Lissvillage
neighbourhood plan

Liss Village Neighbourhood Development Plan
Making the Plan:

Consultation Statement

Submitted to the South Downs National Park Authority

Liss Parish Council

November 2016

Contents

1. Background

1.1 This statement is a record of all consultations with the public and organisations carried out in the preparation of the Liss Village Neighbourhood Development Plan. It is intended to fulfil the requirements of Section 15(2) of Part 5 of the 2012 Neighbourhood Planning Regulations.

1.2 The regulations require:

(a) details of the persons and bodies who were consulted about the proposed neighbourhood development plan

(b) explanation of how they were consulted

(c) summary of the main issues and concerns raised by the persons consulted

(d) description of how these issues and concerns have been considered and, where relevant, addressed in the proposed neighbourhood development plan.

2. The consultation process

2.1 This section outlines the process of consultation throughout the preparation of the Liss Village Neighbourhood Development Plan and in relation to the consultation draft of the plan. The specific actions taken to consult with the public at each stage are set out in Table 1 and in the supporting Appendices.

a. The decision to prepare a neighbourhood development plan

2.2 The possibility of preparing a neighbourhood village plan was first put to the public in a presentation at the Liss Parish Council AGM on 19th March 2014. The Council decided on 9th April 2014 to initiate a process for preparing a neighbourhood development plan for the Parish.

2.3 A public exhibition was held on 25th and 26th July 2014 to inform the community about the implications of a neighbourhood development plan and to sound out their views on preparing a plan. The exhibition was publicised in the Village Voice, the magazine of the Parish Council, delivered to nearly 2,500 households in Liss, supported by posters around the village. Over 420 people attended and a note of issues raised was kept which helped to guide the initial work the Steering Group. An email data base of 54 interested people was created following the exhibition which was added to throughout the planmaking process.

2.4 Those who had attended the exhibition and others who responded to publicity were invited to a Forum on 6th September 2014. Amongst its purpose was to encourage members of the community to put themselves forward to take part in preparing the plan. A number of people were added to the email data base, with details of skills and interests.

2.5 The Parish Council on 15th September 2014 confirmed its decision to prepare a plan and that the work should be managed through a Steering Group representative of the local community. The Steering Group of 11 members was appointed by the Parish Council in November 2014, drawn from those who had expressed interest and reflecting as far as

possible a balance of people from different parts of the village, and in terms of age, sex, social background and skills. Sir John Dunt, a long standing Liss resident, was appointed chairman.

b. The preparation of the consultation draft of the neighbourhood development plan

2.6 The process of plan preparation was shaped around three public forums and a public exhibition which were held in the Village Hall. The forums had some exhibition material but also had presentations on neighbourhood plan issues and discussions amongst those present and invited further comment. The exhibition displayed the work which had been undertaken on the neighbourhood development plan and invited further comment. The details of how the forums and exhibitions were publicised is included in the Appendices.

2.7 The forums and exhibitions were:

Public Forum 14/2/15: Seeking views on Vision and Objectives and the general direction and scope of the neighbourhood plan

Public forum 11/7/15: Seeking views on criteria for residential development sites and on possible sites, and setting out possibilities for various environmental issues. At the Forum and following it, a call was made for landowners and potential developers to bring forward any other sites for consideration.

Public forum 23/24/10/15: Seeking views on options for residential development sites and other key policy areas. 172 people attended.

Public exhibition 16/1/16: Setting out preferred options for the residential development sites, and for other key policy areas and seeking comment. 227 people attended.

2.8 Feedback was given at the forums in discussions and question and answer sessions, on post its and on feedback forms, and further feedback was received through feedback forms collected in the Parish Council office and other locations around the village, and online in the weeks following each forum and exhibition. At each stage the responses were considered by the Steering Group and the working groups and were a major factor in giving direction for the work on the plan.

2.9 A wide variety of methods were used to communicate with the Liss community about the neighbourhood development plan and particularly the forums and exhibitions. A website was established which was used to inform the community of stages in plan preparation and also to invite comment and feedback. The Parish Council newsletter, Village Voice, which is circulated to almost all households in the village, was used to publicise the plan, particularly the forums and exhibitions which were held. Posters were placed around the village and a large banner displayed for the exhibitions on the front of the village hall. The email database of interested people was used to inform people and organisations. Press releases were issued and significant press coverage was achieved both before and after each forum and exhibition.

2.10 Many opportunities were taken to raise awareness of the neighbourhood development plan, including:

Stalls manned by members of the Steering Group at:

- Liss Forest Fun show 2015
- Liss Forest Fun day 2015
- Liss Junior School Christmas fayre 2015
- Liss Infants School Christmas fayre 2015
- Liss late night Christmas shopping event 2015
- Liss Community event 2015
- Outside the Tesco's convenience store in the village at various times

A School Drawing competition was held in the infants and junior school on the theme of what the children would like to see in the village

2.11 The identification of local housing needs was the subject of a questionnaire circulated to all households in Liss in August 2015. The details of the questionnaire are set out in the Supporting Paper on Housing Needs, but it achieved a response of almost exactly 10% of the households in Liss. The issues raised are considered in Section 3 below.

2.12 Meetings or conversations were held with local organisations, including the Junior football club, the Triangle Community Centre, and the nursery based there, the Crossover (Youth organisation), Puddleducks (nursery), the Historical Society, the infants and junior schools, representatives of Liss business, and the doctor's surgeries. A presentation was given to the Liss Forest Residents Association. Meetings also took place with infrastructure providers such as the Highway Authority and Southern Water and other providers were consulted, including Network Rail. A meeting was also held with CPRE. Meetings also took place with adjoining Parish Councils, particularly Rogate and Rake Parish Council where there are common issues along the border between the two parishes and two meetings were held and several email communications.

2.13 Meetings were held with developers or landowners for all the preferred sites, and also some of the other sites which had been rejected through the site selection process. The exception is the Inwood Road site where its planning history had established the principle of residential development (although with many details to be resolved).

c. The Consultation Draft

2.14 The public consultation on the draft plan was launched on Monday 21st March 2016 following a public exhibition held on Saturday 19th March which had 197 attendees. The exhibition and the launch of the consultation was accompanied by extensive publicity including leaflets throughout the village and to all school children for their parents, press coverage, information on the website, posters, emails to the email database and emails and letters to statutory consultees and most village organisations. The consultation closed after eight weeks on Monday 16th May.

2.15 118 individual responses were received, as well as responses from statutory consultees, developers and other organisations. The issues raised are set out in Section 4 below.

3. Issues and concerns raised during the preparation of the neighbourhood development plan consultation draft

3.1 The issues and concerns of the community are documented in the notes of the forums and exhibitions which are included in the Appendices.

3.2 The views expressed by the community remained consistent throughout the process of preparing the plan except that towards the end of the process comment focussed on the individual sites being considered for residential development.

Housing needs

3.3 The lack of opportunity for local people who wished to stay in the village to find suitable housing was a clear area of concern. Two particular groups were highlighted: older people who wanted to downsize but stay within the village, and young people currently living with parents who want to find accommodation within the village. The need for housing to be affordable was a general concern, particularly for young families, but some views also considered that there were not sufficient opportunities for market housing of the right type, particularly for older people. Overall, there appeared to be support for more housing provided that it was for local people.

The scale and location of development

3.4 A very clear view from the community was that they would prefer new residential development to be on smaller sites rather than in larger estates because they wished to avoid development with an "estate" feel and because it was felt smaller developments could be integrated better into the village. The importance of locating development with good access to the centre of the village came across, although some also thought that development should have good access to the A3. Several commented on the way in which the railway line divided the village, particularly given the difficulty of using the level crossing in the centre of the village. For some this counted against development on the other side of the crossing from the main part of the village centre while for others this had the advantage of access to the A3.

The design and character of development

3.5 Many commented about the need for residential development to be of high quality design and also to fit in with the character and vernacular of the village, although it was difficult to define that vernacular since the village has a diverse character.

Pressure on Services and Infrastructure

3.6 A lot of fears were expressed about the pressure from additional population on services and infrastructure, particularly the infant and junior schools, the two doctor's surgeries, and the pharmacy in the village, including the related problem of parking outside the two schools. However, assurances have been received from the Education Authority and from the doctor’s surgeries that they can grow to accommodate the extra demand.

Traffic and Parking

3.7 Traffic was cited as a problem in the village centre, and along certain roads, particularly Andlers Ash, and the access from Inwood Road to Rake Road but also Station Road, Milll Road and Farnham Road, all related to speeding. General concern was expressed over more traffic from development. Congestion in the village centre was seen as associated with the problems of the level crossing in the village and the difficulties of parking in the centre. Issues around Andlers Ash and the access to Rake Road are considered in relation to the site-specific proposals below. Several comments wanted more provision for walking and cycling both in connection with development but also generally throughout the village.

Flooding and surface water

3.8 Liss lies in the valley of the River Rother which flows through the centre of the village. It has flooded adjoining development and concerns were expressed about this. None of the sites considered for residential development, however, are within areas at risk of flooding. A related issue, however, is that of surface water runoff down the sides of the village. This has most relevance to the Andlers Ash and Inwood Road sites considered below.

