

Query No. SINDP Policy No.	Examiner's query (Full details can be found Examiner's Request for Clarification July 2019)	SIPC Response to Examiner's Request for Clarification (July 2019)
1	Conformity with European obligations	SIPC agree that this should be answered by SDNPA.
2	Comments on Regulation 16 Representations	<p>SIPC submitted its responses to all Reg 16 representations to both the Examiner and SDNPA in February 2019. Representations from both Reg 14 and 16 consultations are published on the SIPC website (Link below). Copies of the following are attached:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SIPC Response to Reg16 Consultation sent to Examiner - 26/02/2019</li> <li>• Letter to SDNPA expressing SIPC's concern about delay to NP- 27/02/2019</li> </ul> <p><a href="http://www.stedhamwithiping-pc.gov.uk/Neighbourhood_Plan/Neighbourhood_Plan.aspx">http://www.stedhamwithiping-pc.gov.uk/Neighbourhood_Plan/Neighbourhood_Plan.aspx</a></p>
3 SINDP1	<p>The settlement boundary in the adopted South Downs Local Plan differs to that in the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Confirm (or otherwise) that the Stedham settlement boundary should mirror that of the adopted Local Plan ?</li> </ul>	<p>The preferred boundary for Stedham Sawmills was that recommended by Natural England which provides a 125metre buffer zone between the development and the nearby SSSI zone.</p> <p>Both the SDLP and Natural England buffer lines are shown on the map for the Sawmills site. However, as the SDLP has been made, the settlement boundary in the SINDP can mirror the one in the SDLP</p> <p>Apart from Stedham Sawmills site the SIPC Settlement Boundaries mirror those of the adopted SDLP.</p>
4 SINDP2	<p>Unable to find substantive evidence to demonstrate that all development, including fencing, can be completely hidden from the A272 corridor at all times</p> <p>Please can you point me to evidence to demonstrate that Policy SINDP2 is deliverable and would contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, and that the information required is relevant, necessary and material, having regard to NPPF (2012) Paragraph 193 ?</p>	<p>The South Downs Local Plan takes a landscape led approach to development and in general that is reflected in this policy. The information requested is also consistent with that approach. Depending on the scale of the development a s106 agreement could secure a Landscape Management Plan for example that would deliver the strengthening of the tree screen along the A272 corridor that the policy seeks to achieve. The policy is therefore considered to be deliverable.</p> <p>Text in the SINDP Plan will be updated accordingly</p>

Query No. SINDP Policy No.	Examiner's query (Full details can be found Examiner's Request for Clarification July 2019)	SIPC Response to Examiner's Request for Clarification (July 2019)
5 SINDP3	<p>No definition is provided of what type of development might “affect” a recreational or community facility.</p> <p>1. Is the first part of the Policy meant to apply to development of recreation or community facilities ? Why would the NP seek to prevent say the improvement of a community facility for improvement's sake, as opposed to their being a defined “need” ?</p> <p>2. The Policy refers to Assets of Community Value. Please provide a list of the relevant, registered Assets of Community Value.</p>	<p>1. The SINDP does not seek to prevent the improvement of a community facility for improvement's sake. The Policy will be reworded to read <i>“Development affecting recreational and community facilities will only be supported where it can be demonstrated that it will improve the quality and effectiveness of the facility and/or will be of benefit to the local community”</i>.</p> <p>2. An appendix will be included in the SINDP listing all building/land registered as an Asset of Community Value. (Link below connects to Review of Heritage Assets included in the Evidence Base – List of 31 sites is on Page 3)</p> <p><a href="http://www.stedhamwithipping-pc.gov.uk/Document/Default.aspx?DocumentUid=5E564316-EBB3-4B6B-895A-3D942FB92404">http://www.stedhamwithipping-pc.gov.uk/Document/Default.aspx?DocumentUid=5E564316-EBB3-4B6B-895A-3D942FB92404</a></p>
6 SINDP4	<p>Representations have been made in respect of the proposed designation of Rectory Field as a Local Green Space failing to meet the relevant tests, as set out in Paras 76-78 of the NPPF (2012). A representation has been made in respect of the boundary of the proposed Allotments Local Green Space failing to include some of the allotments.</p> <p>1. Is there evidence you can point me to in addition to Page 27 of the “Review of Open Spaces and Views” document in respect of Rectory Field ?</p> <p>2. Should the Allotments boundary be expanded to include the area referred to in the representation noted above ?</p>	<p>1. SIPC consider the criteria required to classify Rectory Field as a Local Green Space have been met. Please refer to report by ENPLAN: Landscape Review of Sites 20th November 2017. (Copy attached)</p> <p>This report will be included in the SINDP as an appendix</p> <p>2. SIPC consider the current Allotment boundary to be correct. The additional small piece of land referred to was not included because (a) not statutory allotments (b) no one quite sure who owns the land and (c) other people have suggested parking provision on this land</p>
7 SINDP5	<p>It is not clear on what policy basis the Policy is seeking to introduce a layer of protection. Please can you point me to evidence demonstrating that Policy SINDP5 has regard to national policy and advice and is in general conformity with the Local Plan. Please could you also point me to evidence that demonstrates that the Policy contributes to the achievement of sustainable development ?</p>	<p>These were spaces which parishioners felt to be under threat of development but could not be protected as they did not meet green space criteria. On reflection, SIPC considers that Policy SINDP5 should be removed.</p> <p>SINDP text and maps will be updated accordingly</p>
8 SINDP6	<p>Unable to locate evidence demonstrating that the requirements set out are achievable. Please can you point me to evidence in respect of why the Policy is viable and deliverable, having regard to Para 173 of the NPPF Framework ?</p>	<p>SIPC will remove SINDP6 as a policy, but update the general text to include an aspiration for providing outdoor leisure facilities in the parish which are inclusive and accessible to the general population</p>

