

[REDACTED]

From: Chris Paterson
Sent: 31 March 2017 09:54
To: 'Robert Bryan'
Subject: FW: further comments on Liss NDP

Robert

After saying we had nothing else to send you, the Qualifying Body have sent me the attached and notes below. These are comments provided by myself and Veronica Craddock (our landscape officer). On the document you can see Veronicas comments (generally in red) which may be of interest. Veronica has also made some comments separate to the track changes in the text.

Im not sure whether this will be relevant to your examination but thought you would want to see it as it does include comments from the landscape officer

Kind regards
chris

Chris Paterson
Communities Lead
South Downs National Park Authority

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Sent: 29 March 2017 19:38
To: Chris Paterson
Subject: Fwd: further comments on Liss NDP

Dear Chris,

You asked about any further advice we had received from Roni in addition to the meeting note of December 2015. I attach the email below which you sent us and would appear to contain comments by Roni. In addition, I am sure Roni sent us a sketch map of how Browns Farm might be laid out, but I cannot find it, and it was fairly sparse.

Best wishes

Roger Hargreaves

----Original message----

[REDACTED]

Date : 11/02/2016 - 12:18 (GMTST)

[REDACTED]

Subject : further comments on Liss NDP

Morning all,

I have more comments on the Liss NDP, which I've set out below, these were late comments from officers at SDNPA, some we already covered at the meeting but I thought it might help if I put them in writing so you can circulate round the group. I have also attached the document with comments from the design officer (I have sent these to you before) and Roni's comments on landscape and design briefs. I spoke to Roni briefly yesterday and

she felt the reduction in number on Browns Farm was a sensible idea, so were looking forward to seeing the design brief on that one. PLEASE NOTE MY COMMENT IN BOLD TOWARDS THE END OF THIS EMAIL!

- Concern regarding the lack of a biodiversity policy, particularly as Liss has an SPA lying partially within the parish. This is a great opportunity to have a very Liss specific policy. You could use the SDNPA policy as a base and then amend/adjust to fit to the specific needs of Liss. For example our policy part 2 describes how proposals should have specific regard to ecological networks with potential for habitat restoration, perhaps you have some of these areas identified which you could refer to specifically. You can also use the part three as what you would expect to be submitted with any proposals which impact on any designations. It is important that any aspects of your biodiversity support your allocations. Also worth remembering that this policy will have an impact on any windfall or any potential rural exception sites which could come forward in Liss
- In the supporting text for biodiversity policy you may wish to refer to SANG (suitable alternative natural green space) to reduce recreation use of the SPA in Liss. There is no mention of SANG in the plan and im sure I heard mention of this at one of the steering group meetings.
- It may also be appropriate to mention SANG in the open space policy. As some of your Local Green Space designations may perform as SANG, and reduce pressure on the SPA. I don't think you need a specific policy on this but mention of the use of alternative natural green space to relieve pressure on the SPA would be a good way of demonstrating the importance you place on an appropriate provision of open space to protect the SPA
- Further narration is required on the process for choosing the development sites. For example you need to state clearly in the plan that Liss Forest is essentially off limits because of the SPA. You need to help the reader, and developers understand the challenge in finding land to allocate for housing, stating clearly the constraints you are working within, this would help to explain why the whole unmet need for housing cannot be delivered in Liss
- Useful to have a map showing the sites selected and the constraints in Liss, perhaps this could be in the housing policy and draw on the landscape policy, biodiversity policy to show the constraints and limitations to development, to help the examiner and public understand the challenge you have faced
- I continue to find the description of the built up area of the village confusing, it's a single village but gaps are important! I think it may be better to start with the importance of the separate elements of the village and the gaps between them but explain that all separate parts use the village centre and services and operate as one community. I wonder whether you might take the first four sentences of supporting text for policy 2 'liss is a village with one centre.....' and put this into the intro to the plan as it sets the scene for the village. Then the supporting text of policy two would only need to focus on the importance of the gaps, having already established that it is one village
- More thought given to the development briefs, particularly how they will contribute to the objectives and vision. For example the plan wants to provide more green infrastructure, provide better walking and cycling links to enable people to walk/cycle to the centre, but very little of this is reflected in the development briefs (soft landscaping, use of hedges to soften development edges and provide important wildlife corridors etc)!

I also had some points which are specific to policies

- Policy 6 supporting text mentions the management plan, this should be referred to as the South Downs Partnership Management Plan
- Policy 6 part 2. You mention that development should not impinge on 75m contour unless it can be hidden in tree cover, I assume this is to satisfy one of the sites above 75m, but it does have the potential to conflict with paragraph 5.19 of our local plan which states ' good design should avoid the need for screening' I don't think you are talking about screening here though?!
- I mentioned at our meeting to remove reference to the mini roundabout on andlers ash and refer to the need for traffic calming, and perhaps the scope for a shared space scheme in the future!
- And finally my concerns about andlers ash being split into two separate sites, the development brief says they must be developed as two high quality developments, indicating they need to be delivered separately, but that 3b cannot be delivered separately, I expect an examiner will say this is too prescriptive and the delivery should be left to the land owner / developer. In the Petersfield example the idea of phasing development was removed from their plan

I took one final read through and didn't pick anything else up you will be pleased to hear....**BUT I closed the the plan and noticed the picture on the front cover! This is taken from the VDS, and the description supporting it says**

Thus the settlements, which are largely confined below the 75 metre contour, are barely visible from the higher ground. From the Hangers to the west only East Hill House, St Mary's Church and the farm buildings in Andlers Ash Road are visible. From the Hill Brow ridge only St Mary's Church and Whitegates, close to the A3, can clearly be seen

Obviously you are proposing new development on that site, so that image / view will change as a result of your plan, so you may want to reconsider the picture on the front cover!

I hope this helps, im happy to discuss any of the points above if required

Cheers
chris

South Downs Centre
Chris Paterson
Communities Lead
South Downs National Park Authority



Become a South Downs food champion

Discover hundreds of local food and farm shops, restaurants, pubs and cafés, vineyards, breweries and food producers at southdownsfood.org

This email is confidential, may be legally privileged and/or contain personal views that are not the Authority's. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify us and delete the message from your system immediately. Under Data Protection and Freedom of Information legislation contents may be disclosed and the Authority reserves the right to monitor sent and received emails.