



South Downs National Park Authority

South Downs Local Plan

MAIN MODIFICATIONS REPORT

April 2019

Introduction – What is this document?

1. The South Downs Local Plan was submitted to the Secretary of State on 27 April 2018 and is now in its Examination phase. The Submission Local Plan was accompanied by a Consultation Statement, which met the requirements of Regulation 22 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) (as amended) Regulations 2012.
2. In November and December 2018, the examination Inspector, Brian Sims, conducted a series of examination hearings. On 9 January, Mr Sims issued a note to the South Downs National Park Authority (SDNPA) asking it to prepare a schedule of Main Modifications (MMs) to the Local Plan for public consultation. The Main Modifications Schedule was published on 1 February 2019 and comments on the MMs invited from examination participants and the public. The consultation ended on 28 March 2019.
3. This report provides a summary of issues raised through the consultation. It consists of a table which provides a summary of each issue arising from representations to each of the modifications. It highlights any issues raised by representors relating to soundness or legal compliance of the Plan, including with respect to the Duty to Co-operate, other legal matters and the Sustainability Appraisal. The last column in the table provides the responses of the SDNPA to the main issues raised.

Summary of issues raised by representations to the Main Modifications

MM / map / SA / HRA ref	Policy or part of Local Plan	People or bodies who made representations	Issue raised	SDNPA response
MM1	Introduction, para 1.10	Whaleback Ltd (R570)	<i>[Rep does not relate to MM1 but to Policies SD30 and SD31.]</i> Considers SD30 and SD31 to be unduly restrictive.	The purpose of the policies is to protect the supply of small and medium sized homes in the National Park. The use of the word 'approximately' provides some flexibility for implementation. No changes proposed.
MM1	Introduction, para 1.10	Mr Colin Harris (R590)	<i>[Rep does not relate to MM1 but to SD41.]</i> Objects to the cascade of uses in criterion g and considers affordable housing and open market housing should be deleted and replaced with community facilities.	The cascade has been considered carefully by the NPA and we think it provides a sensible approach to the re-use of redundant agricultural buildings. No changes proposed.
MM3	SD3 (1)	Upper Itchen Valley Society (R159) Various representors (R572, R573, R574, R575, R576, R577, R578, R579, R580, R581, R582, R583, R585, 586, R587)	Support MM3 as it makes the Plan more sound.	Support welcomed. No change to MM3.
MM3	SD3 (1)	Mr Martin Hendry (R243)	Suggests deletion of the word 'adverse' from the policy to bring it in to line with EIA development.	Replicating the EIA process to define major development would be confusing and not consistent with the NPPF. No change to MM3.
MM3	SD3 (1)	Cheriton Parish Council (R362) Mr David Pain (R372)	Supports MM3 and considers it should be considered as part of the current planning application for Boomtown.	Support welcomed. The current application is considered to be major development and so is being considered accordingly in line with the emerging Local Plan policy and the NPPF. No change to MM3.

MM / map / SA / HRA ref	Policy or part of Local Plan	People or bodies who made representations	Issue raised	SDNPA response
MM3	SD3 (1)	Goodwood Estate (R569)	The change is confusing and does not provide clarity to estates on major development.	MM3 provides clarification on an important issues. No change to MM3.
MM3 MM4	SD3 (1) & supporting text	Ventures Ltd (East Sussex) (R397)	Not all of the National Park is of high landscape value and so major development should be allowed in certain locations particularly on the fringes.	As discussed at the hearings, national policy affords the highest level of protection to all parts of the National Park as stated in the Examining Authority's Report on the Navitus Bay Wind Park (Core 15). No change to MM3.
MM4	SD3, supporting para 4.21	Upper Itchen Valley Society (R159) Various representors (R572, R573, R574, R575, R576, R577, R578, R579, R580, R581, R582, R583, R585, 586, R587)	Support MM4 as it makes the Plan more sound.	Support welcomed. No change to MM4.
MM4	SD3, supporting para 4.21	Cheriton Parish Council (R362), Mr David Pain (R372)	Supports MM4 and considers it should be considered as part of the current planning application for Boomtown.	Support welcomed. The current application is considered to be major development and so is being considered accordingly in line with the emerging Local Plan policy and the NPPF. No change to MM4.
MM6	SD9 (1)	Coldwaltham Meadow Conservation Group (R501)	Considers that the SDNPA has not applied the principle of MM6 as part of allocating SD64.	This comment is not about the proposed change as part of MM6 or any other Main Modification, rather it relates to Allocation Policy SD64. No change to MM6.
MM6 (HRA)	SD9 (1) & HRA	Coldwaltham Meadow Conservation Group (R501)	Although "the HRA report has been updated to clarify the extent to which the 2012 visitor survey has been relied upon; this was very little and was provided for context."	This comment is not about the proposed change as part of MM6, rather it relates to Allocation Policy SD64 and the HRA. No change to MM6.