Green issues

3.9 A number of comments wanted open space, green lanes, views and wildlife to be protected but most comments were relatively unspecific except in relation to residential site proposals.

Community provision and services

3.10 The principal concern expressed was over the inadequacy of pitches for playing junior football

Site Specific issues

3.11 The range of possible sites for residential development were first shown to the community at the Forum on 7 July 2015. All sites were shown and comment invited on all, although a number of sites were highlighted as having the most potential for residential development and it is from these that the final preferred sites were selected. Of the sites which were not highlighted there was some support for Site 1, Farnham Road, and Site 12, Clarks Farm, but that support was significantly less than those who rejected the sites. Nevertheless, in response to these views, as well as detailed submissions from the potential developers of the Clarks Farm site, these sites were assessed a second time in the process, but still found not to meet key site selection criteria.

3.12 Of the preferred sites the two on Andlers Ash Road attracted most comment. A few of these comments were concerned over the loss of green land and of views, but a significant concern was that currently properties along Andlers Ash Road on the opposite side to the proposed developments suffer from surface water runoff down the slope from the fields opposite them. The concern has been that the runoff would be increased by development, and this concern has been built into the development brief for these sites and modern drainage systems should reduce surface water runoff. The other concern has been about traffic on Andlers Ash Road. Traffic levels are not high by urban standards and are not the highest in the village, but speeds are perceived as often above the 30-mph speed limit. At the same time the road is seen as difficult to navigate down because of parked cars.

3.13 The Inwood site attracted comment over possible surface water runoff but mainly about access, firstly onto Inwood Road, and then traffic from that site travelling through Inwood Road to what some see as a difficulty with Rake Road.

3.14 The Brows Farm site also attracted some comment, mainly its impact on views, and the South Downs National Park Authority expressed concern on landscape grounds.

4. Issues and concerns raised in response to the consultation on the neighbourhood development plan consultation draft

4.1 A detailed submission was received from the SDNPA on a range of issues, but otherwise comment from statutory consultees were limited. A detailed submission was received from Boyer Planning on behalf of the potential developers of the Clarks Farm site. Submissions were also received supporting one entirely new site and another which provided more information in relation to a site previously rejected. All three of these sites were reassessed against the site assessment criteria but were rejected as not meeting key criteria. Potential developers of the proposed sites made submissions in support of each of these sites.

4.2 Otherwise, comment from the Liss Community was mainly on housing, design, infrastructure and services and on the individual residential site proposals.

Housing and the site selection process

4.3 The SDNPA was concerned that the residential site allocations did not clearly demonstrate that a minimum of 150 dwellings was provided for. Liss Policy 8 has been amended accordingly. Boyer Planning submitted a general critique of the criteria used in the site selection process. The overall critique was not accepted but more explanation of the criteria has been provided.

4.4 Several comments from the community stated the need for provision for the elderly, particularly smaller properties close to the village centre but the needs of first time buyers were also mentioned. The policies of the plan attempt to provide for these requirements. The SDNPA was concerned at the compatibility of policies on residential development in the countryside and on retirement and nursing homes and these have been clarified. The policy on self build has been included in Policy Liss 7 on local housing needs in response to SDNPA on the appropriateness of requiring local connections in the absence of specific allocations for self build.

Other policies

4.5 The proposed settlement boundary in Policy Liss 1 was questioned at detailed points, but these have been reviewed and no changes proposed. Policy Liss 2 on protected gaps was generally supported but textual changes have been made to explain further their justification and purpose. Insufficient justification for local green space allocations in Policy Liss 3 was criticised and further justification has been provided. In response to comments from the SDNPA and others a new Policy Liss 5 has now been included to cover biodiversity.

4.6 Comment on Policy Liss 9 on design generally emphasised the need for design of development to fit in with the local character. Policies Liss 13, 14, and 15 attracted little comment except for a strong representation from the Liss Junior Football Club about the need for further provision. Meetings have been held with the football club but in the absence of suitable sites the policy has not been substantially changed. The need for greater definition of quiet roads and sunken lanes is appreciated but there are practical difficulties in defining them without testing each one.

4.7 Parking is still seen as a problem although the SDNPA questioned the evidence for an existing problem in the village centre. Liss Policy 17 on the village centre also attracted concerns over congestion and the quality of the environment but action on the village centre involves a range of issues which go beyond land use planning and it is envisaged that the Parish Council will lead a separate study of the village centre.

4.8 A number of comments expressed concern over the pressure on services and infrastructure. Many comments were general, but schools and doctors continued to be highlighted, although this had been looked at closely in preparing the plan. Pressure on drainage and sewage was also mentioned, although Southern Water have not objected to the development proposals.

Inwood Road Development Brief

4.9 A number of comments asked for clearer definitions of aspects of the proposed development, including provision for the elderly, the form of housing development proposed, and open space and the development brief has been amended to clarify these matters, A small group of comments continue to express concern over access, the impact on existing sites and particularly the junction of Chase Road and Rake Road which traffic from the development would have to use.

Andlers Ash Development Briefs

4.10 The SDNPA and Savills for the potential developer (Cala Homes) were concerned to clarify the number of units and the provision of open space and changes have been made to the housing policy and the development brief. A number of comments from the public were concerned at the loss of a green area and views, particularly for householders on the other side of Andlers Ash and also the need for suitable landscaping. The development brief sets out to protect views and provide significant landscaping. Surface water runoff was also an issue for householders on the other side of Andlers Ash and the development brief sets out requirements for adequate SUDS as part of the development.

4.11 By far the largest group of comments concerned the suitability of Andlers Ash Road to take additional traffic. Some comments were unspecific but others questioned the suitability of the road to take additional traffic, pointed out the speed of traffic along the road, the narrowness of the road, and difficulties caused by the level crossing. Comments also lamented the loss of the rural character of the road due to traffic and development along its edge. The precise location of the accesses to the two sites was also a matter of comment, with some local residents pressing for an access to the Site 3b at a mini roundabout at Barnside Way. The development brief seeks to protect the character of the road and to provide for traffic calming in conjunction with the accesses to the developments.

The road appears to have the capacity to cope with traffic from the development but this will need to be confirmed by the Highway Authority as will the precise location of the accesses.

Upper Green and land formerly part of the Grange

4.12 This site attracted very little comment other than from Boyer planning who are promoting one of the rejected sites. They questioned the site selection analysis which had led to the selection of this site.

Brows Farm

4.13 The SDNPA expressed many of the concerns previously given during the preparation of the consultation draft plan about the impact of the proposed site on the landscape character of the area, including the need to be more specific about the proposed layout and the nature of the proposed open space, and the protection of views. Other comments also expressed concern about the impact of development on views particularly to and from St Marys Church.

4.14 As a result of these concerns a dialogue was continued with the SDNPA about how they could be overcome, and an urban designer has undertaken design work on the proposed development. From this work the development brief has been significantly amended.

Table 1 – Summary of public consultation events and communications

Date	Event	No of attendees	Details	Appendix
19 March 2014	Liss Parish Council Annual General Meeting	21	The Liss Parish Council AGM was advertised through the Parish Council website and posters were placed on village notice boards. A slide show presentation was given on Liss NP by the Chairman of the Parish Council, Mr Keith Budden.	1
25 July 2014 26 July 2014	Public Exhibition 17.00 – 19.00 Public Exhibition 10.00 – 15.00	420	This exhibition was held over 2 days and in order to advertise it the following was carried out • Posters were placed on all village notice boards 2 weeks in advance of the exhibition • A Press release was published in the Petersfield Post (the local weekly newspaper). • An article was placed in Village Voice (the newsletter of the Parish Council and was circulated to all households in Liss (approx 2,500) asking for volunteers to get involved with the Plan and giving background information on what the Neighbourhood Plan was and its purpose. At the Exhibition, 54 people gave their contact details and were interested in getting involved with the Plan. Feedback was taken at this Forum and is shown in Appendix 23.	2
6 September 2014	Public Forum 10.00 – 12.00	35	The Public Forum was advertised by email (the contacts built up from the July Exhibition), plus word of mouth to those who had expressed an interest in being involved.	3
1 January 2015	Article on Liss NP in Village Voice (the newsletter of the Parish Council), circulated by a team of volunteers	2,500 households (approx) in Liss	An article was placed in the Village Voice advertising the Public Forum on 14th February 2015 and for those that could not attend it gave contact details and asked for volunteers to get involved.	4

14 February 2015	Public Forum 10.00 - 12.00	47 attendees	To publicise this event, we did the following: • A press release was sent to the Petersfield Post for Liss News page. • Notices were placed on all notice boards in the village. At the Forum, feedback forms were available for people to complete if they were interested in getting involved. All attendees were asked to sign in and given an: • Agenda • Draft Vision and Objectives • Terms of Reference • Frequently asked Questions, Information on the role and tasks of each Working Group • A provisional budget. Following the Public Forum, Sir John Dunt (Chairman of the Steering Group) was interviewed by the Petersfield Post for an article for Liss News pages on the 20th February 2015. Feedback from the event was typed up and circulated to all Steering Group members.	5
1 April 2015	Article on Liss NP in The Triangle Newsletter (newsletter of the Triangle Community Centre)	Distributed to 2,500 households (approx) in Liss by a team of volunteers.	A small article was placed in The Triangle News giving people the opportunity to get involved with Liss NP or comment via email.	6
27 June 2015	Raising awareness in Village ahead of Public Forum on 11th July 2016 09.00 – 13.00	Approx 40 people	Members of the Steering Group had a table and display outside the Tesco convenience store in Liss on Saturday morning (the busiest time in the village) with the aim of speaking to as many people as possible and showing them proposed sites on display boards, as well as telling them about the Public Forum and asking them to let their family and neighbours know if they lived in Liss.	N/A

