



**Lewes District Council and South Downs National Park Authority  
Hamsey Neighbourhood Plan Regulation 16 Consultation  
November 2015**

The following page presents a summary, written by Officers at Lewes District Council, of the comments made during the Regulation 16 consultation on the Hamsey Neighbourhood Plan. 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	Adam Kennedy, Marine Management Organisation	No comments to make
2	Zoe Hughes, Sport England	No specific comments but cross-referenced national planning policy and Sport England policy and guidance.
3	Aisosa Omoigui, Highways England	<p><b>Minor comments made on the following parts of the Neighbourhood Plan</b></p> <p>Page 55, Para 10.3.1 recommend that a Road Safety Audit is undertaken (where applicable) and accompanied by a Transport Assessment.</p> <p>Page 55, Para 10.4.1 It is unclear as to location is of the proposed dual/cycleway. It is assumed it is the thick black line shown on the map</p> <p>Page 88, Transport and Travel Policies TT1-4 the hyperlink to the National Planning Policy Framework does not work.</p>
4	Sarah Harrison, Southern Water	<p>Seek policy provision to support new or improved utility infrastructure and propose the following additional policy:</p> <p><b><i>Provision of additional infrastructure</i></b></p> <p><i>New and improved utility infrastructure will be encouraged and supported in order to meet the identified needs of the community, subject to other policies in the development plan.</i></p> <p><i>Development will be co-ordinated with provision of infrastructure.</i></p> <p><b>Policy EN1</b> – feel that the policy does not meet the basic conditions and would create a barrier to the delivery of essential infrastructure required to service existing and planned development and propose an amendment to the policy:</p> <p><i><u>Development of land outside of the settlement planning boundary that would result in an adverse impact on the countryside and/or the defining characteristics of the landscape will not be permitted unless it is for essential utility infrastructure, where the benefit outweighs any harm, or it can be demonstrated there are no reasonable alternative sites available.</u></i></p> <p><b>Policy EN2</b> - feel that the policy does not meet the basic conditions and would create a barrier to the delivery of essential infrastructure required to service existing and planned development and propose an amendment to the policy</p>

		<p>...Proposals that would adversely affect the character or biodiversity of the above designations will not be permitted unless in exceptional circumstances or <u>unless it is for essential utility infrastructure, where the benefit outweighs any harm, or it can be demonstrated there are no reasonable alternative sites available.</u></p> <p><b>Policy EN3</b> - feel that the policy does not meet the basic conditions and would create a barrier to the delivery of essential infrastructure required to service existing and planned development and propose an amendment to the policy:</p> <p><i>...Development proposals that result in any adverse impacts will not be supported <u>unless it is for essential utility infrastructure, where the benefit outweighs any harm, or it can be demonstrated there are no reasonable alternative sites available.</u></i></p>
5	Julian Austin, On behalf of National Grid	No comments
6	Sigma Planning on behalf of Rydon Homes Ltd	<p>Policy EN1 – The policy is worded in the negative and gives insufficient guidance on how on the policy should be applied i.e. the degree of adverse impact that will trigger refusal. Alternative wording is proposed:</p> <p><i>“Development proposals on land outside of the settlement planning boundary will be permitted provided that they would not result in an unacceptable adverse impact upon the quality of the countryside and/or the defining characteristics of the landscape”</i></p>
7	Amy Tyler-Jones, South Downs National Park Authority	<p>The SDNPA welcomes the submission of the Hamsey Neighbourhood Plan but makes the following minor comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Page 7 – SDNPA officers will also determine applications in the parish</li> <li>- Page 9 – Paragraph 1.7, the SDNPA will also make (adopt) the Plan</li> <li>- Page 11 – para. 2.3 final sentence “The SDNPA is also preparing a Local Plan that will cover the entire national park including parts of Hamsey Parish.”</li> <li>- Page 11- para.2.7 “part of the district’s statutory development plan and will be used by the local planning authorities”</li> <li>- Page 12 – para. 3.3.2, the SDNPA also designated part of the Neighbourhood Area</li> <li>- Policy H2 Community Function - needs some clarity on what ‘community related activities’ would meet the requirements of this policy.</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>Policy RS1 needs to clarify how the policy will apply to development proposals.</i></li> <li>- <i>Policy LE2 Local services – the planning system has limited control over the retention of businesses and local services. This policy should be reviewed.</i></li> <li>- <i>Policy LE5 – clarification is needed for what is meant by ‘small scale integrated’ new buildings.</i></li> </ul>
8	John Lister, Natural England	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Welcome the protection of landscape, habitats and biodiversity in the objectives (section 5) and through much of the rest of the plan, not least EN3 and 4.</li> <li>- EN8 (Protection of Views) focusses on views “of the surrounding countryside” from within and adjacent to the built up area and the Rural Park. Some consideration should be given to any potential views of the planning area from the SDNP, albeit the nature, scale and location of the development noted in the plan may prove insignificant in this respect.</li> </ul>
9	Ellen Reith, East Sussex County Council	<p>ESCC has no formal representations but made the following comments in relation to Transport Policy and Travel TT3, to help explain how we would respond to development proposals:</p> <p><i>The Policy states that car parking provision to serve development would need to use ESCC current parking standards, this is welcomed. However, there is concern over the requirement for developments of more than 6 to also deliver an element of public parking to serve the wider community. ESCC would not seek short term parking for other uses, as suggested in the draft Neighbourhood Plan, as this could actually encourage people to travel by car to park at or near for instance the station/school rather than walking or cycling, and the development sites could be a distance away from the station/school so parking spaces would not be used for the purposes suggested in the draft Plan. Also in order to secure works or development contributions through a s106 agreement, from a County Council perspective, developments need to be of 10 dwellings or more.</i></p>
10	James Garside, Lewes District Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Lewes District commends the Hamsey Neighbourhood Plan and believes that it meets the legal requirements, and specifically the basic conditions.</li> <li>- Support the neighbourhood plan’s strong focus on sustainability and preserving the parish’s rich natural and built environment</li> <li>- Commend the extensive consultation that has taken place and clearly informed the neighbourhood plan.</li> </ul>
11	Henry Dodson	<p>Made comments on the following policies</p> <p><b>Policy EN1</b> – Does not feel the policy will restrict the housing and community benefits proposals</p> <p><b>Policy H2</b> – The allocation of 30 net additional units for Cooksbridge in Spatial Policy 2 of the Joint Core Strategy should</p>