MM / map / SA / HRA ref	Policy or part of Local Plan	People or bodies who made representations	Issue raised	SDNPA response
			(SDNPA Summary of issues, p.378), there is no evidence that any other more recent survey was used to evaluate impact pathways of recreational pressure on designated sites.	
MM6	SD9 (1)	Sussex Wildlife Trust (R591)	Supports the modification as this will help ensure that development positively contributes to the Authority's aspirations under purpose 1.	Support welcomed. No change.
MM7	SD9 (1) (a)	Sussex Wildlife Trust (R591)	Supports the modification as it future prods the policy in terms of the Government's commitments to mandatory net gains and changes in policy in the updated NPPF.	Support welcomed. No change.
MM8	SD9 (1)	Coldwaltham Meadow Conservation Group (R501)	Support the modification but consider this is not being applied with regard to SD64.	Support welcomed. Other comments related to SD64. No change.
MM8	SD9 (1)	Sussex Wildlife Trust (R591)	Supports the modification.	Support welcomed. No change.
MM9	SD9 (1)	Sussex Wildlife Trust (R591)	Supports the modification and its reference to the mitigation hierarchy as avoiding negative impacts through good design is key to meeting the objectives of the local plan and purposes of the National Park.	Support welcomed. No change.
MM10	SD9 (2) (d)	Sussex Wildlife Trust (R591)	Supports the modification.	Support welcomed. No change.
MM11	SD9 (2) (e)	Sussex Wildlife Trust (R591)	Propose minor tweak to the modification 'development proposals should take opportunities to contribute to and deliver on their aims and objectives of <u>relevant biodiversity strategies</u> where possible'.	SDNPA agrees that a further minor edit to the last sentence of criterion (2) (e) (i) would improve the clarity of the policy criterion. The following wording, as proposed by the Sussex Wildlife Trust, is considered appropriate

MM / map / SA / HRA ref	Policy or part of Local Plan	People or bodies who made representations	Issue raised	SDNPA response
				(proposed new text is <u>double underlined</u> , newly deleted text double crossed through): ...Development proposals should not prejudice the aims of BOA and should take opportunities to contribute and deliver on the their <u>the aims and objectives of the BOA of relevant biodiversity strategies</u> where possible.
MM12 (HRA)	SD10 (1)	Coldwaltham Meadow Conservation Group (R501)	Considers the HRA is flawed in its assessment of impact pathways for Policy SD64 upon the Mens SAC.	This comment is not about the proposed change as part of MM12 or any other main Modification, rather it relates to Allocation Policy SD64 and the HRA. No change to MM12.
MM14	SD10 (4)	East Hampshire District Council (R221)	Supports the modification.	Support welcomed. No change.
MM14	SD10 (4)	Sussex Wildlife Trust (R591)	Supports the modification.	Support welcomed. No change.
MM15	SD10 (5)	East Hampshire District Council (R221)	Supports the modification.	Support welcomed. No change.
MM15	SD10 (5)	Sussex Wildlife Trust (R591)	Supports the modification.	Support welcomed. No change.
MM18	New para to follow 5.102	Sussex Wildlife Trust (R591)	Supports this modifications as it brings the plan in line with the revised NPPF and provides clarity to developers as to how ancient woodland should be treated within development proposals.	Support welcomed. No change.
MM19	SD26 (3)	Stedham Sawmill Landowners (R242, R255, R329)	The cap on the number of residential units at 16 for the allocated site in Stedham is arbitrary and is not justified by evidence.	The housing figure for Stedham in Policy SD26 relates to the revised allocation site figure of

MM / map / SA / HRA ref	Policy or part of Local Plan	People or bodies who made representations	Issue raised	SDNPA response
				up to 16 dwellings. See SDNPA response to MM99.
MM19	SD26 (3)	Updated Findon Neighbourhood Plan Working Group (R334)	The housing provision for Findon as modified has no justification, as it is based on the assessed capacity of allocated sites, not on local housing need.	MM19 in relation to Findon (an adjustment of just 2 dwellings) is consequential to an amended housing allocation as set out in MM69. The figure has changed since preferred options stage, but has always responded to assessed capacity and the spatial strategy.
MM19	SD26 (3)	Coldwaltham Conservation Group (R501)	Object to the modified housing figure for Coldwaltham, as no modification to the Plan short of withdrawing allocation SD64 can make the Plan sound.	The modified figure for Coldwaltham in Policy SD26 is in accordance with the site allocation figure set out in Policy SD64.
MM19 (HRA)	SD26 (3) & HRA	Coldwaltham Meadow Conservation Group (R501)	The HRA should use the upper limit of the range for the allocation.	This comment is not about the proposed change as part of MM19 or any other main Modification, rather it relates to Allocation Policy SD64 and the HRA. The HRA, at the section cited (5.11.8) takes the mid-point for the allocation which is the same as the figure apportioned to the settlement of Coldwaltham. This was one of the basis that the difference between the upper and lower ends of the range would not materially affect the outcome of the HRA. No change to MM19.
MM22 MM23 MM25	SD30 (1) (a) SD31 (1) (a) SD31, supporting para 7.94	Genesis Planning (R594)	Main modifications in relation to SD30 and SD31 are overly restrictive and fail to have regard to the individual circumstances of each development proposal. The 30% limit is arbitrary. Inserting the word	The supporting text to SD30 (para 7.85) explains that the purposes of the policy are to reduce the loss of small homes in the National Park through replacement by substantially larger homes; and to demonstrate no increase

