

## Consultation feedback and actions

The following table details the feedback received from Statutory Organisations, Businesses and Stakeholders and Individual Residents during the Neighbourhood Plan consultation period which started on the 9th June 2014 and ended on the 21st July 2014. A draft NP document was circulated to all relevant organisations and publicised within the parish of Loxwood by various means as detailed in the record of consultations table attached. Responses are detailed below identifying the name of organisation or individual and their contact details where possible.

Organisation or Individual Name	All boxes 'Support no change' unless detailed	Page No	Policy or Proposal	Policy or Proposal Number	Support with Modifications	Oppose	Comment Received	Birdham Parish Council (BPC) - Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group (NPSG) response	NP Amended Y/N
<b>POLICY 1</b>									
Chichester District Council		18	Policy	1			Paragraph below Policy 1 "Inappropriate extensions or revisions to listed buildings...will be resisted". Need clarification of what is inappropriate or context in which to set it, this text can be added to the policy for more weight.	Text moved & adjustments to Policy wording.	Y
Chichester District Council		18	Policy	1			Last sentence, 1 <sup>st</sup> para – "heritage and character of Birdham Pool Mariana ... must be protected and enhanced", this sentence needs to be more specific and added to policy to have any weight.	Noted Adjustment to policy wording	Y
Chichester District Council		18	Policy	1			"Conservation of...the presence of houseboats on the Chichester Canal". Do Birdham Parish want more or just to retain those already there? Would replacements be considered if so what are the criteria? Further clarification is required.	Noted Adjustment to policy wording	Y
Birdham Village Residents Association	✓	18	Policy	1	✓		(No reason given)		N
English Heritage		18	Policy	1			We particularly welcome the reference to and identification of buildings of local interest in addition to nationally listed buildings and their settings in Policy 1.	Noted with thanks	N
Elizabeth Campbell	✓	19	Policy	1	✓		Paragraph on Somerley could be shortened	Noted	N
Michael Karn	✓	18	Policy	1	✓		I recommend an amendment to the policy, or the creation of an additional one to safeguard the visual integrity of the separate communities either within the parish or just beyond its boundaries so as to prevent their coalescence. The attractive but narrow rural gap between Birdham and Somerley is particularly vulnerable. The importance of safeguarding it and, thereby, protecting the character and setting of the Somerley Conservation Area is vital in <u>maintaining its separate identity</u> .	Agree. See additional wording in Policy 1	Y
Mrs Jane Pauline Russell	✓	19	Policy	1	✓		Further development must not be allowed to adversely affect existing listed buildings. Control on any further ribbon development/extension of the village envelope should be exercised	Agree. See additional wording in Policy 1	Y
Susan & Derrick Pope	✓	18	Policy	1	✓		Holt Place, although not a Listed Building, is a building of historic importance and should be included. The property is thought to have been a duck shooting lodge for the Goodwood Estate, which had extensive land interests in West Itchenor. It is shown in the OS Arundel 8 Map of 1805 when it was known as Godfrey's. By 1895, the property had been enlarged and was known as Holt Place, appearing on OS sheet 332 Bognor (Outline) and also in the OS six Inch England and Wales Map of 1896	Agree. Holt Place added.	Y

Organisation or Individual Name	All boxes 'Support no change' unless detailed	Page No	Policy or Proposal	Policy or Proposal Number	Support with Modifications	Oppose	Comment Received	Birdham Parish Council (BPC) - Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group (NPSG) response	NP Amended Y/N
<b>POLICY 1</b>									
Mr Stephen R Crossley & Mrs Sarah E Crossley	✓	18	Policy	1	✓		Do not recognize Streetscape architectural integrity of 1940's social housing in Crooked Lane as having same value. Currently this site also presents road safety danger for parked / passing cars. Recommend remove this site from list. The village pond currently can play an inadequate role in the village flood relief scheme and as such any proposal to significantly alter or replace, as professionally considered, should not be hindered by policy. Recommend remove from list. Unclear why Broomfield in Lock Lane is included.	Disagree, the street is considered typical of the social housing of its time and has a style recognisably Sussex.	N
