



**Lewes District Council**

**Lewes District Council  
Newick Neighbourhood Plan Regulation 16 Consultation**

**29<sup>th</sup> October 2014**

The following page presents a summary, written by Officers at Lewes District Council, of the comments made during the Regulation 16 consultation on the Newick Neighbourhood Plan, which took place between Monday 1<sup>st</sup> September and Monday 13<sup>th</sup> October 2014. 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	Sport England	Provided general information about the importance of sports and recreation facilities whilst explaining the role of the organisation.
2	Gary Loveman	<p>Although agreeing with much of the Neighbourhood Plan, the consultee suggested the plan was flawed for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The members of the Steering Group were self-elected</li> <li>- Subjective choices made</li> <li>- When selecting sites the main geographical basis was proximity to the Village Green rather than the school.</li> <li>- The plan ignores the Ashdown Forest 7km zone. The sites aren't deliverable without mitigation, making the plan at odds with EU obligations.</li> </ul> <p>In further comments, the consultee states that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The Habitats Regulations Screening Opinion does not take into account the Habitat Regulations Assessment written by LDC in March 2014</li> <li>- The sustainability appraisal was carried out by the steering group alone, behind closed doors and that these 5 unelected officials have had a far greater say than the rest of the Village - undermining the intentions of Localism.</li> </ul>
3	CPRE Sussex (Lewes District Branch)	"The Lewes District branch of CPRE Sussex commends the Newick Neighbourhood Plan, and in particular its environmental policies EN1-EN4, its housing policies HO1-HO5 and its community facilities policies CF1-CF2."
4	South East Water	<p>Provided general information about their Water Resources Management Plan and the impacts that it would have on development in the whole district, not just the neighbourhood area.</p> <p>They confirm that their planned programme will meet the housing numbers planned in the district and for the neighbourhood plan.</p>
5	Highways Agency	Provided general information about the organisation and stated they did not wish to make a representation on the plan
6	Natural England	<p>The following comments were made:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Welcomed the commitment to protect and enhance the natural environment and other similar features</li> <li>- It would be helpful to reference other things that will apply to development within 7km of Ashdown Forest – not just SANGS</li> <li>- The plan's proposals should be screened in respect of their potential impact on SSSIs (see NPPF para 118), notably</li> </ul>

		Chailey Common, which is likely to be sensitive to the development of some 100 units.”
7	Ringmer Parish Council	"Ringmer Parish Council congratulates Newick Parish Council on the quality of their Neighbourhood Plan, and in particular the well thought-out policies on new housing sites. The emphasis on placing new housing at the most sustainable village locations is strongly supported. The arrangements for ensuring community consultation in the development of the plan are exemplary."
8	Mel Goddard	<p>A number of concerns were raised, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The 50/50 weighting between the sustainability appraisal and village vote was never explained</li> <li>- Decisions were made on sites before policy-dependent issues were considered</li> <li>- The village did not indicate a strong preference for either the Woods site or Mitchelswood Farm</li> <li>- Questioned why the Steering Group had not taken up their suggestion to share the amount of housing between Mitchelswood Farm and the Woods site and to allocate more bungalows</li> <li>- That screening was required to protect views outside of the village but not within it</li> <li>- That requests to meet with the Screening Group were ignored as were their suggestions at previous consultations</li> </ul> <p>The response then went into detail on the following topics:</p> <p><u>Policy-dependent issues</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Habitats - explained reasons why areas outside of the 7km Ashdown Forest Zone of Influence should be preferred to areas within it and that residents did not fully understand the issue.</li> <li>- Street Lighting - Only limited on new housing developments and may be necessary on developments, such as the Woods field which is on the A272.</li> </ul> <p><u>Scoring not meeting the sustainability objectives</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- No reflection of the proximity to the school in relation to traffic issues</li> <li>- Development at Mitchelswood Farm would use A272 to travel to the Village Green</li> <li>- Made a number of other points that would alter the scoring of the Mitchelswood Farm and Woods development (visual appearance, use of facilities, agricultural land quality)</li> </ul> <p><u>Site Availability</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Identified that Mitchelswood farm is available now, whereas the Woods site is not available until 2026</li> </ul> <p><u>Inclusion of North Chailey residents in referendum</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Felt the reasons for including North Chailey residents in a referendum were unclear</li> <li>- No justification for not building in the gap between Newick and Chailey.</li> </ul>