Query No. SINDP Policy No.	Examiner's query (Full details can be found Examiner's Request for Clarification July 2019)	SIPC Response to Examiner's Request for Clarification (July 2019)
9 SINDP7	The Neighbourhood Plan does not allocate any land for development. The South Downs Local Plan allocates Stedham Sawmill for mixed use development. Local Plan Policy SD88 sets out detailed criteria for the delivery of the allocation.	<p>SIPC's reading of Neighbourhood Plan preparation was that it should allocate land for development but be in general conformity with the Local Plan.</p> <p>The reason why the SINDP does not allocate any land for development derives from a meeting held between SDNPA officers and SIPC Councillors in June 2018 at which the officers advised that both plans could not include the same sites. A copy of the minutes is attached.</p> <p>An unintended consequence of removing the sites, as included in the SINDP Reg 14 document, was that the report "Assessment of Potential Development Sites" available in the Evidence Base (Link below) does not appear in the Reg 16 Plan document. This covered eleven pieces of land put forward by their owners for development. SIPC consider that this is a weakness in the Reg 16 plan which should be corrected.</p> <p><a href="http://www.stedhamwithipping-pc.gov.uk/Document/Default.aspx?DocumentUid=858A7F8C-3A3B-4C17-8E29-0585CB7F629F">http://www.stedhamwithipping-pc.gov.uk/Document/Default.aspx?DocumentUid=858A7F8C-3A3B-4C17-8E29-0585CB7F629F</a></p>
9.1	Please can you clarify which of the thirteen criteria of Policy SINDP7 are in general conformity with Local Plan Policy SD88 and add an additional level of detail to the requirements of that Policy in a viable and deliverable way, having regard to Paragraph 173 of the Framework ?	<p>SIPC believes that all thirteen criteria in SINDP7 either directly echo the Local Plan policy SD88, other policies in the SDLP or the negotiated agreement with SDNPA on the Sawmills prior to the Reg 14 submission.</p> <p>SIPC will re-instate into the policy the findings with regard to owners' submission for eleven potential development sites referenced to an appendix listing said submissions and referenced to "Assessment of Potential Development Sites" report.</p> <p>The policy will be amended to include latest detail about use of Stedham, Trotton and Rogate Together (START) Community Trust to provide local affordable housing</p>
9.2	Please can you point me to detailed information, with reference to viability and deliverability, in respect of the proportion of market housing to be made available for the needs of the elderly ?	<p>The proportion of market housing to be made available for the needs of the elderly derives from the SIPC's survey in 2017 (available in the Evidence Base - link below) and amounts to 10%, ie one dwelling which would be no problem to sell in this village and would not adversely affect a developer's revenue calculation. This is in line with SDNPA's policy SD27 Mix of Homes in the SDLP and in particular paragraphs 7.42 to 7.45 of said policy.</p> <p><a href="http://www.stedhamwithipping-pc.gov.uk/Document/Default.aspx?DocumentUid=52F3F5FB-9BBD-459D-A0A3-DA2B0F19154A">http://www.stedhamwithipping-pc.gov.uk/Document/Default.aspx?DocumentUid=52F3F5FB-9BBD-459D-A0A3-DA2B0F19154A</a></p>

