



Summary of Representations made on the Regulation 16. Submission version of the Petersfield Neighbourhood Plan.

1. This document provides a summary of the representations submitted in accordance with Regulation 16 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 to the Petersfield Neighbourhood Development Plan (PNP). This document is produced in compliance with the Neighbourhood Plan (Referendum) Regulations 2012.

2. The South Downs National Park Authority (SDNPA) published the PNP for consultation from 2 Feb to 16 March 2015 in accordance with Part 5 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012. Representations were submitted during the publicity period by 52 respondents. The representations were received from statutory consultees, developers and their agents, local residents, landowners, and other organisations.

3. Paper copies of the representations can be viewed on request at the South Downs Centre, North Street, Midhurst, West Sussex, GU29 9DH and Petersfield Town Council, Heath Rd, Petersfield GU31 4EA

4. Set out below is a summary of the issues raised in the representations.

Challenging the site selection process

5. A number of representors challenged the process by which the PNP group had selected the sites identified in the PNP. It was suggested in a number of representations that sites which had been included following the Pre Submission consultation had not been adequately tested prior to their inclusion. A number of representors also identified that some of the town centre sites were proposing less than 6 dwellings and therefore should be considered as windfall sites rather than allocations in the PNP. A number of representors stated that more town centre sites should have been included to fit with the PNPs objective to create a 'walkable town'. A number of representors stated that the majority of sites proposed in the PNP were not within walking distance of the town centre and therefore did not fit with the PNP objectives.

Strategic Environmental Assessment / Sustainability Appraisal

6. A number of representors have challenged the testing of reasonable alternatives in the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA). The representations suggested that the alternatives of 700, 768 or 2000 homes was not adequate and the testing of 2000 homes was never realistic for a Neighbourhood Plan in a National Park. One representation had suggested that a reasonable alternative of 1000 dwellings should have been tested through the SEA.

Phasing of development

7. A number of representors raised concerns relating to policy HP5 (Phasing of Development) suggesting that the policy was too restrictive and did not conform to

National Policy. One representor suggested that the timing of development should be linked to the provision of necessary infrastructure rather than being linked to phasing with no justification for the proposed phasing.

Affordable Housing

8. A number of representations raised concerns as to the amount of affordable housing being proposed in the PNP. Concerns were raised about the proportion of affordable housing being less than the necessary 40% of all housing due to the provision of a large amount of self-build dwellings proposed in the PNP which were exempt from affordable housing contributions.

9. A number of representors questioned why the PNP was not allocating only affordable housing as it was affordable housing that Petersfield needed. There were also a number of representations relating to the quality of affordable housing stating that the quality, design and size of affordable housing should be adequate for a family to remain in the property as their family grows and changes.

10. A number of representations had raised concerns about the wording of the affordable housing policy (HP6). The wording of the policy was unclear and did not express when affordable housing contributions would be required and whether those affordable housing contributions would be delivered on the development site or provided through a payment in lieu of delivering the affordable housing on site.

Self-Build Housing

12. A number of representations raised concern with the deliverability of 112 self-build units. The main concerns related to the quantum of self-build units proposed and how there could be any certainty that the units would be built within the life time of the plan.

13. A number of representors challenged the occupational criteria set out in policy HP7 (Custom and Self-build Dwellings) stating that the criteria were too restrictive and could result in the self-build units not coming forward in the life time of the plan. Their main concerns related to the criteria which required any prospective self-builder to live locally or work locally for a certain period of time before they can qualify for a self-build plot.

14. One representation challenged the evidence which supported the policy proposing sites for self or custom build properties. The representation suggested that the PNP had incorrectly assessed the level of demand for self-build properties in Petersfield.

Size of dwellings

15. A number of representors had raised concerns relating to Policy HP8 (Size of Dwellings). This policy set out a series of standards which were expected to be met in the development of all new houses. These standards included minimum dwelling size, car parking spaces and storage space standards. The representations raised concerns at these requirements being too prescriptive and not being in conformity with new technical standards which had been set out by Government.