		The representation then appended their response to the previous consultation.
9	Beverly Connor	Identified concerns about development at Mitchelswood Farm in light of planning application, rather than anything specific in the Neighbourhood Plan.
10	Boyer Planning (on behalf of Thakeham Homes)	<p>In summary, the consultee stated that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- They had an interest in land to the East of Newick Hill (Policy H02).</li> <li>- The plan had met the Basic Conditions</li> </ul> <p>In relation to Policy H02 they stated that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- They were fully supportive and had undertaken a number of studies that had evidenced the site's potential for development</li> <li>- The site was sustainably located near to local facilities and bus services</li> <li>- Positive pre-application discussions had been undertaken</li> </ul> <p><u>Ashdown Forest Special Protection Area:</u></p> <p>In order to avoid confusion, it was felt that the Neighbourhood Plan text should be updated to reflect Core Policy 10 of the Emerging Core Strategy in relation to the Ashdown Forest and development within the 7km Zone of Influence.</p> <p>They also stated that minor modifications could be made to clarify the position on phasing.</p>
11	Oxbottom Lane, Lower Station Road and Great Rough Residents Group	Identified strong support for policies HO2 and EN1.
12	Southern Water	Felt that additional policies were needed in relation to housing sites H02, H03 and H04 in order to ensure that sewerage capacity was not overloaded by new development. The additional policies would have the following wording: "The redevelopment should provide a connection to the nearest point of adequate capacity in the sewerage network, as advised by Southern Water."

		Southern Water also felt that a new policy should be developed that encouraged utility infrastructure to meet the needs of the community
13	Diana Boswell	The following issues were raised: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Sites H03 and H04 are outside the current village planning boundary</li> <li>- The sites are within the Ashdown Forest SPA zone</li> <li>- Sets a precedent of development in the 'green belt'</li> <li>- Access issues between chosen sites and community facilities.</li> </ul>
14	Teresa Boswell	Submitted the same response as Number 13.
15	Rob Boswell	Submitted the same response as Number 13.
16	Mark Best, Parker Dann on behalf of Mr Lewin	A summary of the comments is as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The policies within the Neighbourhood Plan (in particular HO3.3) do not accord with national planning policy in respect of density and making efficient use of land</li> <li>- Objections were raised about the phasing of the housing allocations, with a particular belief that site HO3 should be brought forward first as it is the most sustainable site. Alternatively, it could be brought forward in tandem with HO2.</li> <li>- The Neighbourhood Plan should contain a housing target. Currently, the plan is too restrictive through its housing allocations and strict approach to density and garden development in existing dwellings. This does not accord with national or local planning policy.</li> <li>- There are inconsistencies with the scoring and methodology used in the Sustainability Appraisal</li> <li>- The neighbourhood plan does not meet the basic conditions, but it is capable of being met through alterations.</li> </ul>
17	Frances Cooper	The following objections were raised: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The footpath linking sites H03 and H04 to the village should not be utilised and should remain private.</li> <li>- An objection was also raised to the separate access points to sites H03 and H04 due to road safety concerns</li> <li>- Absence of any provision to mitigate the visual impact of the development on views from the southwest.</li> </ul>
18	Stephen Clancy	Same objections as Number 17
19	P Cumberlege	The following objections were made:

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Objections were raised concerning the “non-specific” housing target (the “minimum” target set for Newick in the Lewes District Core Strategy) which the Neighbourhood Plan plans for</li> <li>- Windfall sites outside of the existing development boundary should count towards the village housing target otherwise the plan is impossible to implement.</li> <li>- Does not believe that the referendum area should be extended beyond the parish boundary to include properties to the east of the old railway line in Chailey parish.</li> </ul>
20	Kirsten Williams, East Sussex County Council	No further comments to make, although a number of points were raised in relation to the transport policies and more specifically how ESCC would interpret proposals coming forward if the plan is ‘made’.
21	Marina Brigginshaw, Wealden District Council	<p>Concern raised as to the approach taken for the Habitat Regulations screening</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- An unadopted Local Plan (Lewes District Core Strategy) and its evidence base was used to inform the screening</li> <li>- The screening opinion has not fully considered the in combination effects of development proposed in the neighbourhood plan with other relevant plans in regards to nitrogen deposition effects on the Ashdown Forest SAC and the Lewes Downs SAC.</li> <li>- The neighbourhood plan relies on the unadopted Lewes District Core Strategy to mitigate recreational pressures on the Ashdown Forest SPA brought about by new development – it would be more appropriate for the neighbourhood plan to reflect the need for provision of these mitigation measures</li> </ul>
22	Tony Turk	<p>The following objections were raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Neighbourhood plans do not need to comply with strategic policies in “emerging” local plans (Lewes District Core Strategy)</li> <li>- Newick does not need the level of expansion as identified through the target set in the Core Strategy which is opposed by the majority of village residents and the parish council</li> <li>- The neighbourhood plan does not sufficiently control greenfield windfall sites which, if brought forward, should contribute towards the total figure for the village – a new policy should be inserted to reflect this.</li> </ul>
23	Jo Hanslip, Urbanissta Development Planning on behalf of Persimmon Homes South East Ltd	<p>The following objections were raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Policy TC1 needs to be amended to allow flexibility on a case-by-case basis in line with transport highways advice</li> <li>- The Neighbourhood Plan does not meet the basic conditions as it is prepared in accordance with an unadopted Local Plan which has not been scrutinised through an examination and which is considered unsound. The Neighbourhood Plan should not be considered until the local plan has been adopted.</li> <li>- A number of the design policies (HO1.1, HO1.2, HO1.3, HO1.4 and HO1.7) go beyond being acceptable and reasonable policies to inform future housing development</li> <li>- The referendum area should not be extended beyond the neighbourhood area</li> </ul>

24	Lewes District Council (LDC)	<p>A summary of the comments received are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The requirements of paragraph 8 of Schedule 4B of the 1990 Planning Act have been met.</li> <li>- The Neighbourhood Plan meets the basic conditions</li> <li>- The Parish Council have carried out extensive consultation, going beyond the minimum prescribed standards, and have incorporated a number of LDCs suggestions into the final version.</li> <li>- LDC believe that the referendum boundary should be extended to allow residents living outside of the parish (more specifically the eastern part of Chailey), who have an interest in the plan, to vote.</li> </ul>
25	Nick Stafford, David Lock Associates	<p>Explain that they have an interest in land at Mitchelswood Farm and that a planning application has been submitted to Lewes District Council for 63 units and includes as appendices, information submitted as part of the planning application to highlight the "suitability, availability, achievability and overall deliverability" of their site.</p> <p>Detail a number of concerns that they believe results in the plan failing the basic conditions and should be withdrawn or modified. These are summarised below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The Parish Council has only planned for 100 dwellings, the minimum target in the Core Strategy, and has treated the target as a ceiling in a context of a worsening housing land supply position in the district.</li> <li>- An objection was raised to the site assessment and selection process, suggesting the process was flawed, without justification, biased and did not factor in the delivery of sites.</li> <li>- Concern was raised about the deliverability of certain sites allocated in the N.P and hence the plan as a whole.</li> <li>- All of the allocated sites are within the 7km zone of influence in respect of the Ashdown Forest Special Protection Area (SPA) and Special Area of Conservation (SAC). The N.P has not considered the impacts on the Forest or potential mitigation measures.</li> <li>- With developments currently unable to contribute either SANGS or SAMMS, it is currently the case that development cannot be brought forward without being in conflict with emerging local, national or EU policy. All of the sites allocated are therefore undeliverable.</li> <li>- Mitchelswood Farm is largely located outside of the 7km zone and so is deliverable.</li> </ul> <p>Extensive supporting material was also submitted with the representation which will be considered by the Examiner.</p>
26	Seona Lightfoot	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Concerns were raised as to the site selection during the preparation of the Neighbourhood Plan.</li> <li>- Mitchelswood Farm site should have been allocated due to its access to the road network and sustainable location near to key services.</li> <li>- The proposed sites are within the Ashdown Forest Zone of Influence and no SANGS have been identified to mitigate</li> <li>- The Neighbourhood Plan therefore does not adhere to the EU Habitat Regulations</li> </ul>
27	Peter Rainier,	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The consultee proposed a further site to contribute towards the village's housing requirement:</li> </ul>

	DMH Stallard on behalf of Henry James (Sussex) Ltd. (Late representation)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- The site is unconstrained and sustainably located</li><li>- The neighbourhood plan should be identifying sites to provide in excess of 100 dwellings in line with the Lewes District Core Strategy submission version which sets a minimum target for the village</li><li>- The client has not been consulted in relation to the sites use as an extension to the King George V Playing Fields.</li></ul>
--	---	---