04 July 2015	Raising awareness in Village ahead of Public Forum on 11th July 2016 09.00 – 13.00	Spoke to approx 35 people	Members of the Steering Group had a table and display outside the Tesco community store in Liss on Saturday morning (the busiest time in the village) with the aim of speaking to as many people as possible and showing them proposed sites on display boards, as well as telling them about the Public Forum and asking them to let their family and neighbours know if they lived in Liss.	N/A
11 July 2015	Public Forum 10.00 – 16.00	120 attendees	To publicise this event, we did the following: • We held two Raising Awareness events in Liss (see above). • A Press Release was released to the Petersfield Post for the week before the event. • Notices were placed on village notice boards • Signs were placed at railway crossings • A banner was put up over the Village Hall • An invitation was sent by email to all local organisations, working group members and those on the email database • The Liss NP website was updated with details on the Public Forum. At the Forum, there were handouts for all attendees including: • A feedback form • A paper on How does the Liss NP choose sites for housing • Information on the Environmental group • A contact form to get involved. Steering Group members were in attendance for discussion, explanation and comment if required. At the Forum questions were taken from the audience which were recorded, typed up and circulated to the Steering Group (see Appendix 26).	7
24 July 2015	Liss Infant School Drawing Competition	168 pupils	As a way of ensuring that families were aware of the Liss Neighbourhood Plan and the work being undertaken, a Drawing competition was organised that had the competition on one A4 side where the children were asked to draw their favourite place in Liss and on the other, information on the Liss NP, how to get involved and the website details.	8

			This went home to all pupils at the end of the Summer Term. A £10.00 book token was the prize with a presentation to be made to the winner in an assembly in September by the Headmistress.	
24 July 2015	Liss Junior School Drawing Competition	260 pupils	As a way of ensuring that families were aware of the Liss NP and the work being undertaken, a Drawing competition was organised that had the competition on one A4 side where the children were asked to draw their favourite place in Liss and on the other, information on the Liss NP, how to get involved and the website details. This went home to all pupils at the end of the Summer Term. A £10.00 book token was the prize with a presentation to be made to the winner in an assembly in September by the Headmaster.	9
31 July 2015	Article on Liss NP in Village Voice (the newsletter of the Parish Council),	Distributed to 2,500 households (approx) in Liss	To help everyone keep up to date with progress following the Public Forum on 11 July 2015, a large article (covering 2 pages of Village Voice) was published. This gave the website address for getting in touch and also advertised the next Forum in October 2015.	10
1 August 2015	Housing Needs questionnaire circulated to all households	Distributed to 2,500 households (approx) in Liss	A team of volunteers circulated Village Voice (above) with the Housing Needs questionnaire to all households in Liss. The closing date for completion of the questionnaires was Friday 11th September 2015. Collection boxes were placed in Jade News (the local newsagents), the Parish Office and the Triangle Centre and were emptied weekly by the Administrator. 249 responses were received in total, almost exactly 10% of Liss Households. This information was collated and considered as part of the plan making process.	11
12 August 2015 & 19 August 2015	Press Release in Petersfield Post on Questionnaire		A press release was issued to update everyone and remind people to complete their Questionnaire and the importance of the feedback.	12
31 August 2015	Liss Forest Fun Show 12.00 – 17.00	450 attendees approx	Members of the Steering Group had a table and display at the Liss Forest Fun Show with the aim of talking to as many people in Liss Forest as possible and showing them progress to date.	N/A

13 September 2015	Liss Village Fun Day 12.00 – 17.00	200 attendees approx	Members of the Steering Group had a table and display at the Village Fun Day which is mainly a family event, with the aim of talking to as many people in Liss as possible and showing them progress to date.	N/A
16 September 2015	Press Release in Petersfield Post on Questionnaire		A Press release was issued to remind everyone to complete their Questionnaires and where the collection boxes were.	13
23 October 2015 24 October 2015	Public Forum 17.00 – 19.00 Public Exhibition 10.00 – 15.00	172 attendees (in total)	A Public Exhibition was held on Friday 23rd October between 5 and 7 pm and on Saturday 24th October we held a Public Forum between 10 am until midday and then continued with the Public Exhibition from the previous evening until 5 pm on Saturday evening. To publicise this event, we did the following: • A press release was issued to Petersfield Post • Notices were placed on all village boards • Information was distributed to pubs. • A handout for pupils to take home was sent to both schools • A banner was put up over the village hall one week before. • Signage was displayed at railway crossings in the village. • Local groups were emailed, as well as members of working groups and the database of contacts built up • Information was displayed on the Neighbourhood plan website This was a large exhibition detailing work to date and sites identified, along with Development Briefs for each site. On Monday 26 October, Sir John Dunt (Chairman of the Steering Group) was interviewed by the Petersfield Post for an article in Liss News that week. Steering Group members were in attendance throughout for discussion, explanation and comment if required.	14
4 December 2015	Liss Junior School Xmas Fayre	N/K	Members of the Steering Group had a table and display at the Liss Junior School Xmas Fayre with	N/A

	14.30 – 18.00		the aim of talking to as many people as possible and showing them progress to date.	
5 December 2015	Liss Infant School Xmas Fayre 14.00 – 16.00	N/K	Members of the Steering Group had a table and display at the Liss Infant School Xmas Fayre with the aim of talking to as many people as possible and showing them progress to date.	N/A
9 December 2015	Liss Late Night Xmas Shopping Event 18.00 – 20.00	N/K	Members of the Steering Group had a table and display at the Liss Christmas late night shopping event in the Village with the aim of talking to as many people as possible and showing them progress to date.	N/A
16 January 2016	Public Exhibition 14.00 – 17.00	227 attendees	This Exhibition was held on Saturday, between 10 and 2 in the Village Hall. Press releases were issued, notices were placed on all village notice boards, information was available in pubs and a handout was given to the schools as well as a banner over the village hall the week before. There was signage up at railway crossings around village. An email was also sent out reminding everyone of this event to working group members, local Liss organisations and our database of contacts built up. Wates Developers had also issued some information on sites to be proposed and so the number of attendees was higher than usual. Following the Exhibition, Sir John Dunt (Chairman of the Steering Group) was interviewed by the Petersfield Post and an article was issued. Steering Group members were in attendance for discussion, explanation and comment if required.	15
23 January 2016	Liss Community Event 14.00 – 16.00	N/K	This was a Triangle Community Centre event calling for volunteers to help Liss community groups. 2 Steering Group members attended to be on hand to speak to people about the Neighbourhood Plan and progress to date.	16

Public Consultation Phase for the Liss Village Neighbourhood Development Plan Consultation Draft					
1 March 2016		Publicity for Public Exhibition on 19 March 2016 and the launch of 8-week Consultation Period		To publicise the Public Exhibition on 19 March 2016 and the launch of the 8-week consultation period from 21 March 2016, the following was carried out: • Information was sent to both schools for pupils to take home • Information was placed in the village shops, two village coffee shops, pubs in Liss, West Liss and Liss Forest and also displayed in the Triangle Centre Community Centre, Liss Parish Office and on the window of the Village Hall. • Two press releases were issued and published in the Petersfield Post. • Notices were placed on all village notice boards • A banner was put up over the Village hall a week before • Information was displayed at railway crossings around village. • The Liss NP website was updated to advertise this on the front page.	17
19 March 2016	10.00 - 16.00	Public Exhibition 10.00 – 16.00	197 attendees	This was held on Saturday 19 March between 10 and 2 in the Village Hall. At this exhibition members of the public were able to order copies of the Pre-Submission Consultation document at a cost of £5.00 each (to cover printing costs). This was an extensive exhibition detailing the sites, the sites criteria used, maps were displayed and content of the Consultation Draft report. Steering	18

				Group members were in attendance for discussion, explanation and comment if required.	
21 March To 16 May 2016		Consultation Period	N/A	This was an 8-week consultation period which was publicised beforehand, as shown above. During this 8-week period, people were asked to comment on the Pre-Submission Consultation Report. Copies of the Report were available to read in both Liss doctor's surgeries, 2 x coffee shops, The Triangle community centre, The Liss Parish office, both schools and also online, via our website. A feedback form was widely available and collection boxes for completed feedback forms were placed in the Triangle Centre, Parish offices and Jade News to collate the responses. These were collected weekly. Members of the public could also email their comments in directly or comment via the website. The closing date for the consultation was Monday 16th May 2016.	N/A
22 March 2016		Email issued advising of Consultation Period.		An email was sent to: • Statutory Consultees • Adjoining Parish Councils • Liss Organisations • Developers and Landowners • Email contacts that have been built up in Liss advising them of the 8-week consultation period and advising that an electronic copy of the Plan was available on the Liss NP website and also listing the various	19

				locations around the village that copies were available.	
23 March 2016		Press Release in Petersfield Post.		A Press Release was issued to the Petersfield Post for the Liss News page advising that Consultation has now begun and giving information how to view the Plan on the Liss NP website and in the village.	20
11 May 2016		Press Release in Petersfield Post		A Press release was issued to the Petersfield Post for the Liss News page to remind everyone that time is running out on the Consultation Period, how to view the Plan on the Liss NP website and in the village.	21

Table 2 Summary of comments received on the neighbourhood development plan consultation draft and of responses to those comments.