Additional Sites

16. Some representations suggested other sites in addition to or instead of those allocated in the PNP, these representors also suggested appropriate amendments to the settlement policy boundary. The following representations promoted alternative sites to be included in the PNP:

Representation 9 (R9) promoted a site South of The Causeway for a care home. The representation recognised that the PNP had allocated land in the PNP for the purposes of a Continuing Care and Retirement Community but given the ageing population suggested that this would not be adequate to meet the needs of the ageing population in Petersfield. **This site was not allocated in the final PNP.**

Representation 14 (R14) proposed an extension to site H3 (Penns Field) to provide an increase in the number of dwellings delivered through the PNP. **This site was not allocated in the final PNP.**

Representation 31 (R31) proposed a small housing allocation in the area which had been identified by the PNP as a Local Green Space (Land East of Tilmore Road & Tilmore recreation area) **This site was not allocated in the final PNP.**

Representation 32 (R32) proposed the site to the rear of existing property 115 Sussex Road, to be developed for approximately 20 dwellings, the purpose of this request to ensure the PNP was able to deliver the necessary level of development to meet the minimum of 700 dwellings proposed by the East Hampshire Joint Core Strategy. **This site was not allocated in the final PNP.**

Representation 33 (R33) proposed the residential development of Paris House on Frenchmans Road. The representation challenges the deliverability of a number of sites in the PNP and puts forward Paris House for the development of 47 dwellings to ensure the PNP meets the basic conditions. **This site was not allocated in the final PNP.**

Representation 34 (R34) requested that the site on the corner of High Street and Dragon Street be allocated for the purposes of residential development. **This site was not allocated in the final PNP as it has been previously identified as an urban potential site in the East Hampshire Joint Core Strategy, therefore allocating the site again would be considered double counting.**

Site on the corner of Hylton Road and Dragon Street

17. This site had been proposed by the PNP for the purposes of residential development. A representation requested that this site be removed from the PNP as the site was currently being used as an active employment site. **The site was removed from the PNP.**

Land South of Durford Road (H8)

18. This site was proposed in the PNP for the purposes of a Continuing Care and Retirement Community. A representation requested that the approximate density and

indicative number of dwellings proposed by the PNP be removed as this type of requirement was inappropriate for a Continuing Care and Retirement Community.

19. A number of representations suggested that the allocation of a Continuing Care and Retirement Community at this location was inappropriate as the site was located some distance from the services and facilities in the town centre, a number of representations also suggested that this allocation would break the existing town boundary.

Petersfield Infant School site, Hylton Road

20. A number of representation were made which contested the re-development of the Petersfield Infant School site for mixed residential and retail use. Textual amendments were made to the plan as proposed by a representation from the PNP group, safeguarding the site for education provision in the plan period.

Development on the Causeway

21. A number of representations were submitted challenging the sites proposed for development which were in close proximity to the Causeway. The representations raised concerns regarding the increase in traffic on the Causeway, impact on the important wildlife and landscape in the local area and concerns about flooding at the Causeway Farm site. A number of representations also highlighted a previous appeal decision which had refused permission for a development proposal on this site.

Land North of Buckmore Farm (H2)

22. Representations were received which raised concerns regarding a proposed access onto Bell Hill from housing site H2, there were also concerns raised about this allocation and its potential impact on views from outside Petersfield.

Safeguarding Mineral areas and Mineral facilities

23. Representations were received which identified a number of proposed housing sites which would be in close proximity to safeguarded mineral sites and safeguarded mineral facilities. The representations recommended that additional text was included in the delivery considerations to ensure these areas and facilities were considered in any development proposals.

Community views ignored

24. A number of representations raised concerns that community views had not been considered in the allocation of specific sites in the PNP.

Support for the Plan

25. A number of representations stated their support for the PNP and highlighted the positive elements of the plan, particularly the delivery of self-build sites, improvements to sustainable transport links and the protection of important local green spaces and community facilities.

Design Frameworks

26. A number of representations challenged the design frameworks which are set out in section 12 of the PNP. Representors suggested that the design frameworks were too prescriptive and added unnecessary financial burden to the proposed sites.

Flooding issues

27. A number of representations highlighted concern about some of the allocated sites and their proximity to identified flood zones.

28. One representation had identified a number of allocated sites which were in close proximity to flood zones 2 and 3. The representation suggested more accurate drawing of the proposed site boundaries and some minor textual amendments to ensure flooding matters were considered in the submission of planning applications.