		<p>not include the Covers Timber Yard sites (recently given outline consent) which should be considered as windfall. It is difficult to see how the allocation of 30 homes could be met within the existing planning boundary.</p> <p><b>Policy TT3</b> – Policy TT3 proposes the delivery of an element of public parking to serve the wider community which is difficult to provide without altering the existing settlement planning boundary.</p> <p><b>Policy ED1</b> –Supports the extension of the primary school which is unnecessary as there is an established use and so a presumption in favour of development.</p> <p><b>‘Projects’</b> – Unclear how the objectives to improve the ‘drop off’ and lack of allocated parking could be achieved given the tight constraints of the existing planning boundary.</p> <p>This is a plan that seeks to establish community services and benefits normally associated with much larger settlements but at the same time restrains any meaningful expansion. It also fails to provide definitive proposals to resolve issues within the parish.</p>
12	Robert Lloyd-Sweet, Historic England	<p><b>Policy EN7</b> – Support the principle of the policy but propose amended wording to ensure compliance with the NPPF:</p> <p><i>“EN7 Protection for Parish Heritage Assets. Applications affecting these Parish Heritage Assets or their settings will need to be supported by an assessment of their significance and of the impact of the proposals on it.</i></p> <p><i>“Harm to the significance of any of these heritage assets resulting from development will be resisted and will need to be robustly justified within the proposal, including evidence that applicants have sought to avoid or minimise harm wherever practicable through use of careful design and choice of uses.</i></p> <p><i>“Where relevant, proposals resulting in harm to the significance of one or more of these heritage assets through loss of use as a place of worship, an historic role as a meeting place, school or social venue must be supported by clear and convincing evidence that such a use is no longer the optimum viable use.”</i></p> <p><b>Propose an amendment to the wording of ‘Heritage Assets’ – paragraph 7.6 of the neighbourhood plan:</b></p> <p><i>“Heritage Assets. The community have identified a number of non-designated heritage assets that have local significance as part of the heritage of the parish for their historic, archaeological and architectural interest and their contribution to the spiritual and communal life of the parish. These are described in Section 7 above as the Parish Heritage Assets and include:</i></p>

		<p><i>Offham St Peters Church (also listed Grade II)</i></p> <p><i>Old Hamsey Church (also listed Grade I)</i></p> <p><i>The Rainbow Inn (also listed Grade II)</i></p> <p><i>The Blacksmiths Arms</i></p> <p><i>The Chalkpit Inn</i></p> <p><i>Hamsey Community Primary School</i></p> <p><i>The Goods Shed</i></p> <p><i>Cooksbridge Railway Station (platforms, car park and surrounding area),</i></p>
--	--	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------