Note: The policy numbers are those used in the consultation draft of the plan. The table below shows the changes of policy between the consultation draft and the submitted plan.

Policy name	Consultation Draft policy no.	Submitted Plan policy no.
Biodiversity	-	5 (new policy)
Flood Risk	5	6
Local housing needs	6	7
The allocation of land for housing	7	8
The design of development	8	9
The historic environment	9	10
Residential development in the countryside	10	11
Retirement and nursing homes	11	12
Self Build	12 (included in policy 6)	-

Sections of the Plan	Summary of Comments received	Response to the comments, and changes made to the plan
INTRODUCTION	SDNPA - description of Liss should clarify references to different parts of Liss while describing Liss as a single village. Current wording confusing. SDNPA - Include reference to Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan (2013, policy 15,) in paragraphs on other plans.	Accepted. Changes made. Accepted. Change made.
Strategy	SDNPA - Include reference to the SPA. SDNPA - Set out more clearly the constraints on Liss and development. Including	Accepted. Introduction already refers to the SPA, but a new policy on Biodiversity includes reference to the SPA Agreed. Changes made to text.

	• Topography • Tree Cover • The River Rother (bisecting the built-up area) • SPA. English Heritage - Plan does not set out the issues that it is intended to address.	 Not accepted. Issues included in the Strategy, and Vision and Objectives set out what the plan seeks to achieve.
VISION AND OBJECTIVES	SDNPA - Supports and commends. Historic England - Suggest Vision and a new objective to refer to conserving and enhancing the historic environment.	Noted.
POLICIES		
General	SDNPA - Use numbers or letters in place of bullet points in order to ease reference. SDNPA - Replace references to Proposals Map with Policies Map. 77 - Has there been a sustainability appraisal?	Accepted. Change made. Accepted. Change made. Noted. Plan has a Strategic Environmental Assessment and Habitats Regulation Assessment (SEA/HRA) and there is no requirement to do anything additional.
Liss 1 The Settlement Policy Boundary	SDNPA - 'accordance' in policy. SDNPA -Possible conflict with Policy 10 over what is allowed outside settlement boundary. SDNPA - Define the Development Plan. 57 - Point 2 a very grey statement.	Accepted. Change made. Accepted. Policy clarified. Not accepted. The Development Plan is defined in the Introduction and applies to all policies, not just this one. Not accepted. Reflects policy of the Joint Core Strategy for East Hants.

	92 - Boundary is flawed around Brows Farm and at junction of Andlers Ash Road/Hill Brow Road. 99 - Boundary shown as north of the access road (?) where it joins Farnham Road. This is too far north and risks impinging on view G. 104 - Objection to removal of settlement boundary from Mint Road. 107 - Settlement boundary should include our small dwelling at Whitestones (want to increase house size). HCC - Policy should be amended to allow for redevelopment at the schools, and in particular for disposal of surplus land to developers in order to provide LEA facilities.	Not accepted. The boundary reflects the development proposal and existing development. Not accepted. The boundary reflects the development proposal and is well integrated with existing boundaries. Not accepted. The removal of the boundary reflects the policy of the plan and of the SDNPA towards isolated developments in the countryside. Not accepted. Whitestones is unrelated to development within the existing boundary. Not accepted. The policy would allow for redevelopment of the schools but the Joint Core Strategy does not have provision for other development and there is no reason to make an exception in Liss, particularly as it is within a national park.
Liss 2 Protected Gaps	SDNPA - Consider additional criteria on potential impact on landscape setting and views which are provided by protected gaps. HIWWT - Gaps play an important part in connecting wildlife and providing functioning ecological corridors. 57 - Disagree with last bullet point, makes a mockery of first two points. 93 - Want protected gap removed from land north of 10-acre field and south of Forest Rise.	Accepted. Criteria on maintaining views, in accord with Policy Liss 4, added. Accepted. Wildlife connections and corridors to be covered by a new policy on Biodiversity. Agreed. Point clarified. Not accepted. Gap essential to maintaining the separate identity of Liss Forest by separating Liss Forest and the central part of the Liss.

Liss 3 Local Green Space and informal open space	SDNPA - Need to justify each Local Green Space site related to the criteria in NPPF para 77, in a table.	Accepted. Supporting text changed, and evidence in the existing Table in Making the Plan expanded.
	SDNPA - Local Green Space to be shown on the Policies Map	Accepted. Changes made to the Maps.
	SDNPA - Delete part of policy related to circumstances in which development is permitted, and instead refer to NPPF para 78.	Not accepted. The policies of the plan should be self explanatory and not rely on statements outside the development plan, particularly as the NPPF will not be familiar to the general public, and may be subject to change.
	SDNPA - Define walking networks in text.	Accepted. Term deleted to avoid confusion, but term defined in Policy 15
	SDNPA - Overlap between points 3 and 4 of Policy 15 and part 2 of this policy. Delete part 2 as Policy 15 is fuller.	Not accepted, but the supporting text of Policy 3 changed to clarify its relationship to Policy 15.
	SDNPA - Include in Development Briefs where connections to informal open space are required.	Accepted. Development Briefs clarified.
	Southern Water - Suggest change in wording to allow for them to provide infrastructure on open spaces (wording suggested).	Accepted. Change made.
	77 - Support open space in association with development.	Noted.
	77 - criterion 2 add "must be accessible to all".	Not accepted. General accessibility is implicit, and does not need repeating.
	77 - criterion 2 delete "normally".	Not accepted. Need to recognise that provision on site is not always possible.

	77- criterion 3 add "adversely" impact.	Accepted. Change made.
	77 - criterion 3 add "and secure" suitable alternative provision.	Not accepted. Open space cannot always be secure.
	93 - Want local green space removed from land north of 10-acre field and south of Forest Rise.	Accepted. Local Green Space not intended to include this area. Boundary will be clarified.
	99 - How is open space to be maintained.	Accepted. Within Development Briefs maintenance of open space clarified.
Liss 4 Landscape and Views	SDNPA - Show 75m contour on map.	Accepted. Change made.
	SDNPA - Reference to tree cover above 75m should refer to existing trees.	Accepted. Change made.
	HCC - Policy should be amended to allow for redevelopment at the schools, and in particular for disposal of surplus land to developers in order to provide LEA facilities.	Not accepted. The policy would allow for redevelopment of the school but the Joint Core Strategy does not have provision for other development and there is no reason to make an exception in Liss, particularly as it is within a national park.
	77- criterion 2 having development close to Andlers Ash Road at odds with setting it back from Shipwrights Way.	Not accepted. Context makes it clear that Liss 4 is taking a broader view than the detail of the Development Brief for Andlers Ash.
	77 - Explain why 65m contour is not taken forward	Accepted. Text changed to be clearer.
Liss 5 Flood risk	SDNPA - Remove policy because covered by the development plan. Individual development briefs should refer to flooding issues.	Removing policy not accepted. Flooding is a particular issue in Liss and needs to be given appropriate emphasis.

		References to flooding enhanced in relevant development briefs.
	Environment Agency - No objection to the housing allocations, but general advice on flooding.	Noted.
	HIWWT - All runoff from development and associated infrastructure should be dealt with by SUDS.	Existing Development Plan policies sufficiently provide for SUDS.
	Aecom EIA - Strengthen Policy in regard to protection of surface water resources.	Noted, but unclear what is required, particularly as none of the development sites directly impact on water resources
	77- Include "and off site" standing water	Not accepted. Cannot require development to deal with off-site issues unrelated to the site.
	91 - Flooding is an issue.	Noted.
	99 - Policy does not address the potential for flooding from poor development.	Not accepted. Policy seeks to ensure all development does not add to flood risk.
Liss 6 Local Housing Needs	SDNPA - include in text statement that the scale of obligations should not make development unviable.	Not accepted. This is a national policy point and is not specific to a particular policy.
	SDNPA - reference to Policy 11 should be to 7.	Accepted. Change made.
	SDNPA - Clarify definition of Starter Homes.	Accepted. Text changed to include reference to the government' starter homes initiative.
	Savills (Cala Homes) - Wording of section 2 on the size of units should be changed to be consistent with the development brief which says up to 2 storey.	Not accepted. This policy and the development brief are making different points.