Mr Stephen R Crossley & Mrs Sarah E Crossley	✓	18	Policy	1	✓		If archaeological remains are found, the site should only be afforded the same level of 'recording/protection' as is usual. It should not mean the site cannot be developed. Recommend clarify.	Refers to policy 2, which has been reworded to clarify this point.	Y
<b>POLICY 2</b>									
Chichester District Council		19	Policy	2			Do Birdham Parish mean "Any development"? Gardens aren't previously developed land, so would domestic extensions require such rigorous submissions?	Noted Adjustment to policy wording	Y
Chichester District Council		19	Policy	2			Suggest rewording so that a trigger is added as to when investigation takes place and suggest it is only on land where there is some evidence/likelihood of archaeology. It is not possible to seek investigations on all undeveloped land and there may be occasions where investigation is needed on some sites which have been previously developed?	Noted - Adjustment to policy wording	Y
Chichester Harbour Conservancy		19	Policy	2			this wording goes above and beyond what the NPPF requires, which is basically a proportionate approach according to the importance of the heritage asset: as such it may not be supported by CDC. It would also be more helpful to identify most likely areas of archaeological potential within the parish, which are referred to in the written justification beneath the policy wording. For example, the character appraisal section refers to an abandoned medieval village of East Itchenor.	Policy has been reworded to match NPPF requirements.	Y
Roger Tilbury	✓	19	Policy	2			Last main para of references. Put a full stop after Kelly. Then add "The URS/Scott Wilson Heritage Assessment for Premier Marina (2011) suggests that archaeological..... Etc."	Wording amended	Y
<b>POLICY 3</b>									
Chichester District Council		20	Policy	3			Suggest rewording the policy as it is not clear; also suggest either a map or a list of all sites to be avoided. The map should have a key. May need to think about mitigation and add this to the policy wording. If a small part of a site (especially if of lower importance) is to be lost (e.g. hedgerow for sight lines), this may be acceptable if appropriate mitigation is provided.	Policy reworded	Y
Chichester Harbour Conservancy		21	Policy	3			3rd paragraph: you may also wish to refer to ID 8 (Natural Environment) of the NPPF. A cross reference to CLP Policy 22 would also be useful after the reference to ICZM (although I note there is a reference on page 22).	Noted	N

Organisation or Individual Name	All boxes 'Support no change' unless detailed	Page No	Policy or Proposal	Policy or Proposal Number	Support with Modifications	Oppose	Comment Received	Birdham Parish Council (BPC) - Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group (NPSG) response	NP Amended Y/N
<b>POLICY 3</b>									
Mr Stephen R Crossley & Mrs Sarah E Crossley	✓	20	Policy	3		✓	Recommend that - <i>development can go ahead on condition that the development can demonstrate a net ecological gain.</i>	Disagree, this would not always be proportionate.	N
<b>POLICY 4</b>									
Chichester District Council		21	Policy	4			What are 'significant views'? Are those listed the only views of particular significance? Suggest adding them as an appendix. Are significant views only those seen from a public right of way, and exclude views from the Church/graveyard and the harbour etc. Second para states "any development that intrudes into the landscape character must be appropriate". Clarification is need on what is appropriate? Does the list of areas relate to views or areas of landscape character or both?	Minor revision to policy wording	Y
Chichester District Council		21	Policy	4			See comment on Policy 2 regarding "any development".	Noted	N
Birdham Village Residents Association	✓	21	Policy	4	✓		(No reason given)		N
West Itchenor Parish Council		21	Policy	4			The list of particular areas identified within the policy does not include open views adjacent to Shipton Green Lane heading North from B2179 into the village of West Itchenor and the footpaths including Salterns Way that pass through this areas. Suggest <b>The views across open land from Shipton Green Lane northwards from the B2179 towards the village of West Itchenor and to include the views from footpaths 35 &amp; 36</b>	Views policy revised to include.	Y
English Heritage		21	Policy	4			Welcome and support Policy 4	Noted with thanks	N
