



## **Wivelsfield Neighbourhood Plan Regulation 16 Consultation**

**April 2016**

The following page presents a summary, written by Officers at Lewes District Council, of the comments made during the Regulation 16 consultation on the Wivelsfield Neighbourhood Plan, which took place between Monday 8<sup>th</sup> February and Monday 21<sup>st</sup> March 2016. The summary is written to provide assistance to the Examiner and to allow anyone who wishes to see some of the issues raised. It does not contain every point a consultee has made. The Examiner will read the comments of each consultee in full.

Number	Consultee	Comments
1	Derek Austin	Supports the Neighbourhood Plan
2	Ian Peters	Supports the Neighbourhood Plan
3	Karen Peters	Supports the Neighbourhood Plan
4	Environment Agency	Pleased to see that the proposed allocations have been directed to areas at the lowest probability of flooding (flood zone 1).
5	Turley	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The neighbourhood plan does not meet the basic conditions.</li> <li>- NPPF para 16 requires positive planning and the neighbourhood plan only allocates a small increase on the housing requirement of 30 dwellings, which should not represent a cap on development.</li> <li>- Concern is raised as to the allocation of the Springfield Industrial Estate site, which despite being partly-brownfield site, has sustainability, accessibility and landscape concerns.</li> <li>- The Sustainability Appraisal has been carried out retrospectively, without having been informed by a proper assessment of reasonable alternatives. The SA assessment of the Springfield Industrial Estate site underplays the adverse environmental impacts that would result from development in this location.</li> </ul>
6	Mr Jeremy Harding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Policy 7 – There is insufficient evidence to support the policy which unfairly favours some areas</li> <li>- Slugwash Lane site (a site considered through the neighbourhood plan) – The impact of development is underestimated with regard to “rurality”, travel/congestion and safety.</li> <li>- Site assessment – site size has been used in the evaluation of some criteria but not others.</li> </ul>
7	B Nicholls	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Objects to the sites allocated for residential development at Hundred Acre Lane</li> <li>- The upper site (2iii) would tower over surrounding properties and access to the site is not owned by the landowner.</li> </ul>
8	Historic England	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Consider that the plan meets the basic conditions.</li> <li>- Pleased to note that the steering group have responded to comments made during the pre-submission consultation and on the draft Sustainability Appraisal.</li> <li>- Satisfied that the neighbourhood plan pays appropriate regard to the need to sustain the significance of heritage assets, including non-designated and previously unidentified heritage assets, and so support policies 2 and 3.</li> </ul>
9	Gladman	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The neighbourhood plan is inconsistent with national planning policy and guidance and the plan will limit the ability of future sustainable growth being delivered in the parish and surrounding areas.</li> <li>- Policy 1 - Object to the inclusion of a defined settlement boundary at Wivelsfield Green. The policy is inflexible and would not allow for changes in the market and is also overly restrictive in that it would not allow development on the edge of sustainable settlements such as Burgess Hill. As a result, the plan has not been positively prepared.</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Alternative wording proposed to align the policy with the presumption in favour of sustainable development.</li> <li>- Policy 7 – Do not consider that the local green spaces meet the criteria set out in the NPPF and in particular could be considered extensive tracts of land due to their size.</li> </ul>
10	Councillor Cyril Sugarman	Supports the Neighbourhood Plan
11	Steve Tilbury	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Strongly supports the neighbourhood plan and in particular the designated local green spaces and the plan's protection of the village's rural setting.</li> <li>- The plan makes provision for the required housing numbers and no further provision other than that allocated in the neighbourhood plan should be made over the plan period.</li> </ul>
12	Mr and Mrs Dutton	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Object to the neighbourhood plan</li> <li>- Object to the Springfield Industrial Site being considered part of Wivelsfield Green – it is part of the hamlet of Wivelsfield.</li> </ul>
13	Sally Harper	Supports the Neighbourhood Plan. Fairly represents the views of the residents of the parish.
14	Vicky King	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Bluebell Wood was not considered as a local green space despite a number of residents proposing this site as an option.</li> <li>- Developing on this site (unknown which site is being referred to) would increase the risk of flooding</li> <li>- Disagrees with the Sustainability Appraisal findings which assess the site as having no flood issues.</li> </ul>
15	George and Hilary Theakstone	Supports the Neighbourhood Plan
16	Tony and Sheila Harding	Disagrees with allocation of the Hundred Acre lane site. The assessment of the site does not consider the access to the site which would be across private land.
17	Thakeham	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Some of the policies are negatively worded and do not reflect the presumption in favour of sustainable development. They would also compromise the ability of the district council in providing deliverable housing sites to ensure a five year supply of land.</li> <li>- Recommend delaying the plan until the outcomes of the Joint Core Strategy examination are known.</li> <li>- The neighbourhood plan does not make provision for the area around Burgess Hill that lies in the parish and only seeks to restrict development in this area (which lies outside of the settlement boundary).</li> </ul>
18	Boyer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The neighbourhood plan does not meet the basic conditions.</li> <li>- Object to designation of Land to the South of South Road as a local green space designation which is aimed at preventing future development. No reasoned or robust evidence has been put forward to justify its allocation.</li> <li>- The site is an extensive tract of land and examiners in other neighbourhood plan examinations, under similar circumstances, have removed such designations due to non-conformity with national planning policy.</li> <li>- The Springfield Industrial Estate site is an unsustainable location for development as evidenced by previous refused planning applications.</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Land South of South Road is a sustainable site which could maximise sustainable forms of transport and would be an appropriate alternative to land allocations proposed in the plan.</li> <li>-Sustainability Appraisal – disagree with the site assessments for Land South of South Road and Springfield Industrial Estate and ultimately the plan does not contribute to the achievement of sustainable development.</li> </ul>
19	Anthony Coleman	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Objects to the allocation of the sites at Hundred Acre Lane which are completely inappropriate and not required to meet the housing requirement for the village.</li> <li>The sites are isolated from the village and will impact adversely on the character of the area</li> <li>- The assessment of the site which justifies the allocation contains errors and is insufficiently supported by evidence</li> </ul>
20	D Gibbs	Supports the Neighbourhood Plan
21	Lewes District Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Supports the Neighbourhood Plan and congratulate the Parish Council for the time and effort that has gone into the Plan.</li> <li>- Believe that the Neighbourhood Plan satisfies the legal and statutory requirements, including the Basic Conditions.</li> <li>- Acknowledge that the majority of the concerns raised by LDC at the Regulation 14 consultation have been overcome through the extensive additional work that has been carried out since – namely the Site Assessment Report, Sustainability Appraisal and amended Neighbourhood Plan.</li> <li>- LDC do not support the principle of development on the Springfield Industrial Estate site but acknowledge the robust evidence base and clear reasoning supporting its allocation.</li> </ul>
22	CPRE Sussex	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Support the Neighbourhood Plan which reflects the community’s ambition</li> <li>- Support Policy 6 with its intention to enhance the countryside and its wildlife</li> <li>- Support the Local Green Space Allocations</li> <li>- Suggest a number of minor modifications</li> </ul>
23	John Wigzell	Supports the Neighbourhood Plan
24	East Sussex County Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- No formal representations to make</li> <li>- Would like to reiterate previous comments and recommendations, submitted on the Pre Submission Plan in March 2015, regarding car parking spaces in Policy 5. Though we welcome the additional references to the ESCC parking calculator in the Submission Plan it is recommended that instead of adopting an arbitrary standard, a minimum of two car parking spaces per house, the Plan just refers to ‘a need to comply with the ESCC parking calculator’.</li> </ul>
24	East Sussex County Council (non-duly made representation)	Reiterate previous comments and recommendations, submitted on the Pre Submission Plan in March 2015, regarding a lack of reference to the Historic Environment Record (HER) and information on archaeological potential within the Parish. Attach a Heritage and Archaeology Summary of Wivelsfield from our Archaeology