MM / map / SA / HRA ref	Policy or part of Local Plan	People or bodies who made representations	Issue raised	SDNPA response
			<p>“approximately” in SD30 creates more ambiguity. The expansion of larger dwellings should not be subject to the same policy restrictions as smaller dwellings; to do so unreasonably restricts individual families’ needs, and will force families to move away rather than staying in their extended homes. As set out in original representations, if a 30% limit is to apply, the policy should identify what constitutes a ‘small’ dwelling to which a % restriction should apply. A ‘small’ dwelling should be defined as one consisting of less than 90sqm (gross external floor area) with a curtilage no greater than 450sqm as existed on 18 December 2002. Wording should be reinstated that permits a large dwelling where clearly demonstrated that there is no harmful intrusive impact on the landscape, and that there is an enhancement in the appearance of the host dwelling and the existing site.</p>	<p>in the overall visual impact of the replacement dwellings. SD31 supporting text (para 7.92) explains similar reasons, with reference to Policy SD27: Mix of Homes. There is purposefully no policy distinction between small/medium and ‘large’ dwellings insofar as relates to the 30% limit. This is because whilst extensions on ‘large’ existing dwellings are not likely to impact on the existing supply of small/medium dwellings, they are more likely to have an adverse impact on character and appearance. Comments made relating to the specifics of this policy are noted, however it is a matter of judgement for the Authority to determine detailed wording; it is not considered that the issues raised are ‘soundness’ issues. The SDNPA does not propose to make further changes.</p>
MM24	SD31, supporting para 7.93	Mr & Mrs Cartwright (R592)	<p>The change to the baseline date for ‘existing dwelling’, as regards applying a 30% limit to future extensions, is unfair. It means that clients have found themselves in the invidious position of having purchased a dwelling, and devised a scheme for a 30% enlargement/replacement based on the Pre-submission Local Plan ‘baseline’ date of 1 April 2011, only to find that an extension constructed between 2002 and 2011 has</p>	<p>The base date for the ‘existing dwelling’ with regards extensions was carefully considered following pre-submission consultation, and reviewed in light of concern that the previously proposed date of 2011 allowed too much leeway for inappropriately large extensions in the National Park. The revised date of 18 December 2002 is appropriate as it is the date the National Park was first formally designated. The SDNPA notes that the Pre-</p>

MM / map / SA / HRA ref	Policy or part of Local Plan	People or bodies who made representations	Issue raised	SDNPA response
			kyboshed their dream home. The base date should revert back to the pre-submission stipulation of 1 April 2011.	submission Plan was still an emerging (not final) Plan, and planning practitioners using the Plan would have been fully aware of this.
MM32	SD40 (1) (a) (ii)	Cheriton Parish Council (R362) R.S. Hill & Sons (R589)	Support	Support welcomed. No change proposed.
MM33	SD40, supporting para 7.201	South Downs Land Managers (R195) CLA (R270)	Considers the supporting text to be unduly restrictive and not in line with the NPA's socio-economic duty.	Supporting text explains that existing buildings should be used to accommodate proposed diversification activities. It is a statement of fact that opportunities for diversification will be more limited where there are no available buildings already on site. No change proposed.
MM33	SD40, supporting para 7.201	Cheriton Parish Council (R362)	Support MM32 to MM35 and believe they should be taken into account in the consideration of the Matterley Bowl planning application.	Support welcomed. No change proposed.
MM33	SD40, supporting para 7.201	R.S. Hill & Sons (R589)	<i>[The representation actually relates to MM32, which it supports.]</i>	Support welcomed. No change proposed.
MM34	SD40, supporting para 7.202	South Downs Land Managers (R195) CLA (R270)	Considers the term 'in exceptional circumstances' is unduly restrictive and should be deleted.	The term follows on from the previous paragraph, which states that existing buildings should be re-used. Whilst understanding the need for farms to diversify, the SDNPA also wants to avoid the proliferation of buildings in the countryside. No change proposed.
MM34	SD40, supporting para 7.202	Historic England (R136)	Welcomes the new reference to Historic England's Farmstead Assessment Framework.	Support welcomed.

MM / map / SA / HRA ref	Policy or part of Local Plan	People or bodies who made representations	Issue raised	SDNPA response
MM34	SD40, supporting para 7.202	Cheriton Parish Council (R362)	Supports MM32 to MM35 and thinks they should be taken into account in the consideration of the Matterley Bowl planning application.	Support welcomed. No change proposed.
MM34	SD40, supporting para 7.202	R.S. Hill & Sons (R589)	Support.	Support welcomed. No change proposed.
MM35	SD40, new footnote to 7.202	Historic England (R195)	Welcomes the new reference to Historic England's Farmstead Assessment Framework.	Support welcomed.
MM35	SD40, new footnote to 7.202	Cheriton Parish Council (R362)	Supports MM32 to MM35 and thinks they should be taken into account in the consideration of the Matterley Bowl planning application.	Support welcomed. No change proposed.
MM35	SD40, new footnote to 7.202	R.S. Hill & Sons (R589)	Support.	Support welcomed. No change proposed.
MM36	SD41 (1) (c)	Genesis Town Planning Ltd (R594) R.S. Hill & Sons (R589)	Concerned that the MM is not consistent with paragraph 79 of NPPF18. Suggests alternative wording so that the policy would relate to all rural buildings rather than just agricultural or forestry buildings.	'An environment shaped by farming and embracing new enterprise' is one of the National Park's special qualities. The SDNPA therefore thinks it appropriate that this policy relates solely to redundant agricultural and forestry buildings. Paragraph 79 of NPPF18 relates to the development of isolated homes in the countryside. As the national and local policies address different matters, the SDNPA does not consider them to be inconsistent with each other. No change proposed.