Somerley Residents Association	✓	21	Policy	4	✓		<i>Cover letter</i> - We believe that the character appraisal of Bell Lane as a lane with long, wide vistas north and south and with houses set well back or well screened from the road (see CDC Character Appraisal of Somerley) should be included in the plan, with a request that any new development adjacent to Bell Lane is set back from the road. This would prevent ribbon-type development caused by suburban housing lining what is currently a rural/semi-rural streetscape. It is also important that the expansive rural views from the public rights of way are preserved, particularly the western end of Hundredsteddle Lane. <i>Form Response</i> - Add views from footpath running westwards from Hundredsteddle Lane, Particularly to the north.	Views policy revised to include.	Y
Chichester Harbour Conservancy		21	Policy	4			The word "appropriate" relating to the intrusion of development into wider views in the landscape. What is meant by this word? If the community cannot define this, developers could well take advantage of such a weakness. Is the community for example saying that the grouping of buildings required for agriculture is necessary, to minimise visual impact? What of planted belts to mitigate impact? What of preferred building material colours? These could all reinforce the meaning and clarity of the Policy.	Refer to design (policy 16)	N

Organisation or Individual Name	All boxes 'Support no change' unless detailed	Page No	Policy or Proposal	Policy or Proposal Number	Support with Modifications	Oppose	Comment Received	Birdham Parish Council (BPC) - Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group (NPSG) response	NP Amended Y/N
<b>POLICY 4</b>									
David Nightingale	✓	21	Policy	4			Appendix 7.4 should read Appendix 7.5	Noted	N
Elizabeth Campbell	✓	21	Policy	4	✓		View of Church Lane field from church Lane - to be added.	Felt to be adequately covered by other general views	Y
Peter Barker	not marked	21	Policy	4	✓		I support the open view policy but wish it to be modified to include the views across the fields opposite Pipers Mead to the Harbour. This is the only place where you can see across from the Main Road to the South of Birdham to the Downs.	Added	Y
Jerold Alexander	✓	21	Policy	4	✓		When we moved to Birdham 20 years ago the hedges down Court Barn Lane were much lower and the field opposite the Church was similar to . Mr Mannington has allowed the hedges of Broomers Farm to grow much higher and the field opposite the Church has been utterly neglected & is now surrounded by high hedges, mature trees and fast growing saplings. The new owners should be encouraged to fell many of the trees and maintain the hedges to restore the views.	This is a maintenance issue, so cannot be the subject of planning policy	N
Timothy Firmstone	✓	21	Policy	4	✓		Need to strengthen the landscape character of the pond (which is in need of improvement for wildlife) and its contribution to the Village Green.	Noted	N
Mr Rodney S de Chair	not marked	21	Policy	4	✓				N
Sarah Backhouse	✓	21	Policy	4	✓		In Particular it is important to preserve the views to the north from western end of the Hundredsteddle lane public footpath. There is concern that the recreation ground which is to be provided as part of the Rowan Nursery development, could lead to infilling and the loss of the lovely open view from the Somerley Conservation Area.	Added	Y
Enid Mary Strange	✓	21	Policy	4	✓		Preserve the views to the north from the Hundred Steddle Lane public footpath	Added	Y
Chris Adams	✓	21	Policy	4	✓		Views from Bell Lane - There are none, and there will be even less when Rowan and Tawny Nursery are completed. East & West views from Somerley can only be from current properties.	Noted	N
Mrs Jane Pauline Russell	✓	21	Policy	4	✓		Views of open fields to the north and west of the Hundredsteddle Lane/Huntlands public footpath must not be disturbed by the proposed adjacent 'recreation ground/dog walking area' ( with no vehicular access) to be attached to the Rowan Nursery development	Noted	N
Susan & Derrick Pope	✓	21	Policy	4	✓		The list should be amended to include the open views northwards across farmland in the AONB from Main Road (B2179), east of its junction with Shipton Green Lane to the mini roundabout at Bell Lane.	Added	Y
Graham Campbell	✓	21	Policy	4	✓		I do not think it necessary to list the views, as I think every view in the village is listed. Some of the views listed are insignificant (eg views in the Bell Lane & Pinks Lane areas), so it would be better to have no list at all.	Noted	N

Organisation or Individual Name	All boxes 'Support no change' unless detailed	Page No	Policy or Proposal	Policy or Proposal Number	Support with Modifications	Oppose	Comment Received	Birdham Parish Council (BPC) - Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group (NPSG) response	NP Amended Y/N