	Additional representation submitted after the consultation deadline	Team which they recommend should be included or referred to in the Neighbourhood Plan.  *Note – this representation will be submitted to the Examiner for consideration
25	Richard and Sue Morris	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Sustainability Appraisal – The SA was undertaken late in the process and consequently contains errors and inconsistencies in relation to the assessment of sites.</li> <li>- Local Green Spaces – the LGS are insufficiently justified</li> <li>- Oppose the consideration of the Slugwash Lane site and highlight errors in its assessment</li> </ul>
26	Ruth Forsyth	Same as above (consultee 25)
27	Audrey Wende	Same as above (consultee 25)
28	Mr/Mrs Whelan	Same as above (consultee 25)
29	Petra & Jean Carroll	Same as above (consultee 25)
30	Laura Akehurst	Supports the Neighbourhood Plan
31	Simon Taylor	Supports the Neighbourhood Plan
32	Councillor Sharon Davy	Supports the Neighbourhood Plan
33	Mr Gordon Harper	Supports the Neighbourhood Plan which reflects the views of parish residents in how they want the parish to develop up to 2030.
34	Mr and Mrs Gittings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Object to allocation of Springfield Industrial Estate</li> <li>- Allocating the site will exacerbate traffic on the busy B2112 and is not sustainably located near to village services and so will increase traffic through the village.</li> <li>- The increase in traffic to the site will impact adversely on the amenity of existing residents.</li> <li>- The site suffers from flooding/surface water drainage/sewerage problems which have not been fully considered through the neighbourhood plan</li> </ul>
35	Southern Water	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Welcome the incorporation of earlier pre-submission representations.</li> <li>- Recommend inclusion of a new policy to support provision of new or improved utility infrastructure in order to meet the basic conditions.</li> </ul>
36	Mrs Susan Powell	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Object to site (a) at Hundred Acre Lane as development would be incongruous and as there is no access to the proposed site.</li> <li>- Object to site (b) as the existing path is currently unsuitable for that purpose and the site can only be accessed over private land. Development of the site would also impact on the surrounding woodland and wildlife.</li> </ul>
37	Highways England	No comments