH2 : Policy adopted by three previous Examiners. No mention of this in previous responses.

Page 30 : This again was not mentioned in your previous response. The conditions may well be on the planning consent but the Authority does not have a good track record

when it comes to the enforcement of planning conditions. The reinstatement of this land and its access are important to the community.

Page 29 EH5 : 'land based rural business is a term used in the NPPF and by LANTRA, DEFRA and others.

Page 31 EH6 : Appendix 2 and 3 are clearly part of the NP and we are unsure why CDC cannot identify them. They are the townscape maps which clearly identify the significant views.

Page 32 EH7 : the importance of this policy canoe overstated. Boxgrove is a largely unlit parish and it wishes to remain so. Insensitive lighting on new housing sites or for highway safety can destroy an environment that the residents hold dear. SDNPA have supported this policy and it has been adopted in other Plans where parishes adjoin the national park. Removal of this policy would make it very difficult to engage residents in the referendum process.

Page 32 EH9 : SDNPA are happy with the policy as written.

Page 34 EE1 : the policy was amended to reflect your comments at Reg 14. Lack of consistency from you.

Page 35 EE2: why do we need to state how important tourism is. The policy would stand whether tourism was important or not because it brings employment which we have stated we wish to encourage.

Page 35 EE3 : Support would given to any communication mast if it met the other criteria.

Page 36 EE4 : Response is inconsistent with your Reg 14 comments which we took into account and amended the policy.

Page 37 LC1 : Independent living is a standard industry term. The policy does not need to describe existing facilities. It states that there is not sufficient for the ageing population.

Page 38 LC4 : The green spaces are clearly numbered on the Map A and c ross referred to Schedule A which provide a justification for each piece of land and an assessment against the NPPF para 76. This format has been used in at least five previous NP's which is why it was adopted by Boxgrove.

Page 39 LC5 : As above

Page 39/40 H1 : This policy wording has been used in many previous adopted NP's which is why it was adopted by Boxgrove. Examiners have even improved the wording.

Page 41 H2: Unsure of the point being made.

Page 41 H3 see previous comments on boundary change. Other comments noted.

Page 43 GA1 : See no reason why CIL contribution cannot be in the policy. GA1.3 answers the question about the status of permissive paths.

Page 44 : GA2 : Again this policy has been adopted by many NP's. It is not unreasonable to seek to ensure that new development does not make worse existing parking and traffic issues. CDC Policy 39 does not state this.

Dated 12th July 2018