MM / map / SA / HRA ref	Policy or part of Local Plan	People or bodies who made representations	Issue raised	SDNPA response
MM37	SD41 (I) (g)	Speer Dade Planning Consultants (R584) Genesis Town Planning Ltd (R594), R.S. Hill & Sons (R589)	Concerned that the modification is not consistent with paragraph 79 of NPPF18. Suggests alternative wording so that the cascade is removed and the policy allows conversion to an appropriate use.	Paragraph 79 of NPPF18 relates to the development of isolated homes in the countryside. As the national and local polices address different matters the SDNPA does not consider them to be inconsistent with each other. The cascade prioritises uses that are the most suitable for redundant agricultural buildings in line with its socio-economic duty. Paragraph 7.213 addresses the issue of viability, and says that if conversion to the uses higher up the cascade is not viable or achievable that other uses will be considered in order of preference. No change proposed.
MM37	SD41(I) (g)	Genesis Town Planning Ltd (R594) R.S. Hill & Sons (R589)	Considers that the SDNPA has not fully taken into account viability in the formulation of the cascade.	Paragraph 7.213 addresses the issue of viability, and says that if conversion to the uses higher up the cascade is not viable or achievable that other uses will be considered in order of preference. No change proposed.
MM38	SD41, new supporting para to follow 7.208	Sussex Wildlife Trust (R591)	Strong support	Support welcomed. No change proposed.
MM39	SD41, supporting para 7.213	Genesis Town Planning Ltd (R594)	Objects to the cascade of alternative uses set in Policy SD41.I.g. Considers it to be inconsistent with NPPF, that no special circumstances justify this approach and demonstrates a lack of understanding of the development process. In particular, open	Paragraph 79 of NPPF18 relates to the development of isolated homes in the countryside. As the national and local polices address different matters, the SDNPA does not consider them to be inconsistent with each other. The cascade prioritises uses that are the most suitable for redundant

MM / map / SA / HRA ref	Policy or part of Local Plan	People or bodies who made representations	Issue raised	SDNPA response
			market housing should not be seen as a last resort.	agricultural buildings in line with its socio-economic duty. Paragraph 7.213 does allow some flexibility in the application of the cascade. It also explains why residential conversion is often not a desirable alternative use for redundant agricultural buildings. No change proposed.
MM39	SD41, supporting para 7.213	R.S. Hill & Sons (R589)	Disagrees that residential conversion results in a high degree of change and intervention to the detriment of agricultural character. Thinks this is not consistent with the policy that allows market housing and also with the NPPF paragraph 79.	It is the experience of the SDNPA, having dealt with many planning applications for conversion from agricultural use to residential use, that such changes do result in a high degree of change and intervention. The SDNPA has balanced this knowledge with other policy drivers to identify an appropriate cascade. Paragraph 79 of the NPPF relates to the development of isolated homes in the countryside. As the national and local policies address different matters, the SDNPA does not consider them to be inconsistent with each other. No change proposed.
MM40	SD41, new supporting para's to follow 7.215	Genesis Town Planning Ltd (R594)	Objects to the cascade of alternative uses set in Policy SD41 (l) (g). Considers it to be inconsistent with NPPF, that no special circumstances justify this approach and demonstrates a lack of understanding of the development process. In particular, open market housing should not be seen as a last resort.	Paragraph 79 of NPPF18 relates to the development of isolated homes in the countryside. As the national and local policies address different matters, the SDNPA does not consider them to be inconsistent with each other. The cascade prioritises uses that the NPA think are most suitable for redundant agricultural buildings in line with its socio-economic duty. Paragraph 7.213 does allow some flexibility in the application of the

MM / map / SA / HRA ref	Policy or part of Local Plan	People or bodies who made representations	Issue raised	SDNPA response
				cascade. It also explains why residential conversion is often not a desirable alternative use for redundant agricultural buildings. No change proposed.
MM40	SD41, new supporting para's to follow 7.215	R.S. Hill & Sons (R589)	Disagrees that residential conversion results in a high degree of change and intervention to the detriment of agricultural character. Thinks this is not consistent with the policy that allows market housing and also with the NPPF paragraph 79.	It is the experience of the SDNPA, having dealt with many planning applications for conversion from agricultural use to residential use, that such changes do result in a high degree of change and intervention. The SDNPA has balanced this knowledge with other policy drivers to come up with the cascade. Paragraph 79 of the NPPF relates to the development of isolated homes in the countryside. As the national and local policies address different matters the NPA does not consider them to be inconsistent with each other. No change proposed.
MM41	SD35, supporting para 7.141	Cheriton Parish Council (R362)	Suggests a MM to SD35 that all increases in traffic related to an increase in employment should be incur a CIL charge to pay for mitigation measures to address adverse impacts of the increased traffic.	MM41 simply provides clarity on what is meant by employment. Although new employment floorspace is CIL liable, the current rate on the SDNPA charging schedule is zero. Criterion 2 of SD35 addresses increases in traffic resulting from changes of use from B2 to B8.

MM / map / SA / HRA ref	Policy or part of Local Plan	People or bodies who made representations	Issue raised	SDNPA response
MM45	SD48 (2)	Andrew Swayne (R425)	Considers the water target (for residential development) of 110 litres/person/day is not low enough and contrasts poorly with the targets apparently proposed by Southern Water and being considered by the Greater Brighton Infrastructure Board of 100 litres and 80 litres for 2040 and 2050 respectively. These should be the targets in the local plan.	Disagree. Currently the Government will not let Local Planning Authorities set targets lower than the optional 110 litres. 2040 and 2050 are well beyond the local plan period. If the Government restrictions ease and the national park was minded to toughen up the water target, the SDNPA could revisit when the Local Plan is next reviewed. No change proposed.
MM46	SD56 (2) (b)	Mr Steve Dudman (R225)	Concerned about the omission of B1 use class. Criteria 2(b) should be amended to include all business uses, i.e. "... B2 and B8 Business uses to support the local economy...."	As set out in Section 7f Employment of the Plan and the supporting ELR and HEDNA, the evidence indicates that B1 office need within the National Park is deliverable on sites across the National Park, particularly in the market towns. Shoreham Cement Works is an out of town location and therefore not a sequentially suitable location for new offices. Out of town offices would also generate unacceptably high levels of traffic. Shoreham Cement Works site could provide limited additional supply for B2 and B8 employment uses. No change proposed.
MM46	SD56 (2) (c)	Mr Steve Dudman (R225)	Fundamentally disagree with reference to residential uses being a 'subordinate land use' and that the deletion of 'further types of development' unintentionally restricts the delivery of any other types of uses not already specified within the policy. Therefore suggests criterion 2 (c) is amended to "Further types of development	Acknowledge current wording of main modification could be interpreted to exclude other enabling uses, therefore SDNPA proposes further minor edit to Main Modification Criteria 2 (c) to reinstate 'further types of development'. Suggest the wording for Criteria 2 (c) as modified by MM46 is