<b>POLICY 5</b>									
Chichester District Council		22	Policy	5			Clarification on whether light pollution should be limited, where and if it applies to all lighting (e.g. external and internal?) Suggest moving some sentences from the supporting text to the policy and provide more detail to the policy e.g. 'proposals to install lighting in areas of the Parish that are currently dark at night will be resisted'. If this is added then suggest identifying where these areas are.	Agreed Policy reworded	Y
Mr Stephen R Crossley & Mrs Sarah E Crossley	✓	22	Policy	5	✓		Policy not strict enough. Recommend – <i>Require the developer to demonstrate the limited impact from light pollution.</i>	Policy revised to be clearer and tighter within bounds of reasonableness	Y
Premier Marina CBRE Ltd on behalf of	✓		Policy	5	✓		Light Pollution, seeks to limit the impact of light pollution from artificial light. Premier Marinas appreciates the sensitivity of the surrounding environment to light pollution, however, seeks an acceptance within the policy, that signage relating to economic development (including businesses and services) should be considered essential to promote local businesses and sustain the economic vitality of the locality.	Each proposal will be considered on its merits, but the dark sky location will be required to be protected.	N
<b>POLICY 6</b>									
Chichester District Council		22	Policy	6			Need to add reference to the NPPF	Policy complies with the NPPF as it is.	N
Chichester District Council		22	Policy	6			Need to add Policy 51 of the emerging Local Plan	Added	Y
Mr KJ Wright	✓	22	Policy	6	✓		(No reason given)		N
<b>POLICY 7</b>									
Chichester District Council		24	Policy	7			See comment on Policy 2 regarding “any development”, a conservatory, for example, should not be caught by this development.	Agreed policy reworded	Y
Chichester District Council		24	Policy	7			Suggest adding a trigger for this development. Assume pedestrian routes are within the site as it is difficult to secure pedestrian routes outside the site. Large sites tend to provide more than one pedestrian access. Suggest adding to the housing policies or else reduce here. Consider the final sentence is not appropriate, it may be better read that it will be designed to encourage use by both future residents of the development and existing local residents.	Agreed policy reworded to be clearer about integration and sense of community	Y
Somerley Residents Association	✓	24	Policy	7	✓		Large-scale development of more than 10 houses should be located close to community facilities (school, church etc) and not be ribbon or peripheral development.	Agree, but there are no allocations in the plan for large scale development. See amended text in Policy 1 concerning settlement separation.	N
Mr Stephen R Crossley & Mrs Sarah E Crossley	✓	24	Policy	7	✓		Proposed sites that are further away from school, shops etc. can present an important health and wellbeing benefit to new / existing residents and visitors, if safe pedestrian and cycle routes are proposed or enhanced. Recommend including guidance notes to account for the above. Recommend phrase– <i>Help to promote sustainable transport methods and healthy lifestyles.</i>	Noted	N

Organisation or Individual Name	All boxes 'Support no change' unless detailed	Page No	Policy or Proposal	Policy or Proposal Number	Support with Modifications	Oppose	Comment Received	Birdham Parish Council (BPC) - Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group (NPSG) response	NP Amended Y/N
<b>POLICY 7</b>									
Genesis Town Planning Trustees of Farquhar-Thompson Trust	Only Policies 7,9,11 ticked support no change		<b>Policy</b>	<b>7</b>			We support Policy 7 which requires development to integrate well into the existing community. In achieving this objective we would expect new development allocations to be focused to the north of the A286 Main road on land close to the existing facilities of Birdham adjacent to the existing settlement policy boundary.	The plan has not made any site allocations or undertaken the assessment and selection exercise needed to support any such allocation.	<b>N</b>
<b>POLICY 8</b>									