	Savills (Cala Homes) - Amend wording of section 3 to allow flexibility in the size and type of dwellings.	Not accepted. Current wording already allows considerable flexibility.
	31 - More provision for the elderly, particularly bungalows.	Noted. No change needed in policy.
	32 - More affordable 2 bedroom homes.	Noted. No change needed in policy.
	46 - Smaller houses needed for older people.	Noted. No change needed in policy.
	57 - Affordable housing should not be allowed to increase price once sold.	Beyond the scope of the plan, but most affordable housing is rental or shared equity which should ensure that prices do not increase.
	77- Affordable housing should be of the "same" design	Not accepted. Unreasonably prescriptive.
	81 - There is no provision for low cost housing for young people/first time buyers (should not just provide for elderly people).	Not accepted. Policy explicitly encourages starter homes.
	85 - Should build smaller properties for the elderly close to the centre.	Noted. No change needed in policy.
	89 - Must be smaller units, and not just for the elderly	Noted. No change needed in policy.
	96 - Priority should be given to local housing needs but prices must be affordable.	Noted.
	109 - None of housing provided is affordable.	Disagree. Plan should ensure at least 40% of provision is affordable.
Liss 7 The allocation of land for Housing	SDNPA - Clarify that development does not have to be on greenfield land.	This is already made clear in the supporting text.

	SDNPA - Need to change presentation of housing numbers to show that a minimum of 150 dwellings will be provided.	Accepted. Changes made to presentation of figures.
	SDNPA - Concerned over allocation of Brows Farm, sees as an isolated site, detached from the form of the immediate area and no strong relationship with the surrounding built form. Also, impact on setting of the church and the views from the ROW. Suggest an alternative solution is found.	Have discussed Brows Farm allocation with the SDNPA and have amended the housing numbers and the development brief.
	Savills (Cala Homes) - Allocations should be expressed as minimum figures to ensure sufficient provision is made.	Accepted. Changes made to presentation of figures.
	Savills (Cala Homes) - Should consider site 3a as a reserve site.	Not accepted. Site has been assessed as not suitable and makes a contribution to the village As local green space.
	Boyer Planning (Wates) - Critical of the site selection process, particularly the criteria and their lack of definition and lack of objective evidence base. Argue for a full site assessment report to be prepared and further public consultation to follow.	Further explanation of the site selection criteria included in supporting documents.
	66 - Developments should be a maximum of 25 dwellings each.	Noted. The plan seeks to provide housing in as small quantities as is practicable.
	77- Is there a contingency if any sites do not come forward?	Not part of the plan.
	77- No timescales for development of sites.	Not part of the plan.
	77 - Will Greenfield land release be phased if windfall sites development exceeds 136 dwellings?	No. Not in accord with government policy.
	78 - Do not agree with the strategy.	Noted

	92 - The plan allows for a greater number of build on greenfield sites than Liss has been instructed to take.	Not accepted. The requirement for Liss is for an allocation of a minimum of 150 dwellings.
Liss 8 The design of Development	SDNPA - Typo 'accordance'. SDNPA - Reformat into a logical list of separate points: 1. Context 2. Landscape 3. Routes and Links 4. Massing, Scale and Density 5. Block Layout in new development 6. Architectural Design / building typologies 7. Parking 8. Materials 9. Refuse and cycle storage 10. Signage and lighting. SDNPA - Include a requirement for soft landscaping. HCC - Include a statement on energy efficiency and climate change (and suggests a wording). Aecom EIA - further direction on energy efficiency and climate change mitigation. English Heritage - concerned wording should not encourage new development which is distinct from the existing character. 56 - Need design sympathetic to its surroundings. 77 - Do not over detail boundary treatments.	Accepted. Not accepted. There are pros and cons with different orders, and insufficient reason for changing from the order that has been established. Accepted. Changes made. Accepted in part, in so far the requirement relates to the planning system. Accepted. Changes made to the policy. Not accepted. The policy is concerned that development should reflect the existing character and vernacular of Liss, but also accepts good quality modern design. Noted. Policy seeks to achieve this. Noted.

	77 - Criterion 3 third bullet point, add "practical" coherent, legible structure.	Accepted. Change made.
	77 - Criterion 3 seventh bullet point add "external lighting".	Accepted. Change made.
	85 - More traditional designs would be preferable (not the Smith's Garage type).	Noted. The policy is concerned that development should reflect the existing character and vernacular of Liss.
	89 - Developments must maintain a rural feel.	Noted. The policy is concerned that development should reflect the existing character and vernacular of Liss.
	96 - Housing should be compatible with local historical design.	Noted. The policy is concerned that development should reflect the existing character and vernacular of Liss.
	97 - Vary the designs of housing.	Noted. Development Briefs seek to do this.
	97 - More trees and soft landscaping (e.g. Smiths Garage site nice design but need trees).	Noted. Development Briefs seek to provide this.
	98 - Designs should be sympathetic to existing properties, promoting a harmonious street scene, with appropriate boundaries between properties.	Noted. Policy seeks to achieve this.
Liss 9 Historic Environment	Historic England - say more about the background to the conservation areas and reason for their designation.	Not accepted. The supporting text to the policy refers to the leaflets produced by East Hants DC which sets out the background.
	Historic England. NPPF emphasises the significance of historical assets	Accepted, but the plan adds to that in its concern over

	rather than their character and distinctiveness.	character and distinctiveness.
	Historic England - Is the condition of historic assets in Liss an issue?	Not an issue sufficient to require a specific planning policy.
	Historic England - Is the requirement for development in conservation areas to make a positive contribution too onerous?	Not accepted. Both Conservation Areas contain buildings that detract from the significance and character of each area and any redevelopment must make a positive contribution to the areas
	Historic England - Could use the plan as an opportunity to stimulate interest in historic environment, e.g. by preparation of a comprehensive list of locally important buildings and assets.	Noted. Beyond the scope of this plan.
	77 - Add reference to archaeology and structures (e.g. milestones)	Not accepted. Policy aimed at the relationship of development to historic development
Liss 10 Residential development in the countryside	SDNPA - Possible conflict with point 2 of Policy 1 over what is allowed outside settlement boundary, and may also stop rural exception sites.	Accepted. Policy 1 clarified. .
	HCC - Policy should be amended to allow for redevelopment at the schools, and in particular for disposal of surplus land to developers in order to provide LEA facilities.	Not accepted. The policy would allow for redevelopment of the schools but the Joint Core Strategy does not have provision for other development and there is no reason to make an exception in Liss, particularly as it is within a national park.
	Aecom HRA – incorporate referral to JCS strategy CP20 here	Not accepted. Policy CP20 is just one of several relevant policies.
	77 - Criterion 3 clarify meaning of "separate accommodation"	Accepted. Change made to wording of policy.

	.	
	77 - Criterion 3 fourth bullet point, is this necessary since it will be covered by a condition or agreement	Not accepted. Need to establish the policy
	100 - Detailed critique of the plan, leading up to a proposed amendment to the policy on alternations and extensions.	Not accepted. Disagree with several of the points made, and the proposed policy reflects the Joint Core Strategy for East Hants.
Liss 11 Retirement and nursing homes	SDNPA - Question whether it is necessary to refer to wheel chair and efficiency measures and, if kept, consistency with housing policies.	Not accepted. Policy is intended to continue Policy H13 which is a 'saved' policy of the Joint Core Strategy, but which is not expected to be continued by the South Downs Local Plan.
	SDNPA - Questions whether the policy conflicts with Policy Liss 10.	Accepted. Text of Policy Liss 10 changed to clarify relationship of the policies.
	Aecom HRA – incorporate referral to JCS strategy CP20 here.	Not accepted. Policy CP20 is just one of several relevant policies.
	57 - Surely enough already.	Noted. Policy intended to regulate provision not encourage it.
	77 - Add, after local care "and employment"	Not accepted. Acknowledged in text, but is not the purpose of the policy
Liss 12 Self Build	SDNPA - Local Connection policies only successful where there is a site allocation.	Accepted. Local connection requirement deleted and policy incorporated in Local Housing Needs Policy.
	SDNPA - If policy is continued with then will need to define the adjoining area.	Accepted. Policy deleted.
	HRA incorporate referral to JCS strategy CP20 here.	Noted. Policy deleted.