MM / map / SA / HRA ref	Policy or part of Local Plan	People or bodies who made representations	Issue raised	SDNPA response
			<p><u>that would enable the environmentally-led restoration of the site, including where necessary to enable appropriate development in accordance with the above land uses, new homes (including affordable homes) as a subordinate land use of part of the overall mix of uses.”</u></p> <p><i>[On a wider point regarding SD56, ECE Planning on behalf of Mr Dudman has put forward a further alternative ('Option C') based on the SDNPA 'Option B'. This is provided as Appendix B to Mr Dudman's representation to the Main Modifications.]</i></p>	<p>deleted and replaced as follows (proposed new text is <u>double underlined</u>):</p> <p>e) Further types of development that would enable the environmentally-led restoration of the site, Where necessary to enable appropriate development in accordance with the above land uses, new homes, including affordable homes, as a subordinate land use of the overall mix of uses.</p> <p><u>c) Further types of development, including new homes (including affordable homes), where necessary to enable development. Such types of development should be a subordinate land use to the overall mix of uses proposed.</u></p> <p>SDNPA has noted wider comments on SD56, however we do not propose any further modifications further to the above.</p>
MM46	SD56 (2) (c)	Sussex Wildlife Trust (R591)	SWT is concerned about the deliverability of sustainable development at this location that includes residential homes, given lack of sustainable transport options and traffic congestion which makes effectiveness of this modification questionable. Will only support this policy if the modification is upheld.	Comments noted, which state support for the main modification despite wider reservations.
MM51	SD60 (1)	Sussex Wildlife Trust (R591)	Object to the removal of criterion I(c) – 'existing mature trees and hedgerows to be retained' – as we do not consider that this is	The modification is essentially housekeeping to ensure a concise policy. It also reflects that mature non-native tree/hedgerow species

MM / map / SA / HRA ref	Policy or part of Local Plan	People or bodies who made representations	Issue raised	SDNPA response
			a duplication of 2a. If 1(c) is not reinstated, 2(a) should be amended to refer to 'protect and enhance trees <u>and hedgerows</u> '.	located on the very edge of the site would most likely not be appropriate to retain. The requirement to 'enhance' as set out in 2(a) is therefore more appropriate.
MM52 MM53 MM54 MM55 MM56 MM57 MM58 MM59 MM60	SD64 & supporting text	Sussex Wildlife Trust (R591)	Maintains objection to allocation but agrees with the proposed MM52-60	Support welcomed. No changes proposed
MM52	SD64, new para to follow 9.48	Coldwaltham Meadow Conservation Group (R501)	Disagrees that it is possible to maximise existing habitats and species or design around existing biodiversity value due to the loss of land to development and the use of some of the residual land for recreational purposes. Considers that the development would prevent Barbastelle bats from foraging on the site and will cause recreational disturbance to the adjacent SSSI. The site is an inappropriate site for development as it is a rare flower-rich meadow.	The Outline Meadow Management Plan (OMMP) (SS09b) and the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (SS09a) explain how net biodiversity gain can be achieved on the site. For example, the residual land will be kept under traditional meadow management, the restored hedgerows will provide nesting for birds, invertebrates and reptiles and new plant species with long corollas will provide nectar sources for bumble bees and hawk moths. The OMMP closes down informal access to the SSSI. The improved hedgerows will provide foraging for bats. It is incorrect to refer to the land as a meadow; it is a 'semi-

MM / map / SA / HRA ref	Policy or part of Local Plan	People or bodies who made representations	Issue raised	SDNPA response
				improved grassland' rather than 'unimproved neutral grassland.' No change proposed.
MM53	SD64 (1)	Coldwaltham Meadow Conservation Group (R501)	The new footpath and shop will increase recreational disturbance on the adjacent international sites. The proposed measures will be ineffective in preventing this.	No new footpath is proposed as part of the scheme. The OMMP closes down informal access to the SSSI and international designations beyond. The potential solutions listed are well established measures which are employed nationwide to address recreational pressure. These measures are appropriate for the nature and scale of the development proposed at this location.
MM55 (HRA)	SD64 (2) (a) & HRA	Coldwaltham Meadow Conservation Group (R501)	This modification will not be achievable as the possible solutions listed in the HRA are not effective.	Disagree. The potential solutions listed are well established measures which are employed nationwide to address recreational pressure. These measures are appropriate for the nature and scale of the development proposed at this location. The role of the monitoring appears to be misunderstood. The monitoring is to identify that the expected trends do occur. If there is a sign that this is not occurring within the 10 year period then additional interventions can be undertaken. No change proposed.
MM56	SD64, new criterion	Coldwaltham Meadow Conservation Group (R501)	Disagrees that it is possible to maximise existing habitats and species or design around existing biodiversity value due to the loss of land to development and the use of some of the residual land for recreational purposes. Considers that the development would prevent Barbastelle bats from foraging	The Outline Meadow Management Plan (OMMP) (SS09b) and the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (SS09a) explain how net biodiversity gain can be achieved on the site. For example, the residual land will be kept under traditional meadow management, the restored hedgerows will provide nesting for