Chichester District Council		<b>24</b>	<b>Policy</b>	<b>8</b>			There seems to be a misunderstanding of the meaning of legislation around Assets of Community Value. This is a separate piece of legislation which requires a community facility to be put to the community for purchase for 6 months prior to going to public sale/auction. It is not possible to have a policy resisting their loss but can say that if you call them community facilities.	The policy refers generally to assets of community value once designated, so this wording will be retained. Agreed it is not possible to designate by policy. the policy has also been reworded to include community facilities as well.	<b>Y</b>
Chichester District Council		<b>24</b>	<b>Policy</b>	<b>8</b>			Suggest renaming the policy Retention of Community Facilities.	Policy Renamed Retention of Assets of Community Value <u>and other facilities</u>	<b>Y</b>
Chichester District Council		<b>24</b>	<b>Policy</b>	<b>8</b>			Is this the complete list of Assets of Community Value and as with Policy 4 should this be in an appendix? The policy refers to key assets, which implies there are other ones.	List and Appendix amended	<b>Y</b>
Somerley Residents Association	✓	<b>28</b>	<b>Policy</b>	<b>8</b>	✓		<i>Form response</i> -The Bell pub and its garden and car parking facilities are an important asset to the communities of Birdham & Somerley, as are the garden centres, caravan & camping sites.	Noted.	<b>N</b>
John F Dyer	✓	<b>24</b>	<b>Policy</b>	<b>8</b>	✓		Worried about The Bell. If they overcome Japanese Knotweed, what is the proposed development of which we hear mutterings?	Noted, but not relevant for policy purposes.	<b>N</b>
Ron Green	✓	<b>24</b>	<b>Policy</b>	<b>8</b>	✓		Add playing field to Policy 8	Added	<b>Y</b>
<b>POLICY 9</b>									
Chichester District Council		<b>26</b>	<b>Policy</b>	<b>9</b>			See comment on Policy 2 regarding "any new development"	Existing wording allows for different sizes of development	<b>N</b>
Chichester District Council		<b>26</b>	<b>Policy</b>	<b>9</b>			A definition is needed as to what would be significant traffic impact.	No change. 'Significant' indicates quantifiable increase in vehicle movements, and depending on the size of the traffic impact the required mitigation measures can be negotiated.	<b>N</b>
Chichester District Council		<b>26</b>	<b>Policy</b>	<b>9</b>			Last para (top of page 27). Some of these improvements could be included in the policy or the list of mitigation suggestions, 'improvements in access and safety ... to and from the Birdham Straight, at junctions of Church Lane and Sidlesham Lane and B2198, congestion at both ends of Crooked Lane and issues of safe child drop off/pick up outside Primary School.	Happy with the suggestions in the justification text as current.	<b>N</b>

Organisation or Individual Name	All boxes 'Support no change' unless detailed	Page No	Policy or Proposal	Policy or Proposal Number	Support with Modifications	Oppose	Comment Received	Birdham Parish Council (BPC) - Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group (NPSG) response	NP Amended Y/N
<b>POLICY 9</b>									
West Sussex County Council		26	Policy	9			Policy 39 (Transport Accessibility and Parking) of the Chichester Local Plan will set the general approach to addressing the impact of new development on the transport system (including traffic). It is therefore suggested that Policy 9 of this pre-submission Plan is omitted to avoid duplication.	The neighbourhood plan policy does not duplicate this transport policy, it sets the local context and priorities.	N
Somerley Residents Association	✓	26	Policy	9	✓		<i>Cover letter Précis</i> - Strongly believe B2198 speed limit should be reduced to 30mph. This would prevent severance for residents either side of Bell Lane. <i>Form response</i> - A 30 mph speed restriction & crossing "islands" should be put in place along Bell Lane on completion of the two proposed developments either side of Bell Lane.	Note support, but the plan cannot specify particular highway solutions.	N
Genesis Town Planning Trustees of Farquhar-Thompson Trust	Only Policies 7,9,11 ticked support no change		Policy	9			This policy states that any new development within the Parish with a significant traffic impact must mitigate that impact via developer contributions to measures agreed with residents and the highway authority. Traffic impact includes effects of adverse road safety, congestion and pollution on both the main roads and rural lanes. We support this policy objective and suggest that traffic impact could best be managed locally at Birdham by the selection of several smaller allocations where impacts could be spread across the local road network.	The plan has not made any site allocations or undertaken the assessment and selection exercise needed to support any such allocation.	N