	HCC - Include a statement on energy efficiency and climate change (and suggests a wording). 57 - To be encouraged. Are these part of the 150? 77 - How will self-build be encouraged and taken into account in planning applications? 77 - Be more specific on minimum period of occupation (3 years) and "adjoining area" 108 - Complaint that no site is earmarked. why not the Grange?	No longer relevant as policy deleted. Noted. Could contribute to the 150 if provided on any of the allocated sites Noted. Policy deleted Noted. Policy deleted Noted. But no landowner has been prepared to offer a site and the evidence of local demand justifying an allocation not strong.
Liss 13 Business Provision	SDNPA - South Downs LP requires 12 months marketing, not 6 months. Should be consistent. 77 - Has the plan considered allocating employment land 77- Should this policy require 12 months rather than 6 months? 77 - Are there implications for Hilliers Tree business of development at Antlers Ash?	Not accepted. The SDLP has no status as yet, and 12 months is a very long period that needs to be tested and successfully justified. It is more consistent to use the same period as adjoining areas such as in the Petersfield Neighbourhood Development Plan uses 6 months. Considered but opportunities on existing employment areas. Noted. But 6 months sufficient to see if there is any interest in a site or property. No.
Liss 14 Community and Sports Facilities	SDNPA - Present wording would require individual dwellings to provide	Not accepted. It is the intention that all development

	onsite open space. Policy should require allocated sites to provide open space in accordance with development briefs or leave it entirely to the development briefs.	should contribute towards the provision of open space, but the policy provides for financial contributions which is the likely form of contribution for small developments.
	HCC - Policy should be amended to allow for redevelopment at the schools, and in particular for disposal of surplus land to developers in order to provide LEA facilities.	Not accepted. The policy would allow for redevelopment of the schools but the Joint Core Strategy does not have provision for other development and there is no reason to make an exception in Liss, particularly as it is within a national park.
	Liss Athletic Junior Football Club - Should include an allocation for a junior football pitch. Suggest EHDC land adjoining West Liss Recreation Ground.	Extensive consideration has been given to finding a suitable site, but it has not proved possible to identify a site which is available and suitable for the purpose. If the Athletic Club can identify a site this could be included in the plan.
	77- Criterion 2 add "suitable" alternative provision.	Accepted. Word added.
	77- Criterion 3 add at end "elsewhere in Liss Parish"	Accepted. Wording added.
	77- Para 3.57 does not explain how development would contribute to alternatives to SPA	Not accepted. Set out in Policy.
	77.- Is a SANG approach proposed?	Not proposed within the plan
Liss 15 Walking and Cycling access	SDNPA - Rights of way, quiet roads and sunken lanes do not have to be on the Policies Map, but desirable.	Accepted. Policies map modified.
	SDNPA - Overlap between points 3 and 4 of this policy and part 2 of	Not accepted, but the supporting text of Policy 3

	Policy 3. but keep this policy as being fuller.	changed to clarify its relationship to Policy 15.
	77 - Criterion 1 to allocations add "including through development allocations"	Not accepted. Other criteria sets out role of development
Liss 16 Parking	SDNPA - Need evidence to support need for further car parking provision,	Not accepted, but supporting text amended to highlight the problem of reliance on privately owned provision.
	56 - Sufficient off-street parking to avoid on-street parking	Noted, but in the absence of available sites this is difficult to achieve.
	60 - How will village cope with demand for more short-term parking in the village centre?	Noted. Plan seeking to encourage provision.
	62 - Need for better parking around Tesco and general reorganisation of car parking in the centre.	Noted, but much of the problem is associated with enforcement of existing controls and is not a development plan issue.
	77- Use CIL or S106 funding to provide facilities in village centre.	Noted.
	77 - criterion 3 amend to read "public" car parking provision	Not accepted. Policy intended to include private and public car parking
Liss 17 The Village Centre	SDNPA - Should include provision of open space in development in the centre.	Not accepted. Not realistic to provide useful open space within the centre, and not a priority for the centre.
	SDNPA - Should include provision of soft landscaping in development in the centre.	Accepted. Policy changed to include provision for soft landscaping in development.
	59 - Should include firm proposals to improve the village centre.	Noted. The plan allows for further work on the village centre.
	62 - Extra traffic in station road will cause chaos at the railway crossing	Noted. The Parish Council has raised the issue of

	and cause rat running down Andlers Ash Road.	congestion and delays caused by the level crossing with Network Rail but otherwise the issue is outside the scope of the plan.
	77 - start policy with "Within the Village Centre".	Not accepted. Intention of policy clear.
	86 - Concerned at congestion in the village centre. Need a zebra crossing for elderly residents (but where to put it), and why is the level crossing down so long compared to Petersfield?	Noted. The Parish Council has raised the issue of congestion and delays caused by the level crossing with Network Rail but otherwise the issue is outside the scope of the plan. Also, roads in Liss do not meet HCC criteria for provision of pedestrian crossings.
Liss 18 Shop Fronts	No comments received.	
Liss 19 Development Briefs	SDNPA - Supporting text should set out whether the development brief text is illustrative or mandatory.	Accepted. Supporting text changed.
	SDNPA - Clarify that delivery of the briefs will be through the determination and implementation of the application.	Accepted. Text changed.
	SDNPA - Para 3 is not a planning policy and should be in the text.	Not accepted. Planning policies are not there just to be used in the determination of individual applications but also to give wider guidance.
	HCC - Include a statement on energy efficiency and climate change (and suggests a wording).	Not accepted here. Statement included in design policy, which covers development briefs.
	Savills (Cala Homes) - Argue the wording of the development briefs should require development to be in General Conformity with the briefs.	Not accepted. Wording of briefs already allows for flexibility in their implementation and the term 'general conformity' is open to wide interpretation.

	77 - criterion 1 add at end "and other policies of this and other components of the development plan"	Not accepted. All policies relate to other policies in the development plan.
Liss 20 Infrastructure and developer contributions	SDNPA - Do not need this policy as it is covered by other mechanisms, but do recognise that need to show that this has been covered.	Not accepted. While existing mechanisms for ensuring contributions are acknowledged it is important to show the priority given to this.
	SDNPA - Remove text implying development should meet existing deficiencies.	Accepted. Text removed.
	Liss Athletic Junior Football Club - CIL money should be earmarked for improving existing pitches or provision of an all-weather pitch.	Noted. Policy Liss 14 on Community and Sports facilities recognises the need for provision of pitches.
	Southern Water- Suggest additional clause to support the provision of utility infrastructure in more general terms (wording suggested)	Not accepted. The proposal does not fit with the purpose of the policy and is a general point which is better provided for in the South Downs Local Plan.
	34 - Concern about pressure on schools and doctors (suggestion of combining practices on a new site, including NHS dentists), if not, better bus service.	Noted. The plan has been prepared after assurances that adequate provision can be made for schools, doctors, services and utilities.
	46 - Extend local schools for additional children.	- As above.
	48 - Concern over pressures on waste and recycling services.	- As above.
	56 - Concern over pressure on drainage, sewage, doctors, schools.	- As above.
	77- criterion 4 will the plan be used to inform priorities for spending CIL?	Yes.
	77- add to list in 4, biodiversity and tree planting	Not accepted. Too unspecific.

	82 - Concern with pressure on schools, doctors, drainage, etc.	Noted. The plan has been prepared after assurances that adequate provision can be made for schools, doctors, services and utilities.
	85 - Concern over pressures on schools and doctors.	- As above.
	91 - Services are overloaded (such as water and fuel).	- As above.
	96 - Overload on surgeries and schools.	- As above.
	109 - Overload on surgeries and shops. No infrastructure.	- As above.
DEVELOPMENT BRIEFS		
Land at Inwood Road	SDNPA - Layout and Design, bullet point 1, add predominately when referring to local materials.	Accepted. Change made.
	SDNPA - Layout and Design, bullet point 2, need to define low rise (is it single storey?).	Accepted. Change made.
	SDNPA - Layout and design, bullet point 3, Need define what provision is needed for the elderly. Adapted homes?	Not accepted. The form of provision is best left to the stage of seeking planning permission.
	SDNPA - Layout and design, bullet point 8, Statement on external lighting should reflect the emerging South Downs LP policy.	Accepted. Change made.
	SDNPA - Landscape and Open Space, bullet point 4, Need to clarify the form of open space (e.g. informal open space, Local Green Space, or sports provision).	Accepted. Change made.
	Boyer Planning (Wates) - assessment should have recognised past planning	Accepted. Change made to include a more explicit

	decisions refusing development on the site	reference to the planning history
	Southern Water - Need to protect a foul sewer which runs across the site (wording suggested).	Noted.
	19 - Want increased visual and security screening between the site and rear of former police houses.	Accepted. Change made.
	60 - Concerns over traffic at Chase Rd/Rake Rd junction. Need for a mini roundabout.	Noted, but additional traffic from the development will be limited, and this is a matter for the Highways Authority.
	88 - Used by children to play on.	Noted.
	88 - Access a problem.	Noted. The development brief requires adequate access to be provided.
	105 - Concerned about extra traffic on Chase Rd. Should consider an alternative access.	Noted, but additional traffic from the development will be limited, and this is a matter for the Highway Authority.
Land at Andlers Ash Road	SDNPA - Points 1 and 5 repeat the same point.	Not accepted. These are making different points.
	SDNPA - What further amenity site is required given the open space separating the two sites.	Accepted. Development Brief amended to clarify provision of open space.
	SDNPA - Point 4 Need to specify which site(s) provides housing for the elderly.	Accepted. wording amended to clarify which site.
	SDNPA - Should specify the route of the footpath to the schools.	Accepted. Site plan amended to indicate the route.
	Savills (Cala Homes) - Number of units should be a minimum of 35 homes each site or a minimum of 70 overall in order to ensure that sufficient housing is provided.	Partly accepted. Numbers amended in Policy Liss.

	Savills (Cala Homes) - Argue the wording of the development brief should require development to be in General Conformity with the brief.	Not accepted. Policy Liss 19 already requires this.
	Savills (Cala Homes) - Gap should be a visual gap and not public open space; particularly as open space is to be allocated within the developments.	Accepted. Development Brief amended to clarify provision of open space.
	Savills (Cala Homes) - Landscape buffer should be further to the south to provide flexibility of the developable area.	Not accepted.
	Savills (Cala Homes) - Greater flexibility in the size and types of dwellings provided on the site.	Not accepted. Importance of maintaining views and openness requires that development is limited to 2 storeys.
	Savills (Cala Homes) - The transition from urban form to countryside should comprise a flexible mix of sizes of units	Noted. Development brief allows for flexibility.
	Boyer Planning (Wates) - No natural barrier to eastern side so how does it get a low score on landscape impact?	Landscape impact is low because the development is limited to the lower part of the slope and views are maintained.
	20 - Need drainage to stop flooding at railway crossing and Woods.	Noted. Development will be required to provide Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems that should control runoff.
	20 - Railway crossing will require improvements.	Noted. Unlikely that the railway crossing can be changed.
	21 - Railway crossing a pinch point.	Noted. Unlikely that the railway crossing can be changed.