Query No. SINDP Policy No.	Examiner's query (Full details can be found Examiner's Request for Clarification July 2019)	SIPC Response to Examiner's Request for Clarification (July 2019)
9.3	Please can you point me to evidence/information in respect of the agreement between the landowners/developers of the Stedham Sawmill allocation, the local housing enabler and the established Community Land Trust ?	Negotiations between the current owners of the Sawmills and the CLT can start in detail once the SINDP is made to complement the SDLP. The CLT in question is called Stedham, Trotton and Rogate Together (START) Community Trust which was registered in April 2019 with access to pre-contract funding in place under the auspices of Chichester DC. Alternative delivery methods have been investigated that will be taken on board in the above negotiations. The local housing provider could be the CLT itself, a Housing Society currently operating in Trotton or the Housing Association currently preferred by Chichester DC
9.4	Please can you point me to information in respect of the agreement between the Community Land Trust and the housing authority in respect of the management of the "Local Connection" criteria. Please can you also point me to evidence to show that the Policy provides for an appropriate and viable cascade mechanism. Please can you also point me to evidence in respect of the criteria leading to the choice of Qualifying Parishes.	Final decisions on the management of the "Local Connection" criteria are yet to be clarified between SDNPA, Chichester DC and START CT, but it is now clear that in order to access funding the location of any CLT site must lie within the three parishes of Stedham with Iping, Rogate and Trotton with Chithurst only.  SIPC agree with SDNPA that the Local Connection test is based upon community consultation and support for homes to meet need within the Parish There is regard for this approach in paragraphs 7.61 and 7.62 of the supporting text of policy SD28 Affordable Homes which sets out how the National Park Authority will determine local connection criteria
10 SINDP9	In land use planning terms, a school is a non-residential educational use. A pub is a drinking establishment and in this case, with expanded food provision. Also, nurseries and garages tend to comprise sui generis uses, not employment sites. Given this, the wording of Policy SINDP9 does not appear precise, having regard to national planning guidance. 1. Is the purpose of Policy SINDP9 to support the expansion of and protect against the loss of important local services and facilities ?  2. Please can you point me to evidence in respect of why support for employers is a relevant land use planning matter ? Also, does the allocation of Stedham Sawmills mean that it no longer fits into Policy SINDP9, given its mixed use allocation?	SIPC responses to the two queries:  1. Yes  2. The relationship to land use planning will be clarified by replacing the words "existing employers" by "the future viability of the business" and also SIPC will remove Stedham Sawmills from SINDP9
11 SINDP11	Please can you point me to evidence to justify the requirement for communications infrastructure to meet an unmet need, given that such an approach would be in conflict with national policy, set out in Chapter 5 of the NPPF (2012) ?	SIPC do not believe the requirements are in conflict with Chapter 5 of NPPF(2012). It is widely recognised that internet connection in rural areas, including the SDNP, is poor. Also, that a prerequisite for ongoing development of new businesses is effective telecommunications.

Query No. SINDP Policy No.	Examiner's query (Full details can be found Examiner's Request for Clarification July 2019)	SIPC Response to Examiner's Request for Clarification (July 2019)
12 SINDP13	<p>Generally, external lighting does not require planning permission.</p> <p>&gt; Please can you point me to information to justify the approach set out in respect of external lighting needing to be essential for health and safety or not a "significant threat" to darkness ? Please can you point me to information in respect of who might determine when light is needed and on what basis; and who will determine "excessive glazing" and on what basis ?</p> <p>Please can you also point me to evidence in respect of the viability and deliverability of the requirement for all glazing in the Neighbourhood Area to be "mitigated" by low transmittance glass, louvres, auto black out blinds or smart glass.</p>	SIPC will remove SINDP13 as the requirement is covered by SDNPA's Dark Skies Policy
13 SINDP14	Please can you point me to information in respect of what "relative tranquillity" comprise, who determines this and on what basis ?	The explanation of relative tranquillity in the South Downs National Park Tranquillity Study that is the evidence base for policy SD7 Relative Tranquillity in the SDLP.
14.1 SINDP15	<p>The Policy requires views to be preserved and protected – hence, development cannot change the identified views. Policy SINDP15 covers the majority of the Neighbourhood Area.</p> <p>Please can you point me to evidence showing the precise nature of each "view" covered by Policy SINDP15. Please can you point me to evidence demonstrating that any change to the views resulting from development would fail to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development.</p>	By their very nature, views and any change to the landscape created by development are subjective. Each of the eight locations listed either make a significant contribution to maintaining the landscape quality within this part of the National Park, maintain views out from villages towards the South Downs to relate them to their surroundings or maintain the critical visual edge of the village seen from the wider landscape. Each of the villages in the parish is based on historic linear routes with cottages lining the thoroughfare. The damage that can be done by departing from this pattern can best be seen by the estate at Common View, built in 1950s
14.2	Please can you point me to evidence justifying a policy approach whereby essential infrastructure "may" be acceptable, given that essential infrastructure is essential ?	<p>This policy is about careful consideration of the location to avoid harm rather than the principle of providing essential infrastructure.</p> <p>SIPC will amend wording to say that essential infrastructure should be deployed with due consideration to the environment</p>