MM / map / SA / HRA ref	Policy or part of Local Plan	People or bodies who made representations	Issue raised	SDNPA response
			on the site and will cause recreational disturbance to the adjacent SSSI. The site is an inappropriate site for development as it is a rare flower-rich meadow.	birds, invertebrates and reptiles and new plant species with long corollas will provide nectar sources for bumble bees and hawk moths. The OMMP closes down informal access to the SSSI. The improved hedgerows will provide foraging for bats. It is incorrect to refer to the land as a meadow; it is a 'semi-improved grassland' rather than 'unimproved neutral grassland.' No change proposed.
MM57 (SA)	SD64 (2) (c)	Coldwaltham Meadow Conservation Group (R501)	<p>Concerns that the assessment of this modification in the SA is incorrect because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The approach to the residual area is still recreation-led - The residual area of the allocation will not provide an alternative to dog walking - Significant impact on existing residents' health and wellbeing 	Disagree, MM57 does change the focus from recreation-led to biodiversity-led with regard to the residual area. As set out in the OMMP, a significant part of the residual area is to be closed off for recreation use to ensure the necessary biodiversity protection. The open space element is not intended to be an alternative to longer walks, but will provided an alternative for shorter quick walks. With regard to health and wellbeing, development of the site does not represent loss of the field, in fact much of the site is to be retained and enhanced for its biodiversity value. Criteria (b) of this policy, plus the requirements of SD5 and SD6, require a landscape-led approach including views. No change proposed.
MM58	SD64 (2) (e)	Coldwaltham Meadow Conservation Group (R501)	The intention to provide adequate car parking on-site and the creation of a new footpath will increase recreational pressure on the site and adjacent international nature designations.	The deletion of the additional car parking means that non-residents are much less likely to drive to the site in order to walk their dogs. No new footpath is proposed as part of the scheme. The OMMP closes down

MM / map / SA / HRA ref	Policy or part of Local Plan	People or bodies who made representations	Issue raised	SDNPA response
				informal access to the SSSI and international designations beyond. The potential solutions listed are well established measures which are employed nationwide to address recreational pressure. These measures are appropriate for the nature and scale of the development proposed at this location. No change proposed.
MM60	SD64, new criterion	Coldwaltham Meadow Conservation Group (R501)	The Development Brief is not consistent with the OMMP. The scale, form and massing of the proposed homes will have a negative impact on the landscape.	The Development Brief for this site was subject to a separate public consultation. Criterion (2) (b) of the policy requires the planning application to be informed by a comprehensive landscape and design strategy to ensure a suitable transition from the developable area to the countryside. The Development Brief provides design principles for the site, for example, paragraph 36 requires significant gaps between buildings in order to retain views from the A29 across the Arun Valley to the Downs beyond. The allocation provides the opportunity to improve the current poor quality settlement edge.
MM69	SD71 (1)	Updated Findon Neighbourhood Plan Working Group (R334)	The slight reduction in dwelling numbers from 15-20 to 14-18 still represents too high a density of development for the site. This number fails to reflect the prevailing character of low density housing with large gardens. The number of dwellings should be	The SDNPA considers that the main modification to the estimated site capacity is appropriate, taking into account previous representations. Proposals will be required to comply with other policies in the Local Plan, to ensure a landscape-led approach is taken.

MM / map / SA / HRA ref	Policy or part of Local Plan	People or bodies who made representations	Issue raised	SDNPA response
			reduced to 6-8, or the policy should be struck through.	
MM70	SD73 (2) (a) Petersfield Road, Greatham	Cove Construction Ltd (R126)	The proposed modification is not sound as it is not adequately evidenced or required to make the Plan sound.	Disagree. The modifications proposed are necessary to reflect work undertaken by the SDNPA balancing the number of residential dwellings proposed with the landscape sensitivities to make the most appropriate use of the site.
MM71	SD73 (2) (h) Petersfield Road, Greatham	Cove Construction Ltd (R126)	The proposed modification is not sound as it is not adequately evidenced or required to make the Plan sound.	Disagree. The modifications proposed are necessary to reflect work undertaken by the SDNPA balancing the number of residential dwellings proposed with the landscape sensitivities to make the most appropriate use of the site.
MM76	SD77: Castelmer Fruit Farm, Kingston near Lewes	Various (R398, R30, R382, R383, R491)	Revisions to policy do not address the questionable deliverability of the site. Issues of site capacity and access have not been resolved. The allocation should be removed.	Disagree. The SoCG between the prospective developer and the SDNPA states that in principle suitable access to the site can be achieved (Core Document Library Ref SS11). This is supported by the report prepared by Hampshire County Council's (HCC) Engineering Consultancy set out in the Site Allocations Highways Assessment Report Update March 2018 (Core Document Library Ref SS 04a). The SoCG also demonstrates the willingness and support of the prospective developer such that development is expected to be delivered in the short to medium term.