Bernice Culley	✓	26	Policy	9	✓		Concerned that '20' limit on Birdham Straight would make congestion worse. Better link to A27 vital - tailbacks getting worse at both roundabouts. Essential that any development provides parking for 2 cars + visitor parking with a development so parking on village roads is not increased.	Highway issue not a planning policy concern.	N
Ian Culley	✓	26	Policy	9			Could pedestrian crossing increase congestion in busy periods? Cyclists on A286 lethal must have a dedicated cycle path.	Highway issue not a planning policy concern.	N
Elizabeth Campbell	✓	26	Policy	9	✓		+ Noise problem from traffic across the village - 30mph speed restriction on A286 should alleviate this.	Added	Y
Mrs Sandra M Vernon	✓	26	Policy	9		✓	Traffic Impact, Speed reduces and 20mph through village. No more development on this peninsula.	Highway issue not a planning policy concern.	N
John F Dyer	✓	26	Policy	9	✓		Bit to gentle - "must mitigate" suggest "It is essential that any new development....." Must be tougher!	Policy felt to be a firm as is reasonable in a planning sense.	N
Mrs Jane Pauline Russell	✓	26	Policy	9	✓		Statistics show over half the dwellings in Birdham currently have two cars. Plans for new housing must be able to accommodate this trend. Bell Lane, now a very busy and increasingly well used road, is having to absorb a disproportionately large increase in new housing which is poorly equipped with parking space.	Noted	N

Organisation or Individual Name	All boxes 'Support no change' unless detailed	Page No	Policy or Proposal	Policy or Proposal Number	Support with Modifications	Oppose	Comment Received	Birdham Parish Council (BPC) - Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group (NPSG) response	NP Amended Y/N
<b>POLICY 9</b>									
Susan & Derrick Pope	✓	26 27	Policy	9	✓		As drafted, Policy 9 implies that significant adverse impacts will always be capable of mitigation by financial contributions to schemes. This should not be the case, as the impacts may be such that it would be preferable to refuse permission. Furthermore, the residents value the rural character of the village and mitigation measure that would lead to an urbanization of the village should, we believe, be avoided. We would like to see this view reflected in the text and we would suggest that Policy 9 is amended to read (changes in red): 'Any new development within the Parish with a significant traffic impact <b>will not be supported unless its impact can be suitably mitigated</b> via developer contributions to measures agreed with residents and the highway authority.' We note also that the Road Accident Map does not include the A2179, but there have been a number of accidents in recent years, including a fatality, in the vicinity of the junction with Shipton Green Lane. If possible, the map and text should be updated to include these, although no improvements to the highway are to be sought in this area which has relatively few pedestrian movements.	Agree the policy needs tightening, and it has been redrafted on these lines.	Y
Mr Stephen R Crossley & Mrs Sarah E Crossley	✓	26	Policy	9	✓		In consideration of increased traffic being a principal concern, all proposed development, should demonstrate how the development has made a contribution to improve the traffic impact. Recommend - Remove the word ' <i>significant</i> ' and add guidance. Also add - Essential minor development, needed by the local community for reasons of human health and safety will be supported.	Disagree, policy needs to be proportionate to the scale of development in line with national guidance.	N
Graham Campbell	✓	26	Policy	9	✓		This policy will have no effect at all. This issue is currently ignored by the planning process, and that situation will continue. A much stronger policy statement would at least register the intent of local people to do something about an issue which registers high on the scale of residents' concerns.	Disagree, policy needs to be proportionate to the scale of development in line with national guidance.	N
<b>POLICY 10</b>									
Chichester District Council		27	Policy	10			See comment on Policy 2 regarding "any development"	Agreed policy reworded	Y
Chichester District Council		27	Policy	10			Suggest adding a trigger as it is not possible to require all development to contribute. "Where appropriate" is too woolly and unenforceable. As outlined above it may be more suitable to add to a list of infrastructure projects.	Any development is required to protect the pedestrian and cycle network. 'Where appropriate' changed to "development with a significant traffic impact"	Y
Birdham Village Residents Association	✓	27	Policy	10	✓		(No reason given)		N