Query No. SINDP Policy No.	Examiner's query (Full details can be found Examiner's Request for Clarification July 2019)	SIPC Response to Examiner's Request for Clarification (July 2019)
14.3	<p>The Policy requires views to be preserved. However, it goes on to state that views that are harmed may be permissible as long as harm is mitigated. Please can you point me to information in respect of what mitigation would result in an “acceptable” level of harm, who would judge this and on what basis ? Please could you also clarify the apparent conflict between accepting harm to views and preserving views.</p> <p>The supporting text to the Policy refers to “respecting” local character. Might this generally provide for a more reasonable approach than preserving views, as set out ?</p>	<p>The principle to be pursued in any development application is that the views should be respected as they stand. However, it can often happen that careful design of buildings and landscape can minimise any significant harm. Each such situation should be carefully examined at application stage and some examples are described in the ENPLAN Landscape Report included in the Evidence Base on the SIPC website. (Also attached as copy re. Query No. 6)</p> <p>SIPC will re-word the first paragraph of the policy to remove the word “preserving” and replace with “to ensure the essential character of the following notable views is respected when development is being considered”</p>
15 SINDP16	<p>Historic England has suggested that non-designated heritage assets should be listed in supporting text, to provide for new such assets to be added over time.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Do you agree with Historic England's suggestion ?</li> </ul>	<p>Yes, SIPC will ensure the Plan is consistent with Historic England's suggestion.</p> <p>The list of assets will be removed from the policy and included as an appendix</p>
16 SINDP20	<p>Please can you point me to evidence, with regards to deliverability and viability, in support of the requirements set out (eg, a two bed dwelling must provide three car parking spaces. Also, why is there no reference to dwellings providing more than three beds ?).</p> <p>Please can you point me to information in respect of why the approach set out contributes to the achievement of sustainable development ?</p>	<p>The survey of the parish in 2017 confirmed that the local need is for smaller, starter homes and SIPC don't want homes with more than 3 bedrooms. The policy allows for both 2 and 3 bedroom homes to have two spaces off road and contribute one space/dwelling to a visitors' carpark. This requirement arises from the appalling situation in the village due to under provision of off-road parking in the past.</p> <p>There is a working party currently looking for ways to rectify the existing situation. There is a direct link between proper provision to store cars and vans off road and the sustainability of a quality environment.</p> <p>Photographs of the existing situation will be included in an appendix</p>
17 SINDP21	<p>Please can you point me to evidence demonstrating why Policy SINDP21 has regard to Paragraph 28 of the Framework, which seeks to support a prosperous rural economy ?</p>	<p>SIPC will delete No. 1 from the Policy and update the general text to include an aspiration for accessibility, ie to allow people to work close to home where possible</p>

<b>SINDP Nos @ Reg16</b>	<b>SINDP Title @ Reg16</b>	<b>SINDP Nos after Response to Examiner Sep2019</b>	<b>SINDP Titles after Response to Examiner Sep2019</b>
SINDP1	Stedham Settlement boundary	SINDP1	Stedham Settlement boundary
SINDP2	Preserving our rural character	SINDP2	Preserving our rural character
SINDP3	Recreational and Community facilities	SINDP3	Recreational and Community facilities
SINDP4	Local Green Space	SINDP4	Local Green Space
SINDP5	Local Community Space		Policy Removed
SINDP6	Promoting Health and Wellbeing		Policy Removed
SINDP7	Stedham Sawmills	SINDP5	Stedham Sawmills
SINDP8	Unallocated residential development	SINDP6	Unallocated residential development
SINDP9	A Strong Local Economy	SINDP7	A Strong Local Economy
SINDP10	The Small Business Economy	SINDP8	The Small Business Economy
SINDP11	Communication Infrastructure	SINDP9	Communication Infrastructure
SINDP12	Wildlife in the Wider Parish	SINDP10	Wildlife in the Wider Parish
SINDP13	Dark Skies		Policy Removed
SINDP14	Tranquillity	SINDP11	Tranquillity
SINDP15	Landscape & Views	SINDP12	Landscape & Views
SINDP16	Parish Heritage Assets	SINDP13	Parish Heritage Assets
SINDP17	Barn Conversions	SINDP14	Barn Conversions
SINDP18	Sunken Lanes & Retaining Walls	SINDP15	Sunken Lanes & Retaining Walls
SINDP19	Permissive and Public Rights of Way	SINDP16	Permissive and Public Rights of Way
SINDP20	Car Parking	SINDP17	Car Parking
SINDP21	Maintaining and improving Accessibility	SINDP18	Maintaining and improving Accessibility