MM / map / SA / HRA ref	Policy or part of Local Plan	People or bodies who made representations	Issue raised	SDNPA response
MM76	SD77 (1)	Fiona Mostyn (R398)	Seeking an off-site link to existing Public Right of Way would infringe on privacy of residents living adjacent to the site.	The concerns raised are noted, however it is considered that the proposed public access and connections to existing PRoW will provide wider public benefits by better connecting Kingston village with Lewes which is only approximately 2 miles away.
MM76	SD77 (1)	Kingston Parish Council (R383) Various (R80, R30, R197)	There is no evidence the allocation can be delivered, therefore alternative omission sites should be considered to meet SD26 housing requirement in Kingston.	Disagree. The SoCG between the prospective developer and the SDNPA states that in principle suitable access to the site can be achieved (Core Document Library Ref SS11). This is supported by the report prepared by Hampshire County Council's (HCC) Engineering Consultancy set out in the Site Allocations Highways Assessment Report Update March 2018 (Core Document Library Ref SS 04a). The SoCG also demonstrates the willingness and support of the prospective developer such that development is expected to be delivered in the short to medium term.
MM76	SD77 (1)	Kingston Parish Council (R197)	Should the site capacity prove to be less than 11 new homes, the affordable housing objective of the Local Plan will not be met.	Disagree. SD28 has a sliding scale to ensure a proportion of affordable homes is delivered on sites with a gross capacity to provide between 3 and 10 homes. The final quantum of development will be established through the planning application.
MM80	SD79 (5) (k)	Friends of Lewes (R71)	Disagree with modification – requirement owing to floor risk and provision of essential protection for adjoining conservation area.	Disagree. It is considered that the definition of the developable area for development is better determined through the approval of the Design Brief and the application process. No further evidence has been presented to

MM / map / SA / HRA ref	Policy or part of Local Plan	People or bodies who made representations	Issue raised	SDNPA response
			Still consider whole of policy SD79 should be deleted on landscape grounds.	demonstrate that the allocation should be omitted and there are sufficient criteria to ensure a development of high quality, which take consideration of the landscape sensitivities associated with the site.
MM89	SD89, supporting para 9.199	Pulens Lane Residents Action Group (R52)	The MM is contradictory in allowing development of the site including provision of recreational access to an area that is environmentally and ecologically sensitive. The Allocation should be deleted.	Disagree. The SD 89 Site Allocation fits within the overall spatial strategy for housing sites. The amendments to SD89 relating to the Development Brief set out the framework for balancing development of the site with the need for environmental improvements.
MM89 MM90	SD89 (1) & supporting text	Troy Planning + Design (R251)	Disagree that the modifications proposed are required to make the Plan sound. The original text proposed for the Site Allocation should be retained i.e. 30 to 32 residential dwellings and no amendments to the site boundary. The proposed settlement boundary has the potential to unduly restrict development option testing through the masterplanning process and digresses from the settlement boundary methodology.	Disagree. The reduction in the number of dwellings and the changes to the site boundary reflect the detailed design work undertaken for the Development Brief as the discussed at the Hearings.
MM90	SD89 (1)	Pulens Lane Residents Action Group (R52)	The allocation does not adequately address the issue of site access and an application for 5 dwellings on this site was previously refused. The Allocation should be deleted.	Disagree. An application for 5 dwellings was refused on design grounds and not due to the suitability of the site access. The current applicant has secured additional land which the highway authority has indicated could support development of more than 10 dwellings. Additional land acquisition is possible to make an access suitable for the number of dwellings

MM / map / SA / HRA ref	Policy or part of Local Plan	People or bodies who made representations	Issue raised	SDNPA response
				proposed in the revised allocation (15 to 18 dwellings).
MM91	SD89, new criterion	Pulens Lane Residents Action Group (R52)	The allocation does not adequately address access issues or the potential impact on the environment.	Disagree. As set out in relation to MM89 and MM90, the SDNPA has set out how an access could be achieved to serve the site. The Development Brief and modifications to SD89 set out how development on the site needs to address environmental and landscape issues. The Site Allocation is subject to all policies in the Local Plan.
MM92 & MM93	SD90 (1) (d) & allocation plan	Dr Geoff & Rosalind Prosser (R75) Rupert Grey (R158)	<i>[In relation to deleted former MM56 concerning access to the site]</i> The reversion to the original wording in SD90 1(a) reinstates a single access arrangement to the site. This would damage the landscape and amenity value and character of a historic road that provides pedestrian access from South Harting to the South Downs, and may be hazardous due to gradient. The feasibility of providing a single access within the site is also questionable. However, any new access road, whether multiple or single, will have a detrimental impact on New Lane and also impact upon South Acre with respect to traffic levels, safety and parking.	The reversion to the original pre-submission text for SD90 1(a) was requested by the Inspector, as set out in Inspector note INSP.16. The Inspector has stated his reason as being to <i>minimise the number of entrances onto New Lane and protect the existing hedge bank.</i>
MM94 MM95 MM99	SD92 & supporting text	Stedham Sawmill Landowners (R242, R255, R329)	The creation of on-site heathland habitat and keeping 0.35 hectares of the southern part of the site free of development is unlikely to be an effective mitigation strategy, and is	The amendment to the settlement boundary shown on the allocation plan, and changes to Policy SD92 and supporting text restricting development to the northern part of the site,