	21 - Need drainage to be dealt with.	Noted. Development will be required to provide Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems.
	22 - Need to improve Andlers Ash Road. Better control on station road crossing would help.	Noted. Unlikely that the railway crossing can be changed.
	23 - Property affected by 3c. Concern that concreting over tree nursery will increase runoff.	Development will be required to provide Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems that should control runoff.
	23 - Traffic calming essential on Andlers Ash.	Development brief proposes traffic calming.
	23 - Light pollution should not increase.	Noted. Development will have to conform to the National Park Dark Skies policy.
	24 - Must keep views through the development.	Accepted. Development brief seeks to maintain views.
	32 - Must slow down traffic on Andlers Ash.	Noted. Development Brief proposes traffic calming.
	39 - Access for new houses should not be directly onto the road.	Noted. The Development Brief proposes that access to the developments is from just two points on Andlers Ash Road.
	39 - consider safe footpaths for children walking to school	Noted. The Development Brief proposes a new footpath which would access the schools.
	43 - Need changes to Andlers Ash to accommodate traffic, Stodham Lane will be used as a short cut.	Noted. Development Brief proposes traffic calming.
	45 - Concern over loss of a green lung for Liss. One or both sites should be broken up or replaced by	Not accepted. Open Green Space is proposed along Andlers Ash Road.

	development in Hill Brow or top of Hatch Lane.	Development further up Hill Brow or Hatch Lane would have a significant on the landscape character of the National Park.
	47 - Proposal will destroy ambience of Andlers Ash Road and will only accentuate ribbon development that is already there (on other side).	Not accepted. Development Brief sets development back from Andlers Ash Road.
	49 - Andlers Ash Road cannot take more traffic, too narrow, too high speed.	Noted. Development Brief proposes traffic calming, but the capacity of the road is a matter for the highway authority.
	49 - Losing open land is criminal. Use wasteland behind Junior school (Inwood Rd?) and at Harris Caravans, and opposite Bluebell.	Noted. Land behind Inwood Road is proposed for development. Other sites have been assessed and rejected for residential development.
	51 - Need to improve Andlers Ash Road, including cycle paths, drainage and sight lines.	Noted. Development Brief proposes traffic calming and Development will be required to provide Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems.
	58 - Concern over extra traffic on Andlers Ash Road.	Noted. Development Brief proposes traffic calming.
	60 - Share concerns over traffic on Andlers Ash Road.	Noted. Development Brief proposes traffic calming.
	63 - Seventy houses is too many and houses do not need to be close to the centre. Better sites elsewhere	Not accepted. The majority view of the community appears to support the need for development to be accessible to the village centre. All sites put forward have been assessed and other sites did not meet the

		criteria as well as those at Andlers Ash.
	63 - Need a roundabout at junction of Andlers Ash Road and Hill Brow Road.	Noted, but a matter for the highway authority to consider.
	63 - Do not like loss of green areas and views.	Noted. Development Briefs seek to protect significant green space and views.
	66 - Development will close in the village.	Noted. Development Briefs seek to protect significant green space and views.
	66 - Even with mini roundabouts Andlers Ash will become a whizz way to the A3.	Not accepted. The strategy of the neighbourhood development plan spreads sites for residential development across Liss in part to avoid concentrating traffic in one place.
	75 - Cumbers. Should widen access.	Noted. A detailed design point to be considered with advice from the Highway Authority
	75 - Need a further roundabout opposite exit from new estate.	Accepted as providing potential access.
	75 - Green space between Cumbers and 1st line of trees must be retained to keep views.	Noted. Development brief seeks to maintain views.
	75 - New green space south of the two developments to prevent future development.	Not accepted. Local green space must be justified on the basis of the value of the green space to the community
	75 - ROW to the school through gap in the new hedge.	Accepted. Development Brief proposes a new ROW.

	76 - Concerned about surface water runoff.	Noted. Development will be required to provide Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems.
	77 - Why is site 3a not proposed?	Noted. Site makes a significant contribution to green space close to the village centre. A view supported by previous local plan decision.
	77 - Two sites should be treated together as one site in terms of what the developer can deliver.	Noted. A single developer for the two sites is likely.
	77 - Reposition open space so it is less divided by the single property it surrounds.	Accepted. Change made.
	77 - Access should be opposite Barnside Way with a mini roundabout.	Partly accepted. Wording amended but the proposal must be subject to the views of the Highway Authority.
	77 - Use street tree planting for traffic calming rather than more urban method such as speed bumps.	Accepted. Change made.
	77 - Should include more on biodiversity, including tangible benefits, with many specific suggestions.	Accepted. Biodiversity reference strengthened, but many of the suggestions too specific to include.
	77 - Landscaped boundary strip on southern boundary should be 10-15m.	Partially Accepted. Change made.
	77 - Need a strong permanent landscape boundary and wildlife corridor on the south side of the sites.	Accepted. Change made.
	77 - Tree planting should be included in the development.	Accepted. Change made.

	77 - Create a green corridor along footpath to Hill brow Road 77 - Pedestrian green links to Stodham Lane.	Not accepted. Outside control of development.
	77 - Is the open space within the sites part of or in addition to the local green space separating the sites?	Noted. Text amended to clarify that no open space is required in addition to the local green space.
	77 - How will views of the countryside from existing adjoining development be respected?	Noted. Development Brief provides for views to be maintained through the development.
	77 - Is there an illustrative layout?	The potential developer has provided a proposed concept, but this is not part of the plan.
	77 - Lighting should be kept to a minimum and turned off in the early hours.	Partly accepted. References to lighting strengthened.
	77 - Add a 15m gap between development and Antlers Ash Road.	Accepted.
	77 - Seek sensitive rural boundary treatments.	Noted. Plan provides for this.
	77 - Requiring two storey units on south side of Antlers Ash Road is too prescriptive.	Accepted wording is unclear. Change made.
	77 - Consider removal of permitted development rights to give greater control.	Not accepted. Needs a clear justification for removing rights.
	77 - Reference should be made to the Cumbers Farm buildings. 77 - Require "adequate " parking	Not accepted. Does not appear to add to the plan. Accepted. Change made
	77 - Strengthen references to dealing with existing drainage problems	Accepted. Change made.
	78 - Andlers Ash Road a busy road, why 70 houses?	Noted. Development Brief proposes traffic calming.

	82 - Would a road crossing be required along Andlers Ash Road?	Noted. Will be for the developer to consider with the Highway Authority.
	84 - Traffic from 70 houses will cause mayhem along Andlers Ash Road particularly at school times, and at junction of Andlers Ash Road/Hill Brow Road and outside the surgery.	Noted. Development Brief proposes traffic calming, but the capacity of the road and junctions is a matter for the Highway Authority.
	95 - Agreeing with the plan proposed at Cumbers (No 75).	Noted.
	97 - Put houses back from the road so there is space, and vary designs.	Noted. Development Brief proposes both of these characteristics.
	98 - Like to see a pedestrian crossing at junction of Andlers Ash Road/Hill Brow Road.	Noted. This a matter for the Highway Authority.
	101 - Support, but traffic calming along Andlers Ash essential.	Noted. Development Brief proposes traffic calming.
	101 - Drainage issue must be addressed.	Noted. Development will be required to provide Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems.
Land next to Upper Green	SDNPA - Include requirement to enhance and protect views from the ROW.	Accepted. Change made
	Boyer Planning (Wates) - Questions the evidence for the scoring of low impacts.	Noted, but not accepted.
	Boyer Planning (Wates) - No published site assessment.	Not accepted. Assessed at Site Selection Workshop on 27/8/15 and confirmed as a preferred site following site visit of SDNPA landscape officer on 14/12/15, published on neighbourhood plan website.

	Boyer Planning (Wates) - More remote from services and facilities in the village.	Not accepted. Although a reasonable distance from the village centre, the site is linked by a direct road and ROW which have only a gentle slope.
	Neame Sutton (Peter Sutton Homes) - Demonstrates how the site meets Basic Conditions and meets various other criteria.	Noted.
	Neame Sutton (Peter Sutton Homes) - Argues that site meets the requirements of the Liss Landscape Character Assessment.	Noted.
	Neame Sutton (Peter Sutton Homes) - Considers site within reasonable walking and cycling distance of facilities.	Noted.
	77 - What does "front and rear gardens are permitted" mean?	Accepted wording is unclear. Wording deleted.
Land next to Brows Farm	SDNPA - Concerned over allocation of Brows Farm, sees as an isolated site, detached from the form of the immediate area and no strong relationship with the surrounding built form. Also, impact on setting of the church and the views from the ROW. Suggest an alternative solution is found.	Noted. Further work undertaken to demonstrate the suitability of the site.
	SDNPA - Views need to be highlighted on the site plan.	Not accepted. Views highlighted on the policies map
	SDNPA - Bullet point 3 suggests the site is bounded by two storey detached buildings on the northeast, but this appears wrong.	Accepted. Wording changed to clarify position
	SDNPA - Considers 15 dwellings more appropriate.	Accepted. Number of dwellings changed.

