

STEDHAM with IPING PARISH COUNCIL

RESPONSES TO REGULATION 16 CONSULTATION ON DRAFT NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

Stedham with Iping Parish Council (SIPC) have examined the representations received from the public and statutory consultees. With the exception of the specific issues mentioned in the following paragraphs, SIPC has no comments to make on the other responses. This is either because they have been considered and are acceptable, answered previously at Reg 14 stage, or in SIPC's view do not require further amendment to the text.

South Downs National Park Authority (SDNPA)

SIPC agree with most of the suggestions made by the planning authority but consider that some changes would benefit from greater clarity in the text.

- a. In the preamble to the comments, rewriting paragraph two as proposed gives the impression that the NP was altered to meet with the SDLP allocation. In fact, the original LP draft was amended following objections by the SIPC to the practicability of the original during a series of meetings between the parties. Consequently, we believe that the last sentence of that paragraph should be deleted.
- b. SIPC believes that the proposal to replace the first paragraph of the Allocations for New Development Page 17 should not be permitted as a matter of principle. This plan has been put forward after considerable research and consultation and is not dependent upon any other plan; except to say that it is in general conformity with the strategic policies contained in the development plan for the area of the authority. (Section 10 para 8 of the Localism Act 2011). Ownership of the SINDP lies with Stedham Parish Council not SDNPA and the timescale for making the SDLP is irrelevant.
- c. SIPC agrees the change to the original first paragraph but does not agree to the omission of "within the settlement boundary" in the first sentence of the third paragraph. SIPC needs to clarify to readers of the SINP that the allocation of 16 dwellings to Stedham is restricted to the village itself and not

the rest of the parish. Any planning application outside the boundary would have to be considered as a Rural Exception site.

- d. SIPC agrees with the proposed additional text to the first sentence of the third paragraph but not the reason given. The proposed rewording of the whole of the first sentence third paragraph should not be accepted
- e. SIPC agree that the rewording of the first sentence of the SINDP7 policy will be acceptable if the words " in the emerging South Downs Local Plan" are removed.
- f. With regard to employment at Sawmills in Policy SINDP7, both SIPC & SDNPA agreed that the provision should be identified as variable size starter or office spaces available for rent or sale. It is clear from the repetitive representations to both Reg 14 & 16 by the current landowners that they are still thinking of blocks of larger workshops. The following amendment to the text of the first sentence should clarify this point :
Insert after "...approximately 1500m2 of employment uses " the words " in total, integrated with the residential properties...." Add new sentence reading " There are a number of alternative models to pursue a live-work community already in existence throughout the country including flats above start-up rental workshops, larger than normal garages on-plot of individual houses and extra space within houses to facilitate home working."
- g. In the preamble to SINDP7, the fifth sentence refers to negotiations with two local CLTs as ongoing. In fact, time has moved on in the involvement of a Community Land Trust and one has been set up to include the areas of Rogate & Trotton as well as Stedham. Naturally, this greatly increases the availability of funding and certainty of delivery. it is suggested that the second & third sentences in that paragraph are replaced by the following sentence :
"A new Community Land Trust entitled SMART CT has been set up and incorporation is anticipated in March 2019. It is anticipated that once the SINDP has been made, the CLT, existing owners and SDNPA will work together on a design brief for the site."

Chichester District Council (CDC)

Their comments are a re-hash of those at Reg 14 stage but are key to this development.

There are several models for the delivery of market and affordable housing in existence already; including being wholly developed by the CLT or Housing Association or local builders/developers with agreed plans for affordable units to be transferred to the CLT on completion.

There is currently an ongoing discussion to resolve differences between CDC and SDNPA on allocation policies when properties are to be owned by CLTs.

Stedham Sawmills Landowners

The submission reiterates the argument at Reg14 stage and public hearings by the Examiner. SIPC believes that the proposed additions to SINDP7 set out earlier will clarify the proposal for them. However, it is unlikely that they will be satisfied at least until the Local Plan is made.

Local Residents

- a. E Kruba : The input is welcome in showing community input but the specific suggestions are already covered or fall outside of matters for inclusion in a Neighbourhood Plan
- b. J Crawford : All these matters have previously been considered and no changes are appropriate. In particular, there is a lot of support in the villages for the introduction of wild flowers on open areas including verges and churchyards. Maintenance of these are totally different to the extensive area at Highgrove referred to in the representation. The fitness trail has been suggested to help those who work shifts which preclude them from using organized clubs and classes. SIPC believe the provision of free equipment will help individuals maintain health and fitness as well as providing social interaction for young people.

- c. R Osborne : Although it was originally intended to include only local residents in or adjacent to Stedham with Iping's boundary, the introduction of the new Community Land Trust changes the situation. The result of discussions on allocation policy identified in the Chichester District Council section earlier may well result in revised wording.
- d. R Osborne : Only the large allotments to the west end of Common View are suitable as Local Green Space.
- e. G Ault : The representation on the land known as the "Polo Fields" describes the importance afforded to it by the villagers and people in the wider parish. Not only does it provide views both inwards and outwards across our boundary, it provides visual separation from the local town of Midhurst. Unfortunately, we have been advised that its area is too large to meet the requirements for designation as a Local Green Space.

Prepared by John Wheelhouse

Chairman of SIPC Planning Committee

22 February 2019