MM / map / SA / HRA ref	Policy or part of Local Plan	People or bodies who made representations	Issue raised	SDNPA response
MM101 MM102 MM103 (Policy map)			<p>unsound. The area of biodiversity enhancements area as shown on the MM103 plan is arbitrary. No evidence has been put forward by SDNPA, such as masterplanning or survey work, to substantiate the location or effective function of the biodiversity enhancements area. An alternative proposal is set out in the Outline Ecology and Mitigation Strategy which is attached to this representation. The site allocation plan as included in the September 2017 Pre-Submission Local Plan (Examination document reference SDLP 01) should remain unchanged, with the whole of the site being allocated for development purposes and the arrangement of new homes and green space being determined at a later stage following further detailed studies and discussion. The quantum and location of land on-site for green infrastructure/ biodiversity enhancement is best determined at planning application stage.</p>	<p>were made in response to significant concerns expressed by Natural England. A Statement of Common Ground with Natural England confirms that their concerns have been addressed by the proposed modifications (see SoGG 19 in the Core Document library). Keeping the southern portion development-free is considered to create an appropriate buffer between the developed area and the SSSI. It also focusses development and movement towards School Lane, and maintains a cohesive settlement pattern, avoiding development creeping too far towards the A272.</p>
MM94 MM95 MM96 MM97 MM98 MM99 MM100	SD92 & supporting text	Sussex Wildlife Trust (R591)	<p>Support modifications in terms of protection of Iping Common SSSI and opportunities for heathland creation. Concern that the allocation is prescriptive in terms of where the different elements of the development are situated. Placement of biodiversity enhancements should be based on up to date ecological information in order to avoid</p>	<p>The Wildlife Trust's comments are noted. Reference should be made to SDNPA's response to the Stedham Sawmill Landowners shown above. Policy SD92 as modified, and in particular criteria 2(a), 2(d) and 3(a) will ensure the detailed scheme design protects and enhances biodiversity both on- and off-site, particularly in respect of the SSSI. Paragraph 9.223 requires that development is</p>

MM / map / SA / HRA ref	Policy or part of Local Plan	People or bodies who made representations	Issue raised	SDNPA response
MM101 MM102 MM103			adverse impacts and make the most of opportunities for enhancements.	informed by an Ecology Assessment including a Protected Species Survey. No further changes are proposed.
MM99	SD92 (1)	Stedham Sawmill Landowners (R242, R255, R329)	The landowners call for a more flexible policy approach to support the early delivery of a comprehensive and integrated development for the site as a whole. Object to any reference to employment development, given there has been a robust marketing campaign for well over the 12 months required in Policy SD35 and Appendix 3 of the submission Local Plan, and in light of the site having had permission for BI employment for the last 35 years which has never been taken up. Attached to these representations is a Marketing Report prepared by national agent Lambert Smith Hampton (LSH) that demonstrates that there is no reasonable prospect of the site being used for employment purposes.	The Submission Local Plan had allocated a higher figure of a maximum of 3,000 sqm; the main modification proposed reduces this to approximately 1,500 sqm. The supporting text as modified states that this could include live-work units and small workshops that are compatible and can be integrated with residential units. The SDNPA maintains its view that allocation of some small-scale employment at this site is appropriate, given its historic use for employment purposes, and to provide some local employment in line with the emerging Neighbourhood Plan which is now at an advanced stage of preparation.
MM105	SD93, additional criterion	Steep in Need Charity (R92) Trustees of the Village Hall Memorial Trust (R593)	Support main modification which requires that a proportion of the site should be provided as public open space directly accessible from the village hall and car park.	Support noted and welcomed.
Policies Map (Kingston-near-Lewes Inset Map)	Policies Map (Kingston-near-Lewes Inset Map)	Mr & Mrs T Grieves	The proposed modification to the Settlement Boundary around Audiburn is incorrect in that it does not conform with the existing Development Boundary or include all of the existing buildings on the	The SDNPA has reviewed planning permission SDNP/18/04985/OUT and modified the settlement boundary in accordance with plans submitted. The amended boundary intentionally excludes an existing peripheral

MM / map / SA / HRA ref	Policy or part of Local Plan	People or bodies who made representations	Issue raised	SDNPA response
			development site, which will form part of the recent planning permission.	outbuilding which appears to be of insubstantial construction, and incidental to the new dwellings. The boundary as amended is considered to be in line with the published Settlement Boundary methodology.
General	n/a	Highways England (R11) Sport England (R153) Winchester City Council (R162) Waverley Borough Council (R221) Mr Steve Dudman (R225) The Stedham Sawmill Landowners (R242, R255, R329) Liss Parish Council (R273) Environment Agency (R396) The Goodwood Estate (R569) Alresford Town Council (R571) Surrey County Council (R588)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Highways England does not have any further comments. (R11) • Sport England is disappointed to note that the SDNP does not currently have a robust and up to date evidence base such as the Playing Pitch Strategy. (R153) • Winchester City Council has no further comments. (R162) • Waverley Borough Council has no further comments. (R221) • Mr Dudman has made general comments on Policy SD56. These are summarised under MM46 above. (R225) • Stedham Sawmill landowners have made general comments on the consultation process, stating this is the first opportunity they have had to make representations on numerous changes. (R242, R255, R329) • Liss Parish Council welcomes the stronger policies concerning countryside protection and the inclusion of measures for mitigation and long-term management. (R273) 	Noted. No further changes proposed.

MM / map / SA / HRA ref	Policy or part of Local Plan	People or bodies who made representations	Issue raised	SDNPA response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confirm that the Main Modifications and Minor Edits satisfy all comments made at the Pre-submission stage and reflect the Statement of Common Ground signed 20 March 2018. (R396) • The plan with its main modifications remains out of balance with the NPPFs approach to sustainability, and brings into question the deliverability of the plan's proposed development and protection policies. <i>[Comments made on various Plan policies but not referenced to specific MMs.]</i> (R569) • Happy with the modifications and hope they will be found sound. (R571) • Surrey County Council has no comments. (R588) • RS Hill & Sons has made general comments regarding their farm diversification plans. (R589) 	