	SDNPA - Refers to the focal point of St Marys Church but church is not clearly shown on the plan.	Accepted. Plan changed
	SDNPA - Position and scale of the village green should be shown on the site plan.	Accepted. Plan changed.
	SDNPA - Suggests adoption of a courtyard layout to give depth to the development at the eastern side, and therefore less development at the southern end.	Noted. Urban design work undertaken to demonstrate a suitable location.
	SDNPA - add predominately when referring to local materials.	Accepted. Wording changed
	SDNPA - Links to the ROW and improvements to the ROW. should be clearly identified on the plan to ensure that appropriate connections and improvements are made.	Accepted. Plan changed.
	Aecom EIA – improved wording over protection of long range views and views of the church.	Noted.
	Boyer Planning (Wates) - Site is visually prominent and within sight of viewpoints.	Not accepted. Layout of development is designed to minimise impact on views.
	Boyer Planning (Wates) - Impact on heritage.	Not accepted. Main heritage asset is St Marys Church and the layout of development is designed to minimise any impact.
	Boyer Planning (Wates) - scoring inconsistent and unjustified.	Not accepted, but further explanation provided of the site assessment criteria.
	Historic England - Need to consider impact of development on the setting of the Church (Grade II listed building).	Noted. Main heritage asset is St Marys Church and the layout of development is designed to minimise any impact.

	24 - Support strategy.	Noted.
	25 - Need to protect the view from ROW.	Noted. Layout of development is designed to minimise impact on views, including from the ROW.
	26 - Parking for St Marys to be provided close to the site?	No. Further work suggests the site is not suitable for providing parking beyond that required by the housing provided.
	74 - Must include effective drainage.	Accepted. Wording changed.
	74 - Ownership and responsibility of oak tree at no 7 to be clarified over drainage	Noted. Outside the scope of the plan.
	74 - Is it a traditional village green or a football pitch?	Noted. Purpose of the open area clarified.
	74 - Privacy of 6 and 7 Bishearne Gardens would be compromised.	Noted. Layout of development is designed to minimise impacts on adjoining development.
	74 - Need planting to ensure rural appearance.	Accepted. Wording added to require planting.
	74 - If gardens face the village green there should be no inappropriate fencing or outbuildings.	Accepted. Wording added to protect the setting of the open area.
	77 - What does "gardens facing south west are permitted" mean?	Accepted wording unclear. Wording deleted.
	97 - Save the view of the Church from the road by Brows Farm.	Accepted. Wording added to protect view.
	99 - Need flood protection from runoff down the slope.	Accepted. Wording added to clarify commitment to SUDS.

	102 - Concerned about protection of hedgehogs on the site (currently fed in his/her garden). 102 - Concerned over drainage. 102 - Wants protection of Oak Trees.	Noted. Commitment to protecting wildlife included in the development brief. Accepted. Wording added to clarify commitment to SUDS. Noted. Existing trees should be retained.
All Development Briefs	SDNPA - Refer to the SPA as a significant constraint that development must reflect. SDNPA - Include in Development Briefs where connections to informal open space are required. SDNPA - Specify what open space is required, in place of requirement in Policy 14. SDNPA - Include reference to Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan, and suggests a Text. SDNPA - Provide more detail, and sets out what is required. SDNPA - Add predominately when referring to local materials. SDNPA - Relevant development briefs should be more specific about flooding issues. 29 - all briefs should refer to alleviating surface runoff.	Accepted. Biodiversity policy included which clarified the significance of the SPA. Accepted. Development briefs amended to clarify relationship to open space. Accepted. Development briefs amended to clarify provision of open space. Not accepted. General reference to the Minerals and Waste Plan included in the introduction and not necessary within the development briefs. Accepted. More detail included in development briefs where needed. Accepted. Change made. Not accepted. Flooding does not affect any of the development sites, but briefs amended to be more specific about managing surface water. Accepted. Development briefs amended as appropriate.

	96 - al briefs should have proper access and parking and housing should be compatible with local historical design.	Noted. Development briefs amended to clarify access and parking. Design policy refers extensively to the local vernacular.
IMPLEMENTING AND MONITORING THE PLAN		
	77- Need to engage the community with the development of any of the sites, and keep them informed.	Noted. Will consider how to do that.
APPENDICES		
Local Green Space and Open Space	No comments received.	
Important views around Liss		
Listed buildings and those of local historic interest	Historic England. Need to provide more information about buildings of local historic interest in order to guide decisions.	Noted. Buildings of local historic interest are taken from Hampshire Treasures and the plan relies on guidance in that publication.
Important Community and Sports Facilities	No comments received.	
MAPS		
Neighbourhood Plan Area and important views		
Proposals Map	SDNPA - Should be called Policies Map and should include NP area, and all designations including Local Green Space. SDNPA - Show 75m contour.	Accepted. Changes made to maps. Noted, but no change made because of the difficulty of showing an accurate 75m level.
Environmental Map	SDNPA - Include SPA in Policies Map. SDNPA - Rights of way, quiet roads and sunken lanes do not have to be on the Policies Map, but desirable.	Accepted. Change made to map. Noted, but difficult to show quiet roads and sunken lanes as they have no clear definition and need to be tested in each case.

	HCC - Concerned at new footpath through the school.	Accepted. Footpath deleted.
All Maps	SDNPA - Refer to maps as appendices	Accepted. Contents, and names of maps changed
OTHER		
Exhibition	36 - Display confusing.	Noted.
Basic Conditions	Boyer Planning (Wates) - question whether the plan meets Basic Conditions.	Not agreed. See the assessment of the plan against Basic Conditions in supporting documents.
Biodiversity	SDNPA - References to the SPA as a significant constraint needed throughout the plan, inc. Development Briefs. 102 - Concerned about protection of hedgehogs on the site (currently fed in his/her garden).	Accepted. New policy on Biodiversity added, and changes made to the Development Briefs. All major developments will require biodiversity to be assessed before development can begin.
Hilliers Land Adjoining Station Rd	Savills (Cala Homes) - The SDNPA area on Kippences site should be considered as a reserve site, for 35 units 30 - Should consider this land instead of 4a or 5. 49 - Alternative site, opposite Bluebell.	Not accepted. Site assessed through the site selection process and rejected as not meeting the criteria. Not accepted. Site assessed through the site selection process and rejected as not meeting the criteria Not accepted. Site assessed through the site selection process and rejected as not meeting the criteria.
Land along Farnham Road	63 - Better sites along Farnham Road that will have less impact.	Unclear which sites are referred to.
Clarks Farm	Boyer Planning (Wates) - Promoting this site, particularly relying on landscape appraisal by HDA. Boyer Planning (Wates) - Appraises site against NP site selection criteria.	Noted. The site was reassessed against site selection criteria but was rejected as not meeting the criteria. Noted. but the Boyer Planning appraisal not accepted. It particularly fails to address issues of impact on landscape character of the National Park.

	Boyer Planning (Wates) - Responds to points in the SEA. 9 - Site should be included in the plan	Noted. Plan has taken account of points made in the SEA and HRA. Not accepted. The has been assessed against selection criteria on three occasions and has been rejected as not meeting criteria.
Rake Road site	RDW (Tudors) - Promotes the site, and state that SDNPA has no objection in principle to development on the site! - Refers to the Liss Landscape Character Assessment and the South Downs Integrated Landscape Assessment	Site reassessed again site selection criteria and rejected as not meeting the criteria.
Land at the Spread Eagle	Wilbraham Associates - Promotes site. In particular, argues that it is infill and therefore is better than sites that are an extension to the village	Site reassessed again site selection criteria and rejected as not meeting the criteria.
Liss Forest	66 - Why no developments in Liss Forest, particularly given other recent development there. 92 - Why no development in Liss Forest, which has a lower density.	Noted. Development would impact on important gaps and the Special Protection Area. Noted. Development would impact on important gaps and the Special Protection Area.
Hill Brow and top of Hatch Lane	45 - Hide development in the trees in these places. 92 - Why no development in Hill Brow?	Noted. Development would impact on the landscape character of the National Park. Noted. Development would impact on the landscape character of the National Park.
Harris Caravans	49 - Put forward as an alternative site.	Not accepted. Submitted out of time and does not appear to meet basic selection criteria
Land north of 10-acre field and south of Forest Rise	93 - Requesting deletion of protected gaps and local green space.	Not accepted. Site not covered by local green space designation, but Gaps

		designation slightly amended for greater clarity.
Allotments at Princes Bridge	94 - Alternative site, will cause less congestion in the village.	Not accepted. Submitted out of time and does not appear to meet basic selection criteria.
The SEA	Horsham DC (for SDNPA) - Suggests possible small changes and a section on monitoring the plan.	Response passed through to Aecom to consider.