Organisation or Individual Name	All boxes 'Support no change' unless detailed	Page No	Policy or Proposal	Policy or Proposal Number	Support with Modifications	Oppose	Comment Received	Birdham Parish Council (BPC) - Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group (NPSG) response	NP Amended Y/N
<b>POLICY 10</b>									
Chichester Harbour Conservancy		27	Policy	10			what is meant by the words "where appropriate"? Contributions are usually triggered by a net increase in trip generation before and after the proposed development and 'significant' traffic impact is typically one where 10% increase in traffic on the immediate highway network is caused by the new development. It may be worth putting statements like this in the written justification under the Policy, to clarify what you mean. It is of course a matter for the Parish to determine what proportion of the 25% of S.106/CIL monies raised from development is spent on footpaths and cycle paths, if the community referendum confirms support for a neighbourhood plan. However, you may wish to refer to priorities the community have established and say these will be used to guide such financial decisions by the Parish Council.	See above. We do not agree with this definition of "significant traffic impact" in the context of the village.	N
Chichester Harbour Conservancy		27	Policy	10			4th paragraph up from bottom of page, 2nd line: I would agree that for the young and fit, 2 miles walk on a level surface should not be arduous, but to generalise is stretching the point a little. Urban Design studies have shown that most people will walk 400m and cycle 800m comfortably. Maybe better to use those figures instead. Improved broadband connectivity may also have a role in reducing travel, especially by car, where people can apply for goods/services and pay bills on-line, instead of getting in the car and travelling to places to conduct that business.	Agree 2 miles is too far to consider it a walking distance, text altered. Cycle trips of 2 miles are generally considered acceptable to all cyclists by Sustrans.	Y
Bernice Culley	✓	27	Policy	10	✓		Need cycle path along A286, in both directions - lethal at the moment.	Highway issue not a planning policy concern.	N
Peter Barker	not marked	27	Policy	10			Pedestrian Islands exist to assist crossing the A286. A formal light controlled crossing will not help because it will never be in the right location. It will urbanise the village against the objective to keep it rural - See Vision Statement. Traffic calming and reduced speed limit along the main road will be sufficient.	Final form of traffic mitigation will be negotiated between residents (we hope), highways and the applicant.	N
John F Dyer	✓	27	Policy	10	✓		Do not like "consider" Suggest "must protect...." Must be tougher!	Agree, policy re-drafted	Y
Chris Adams	✓	27	Policy	10	✓		100% ?? to cycle path s in Bell Lane - Cyclists already take to the pavements either side of the road. 50 years ago there were ditches either side of the road and if they were still there they would have prevented flooding of may houses in the road.	Gap in text - highway issue	N
Giles Nicklin	✓	27	Policy	10	✓		I strongly support the policy on footpaths and cycle paths. I would have liked to have seen reference in the plan to a sustainable maintenance programme for the ROADS in the village. Many roads in Birdham are now in a very poor state of repair. Potholes and broken edges mean that the usable width of these roadways is less than designed and this creates additional problems/dangers for all road users. Examples are Crooked Lane and Westlands Lane. A visit to Itchenor will illustrate what a well-maintained village road network looks like!	Maintenance is not an issue for planning policy.	N

Organisation or Individual Name	All boxes 'Support no change' unless detailed	Page No	Policy or Proposal	Policy or Proposal Number	Support with Modifications	Oppose	Comment Received	Birdham Parish Council (BPC) - Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group (NPSG) response	NP Amended Y/N
<b>POLICY 10</b>									
Ron Green	✓	27	Policy	10	✓		Construction of cycle way <u>at least</u> as far as canal A286 (Parish Boundary)	Highway issue not a planning policy concern.	N
Mr Stephen R Crossley & Mrs Sarah E Crossley	✓	27	Policy	10	✓		In consideration of increased traffic being a principal concern, all proposed development, should demonstrate how the development has made a contribution to improve the traffic impact. Recommend - Remove the word 'significant' and add guidance. Also add - Essential minor development, needed by the local community for reasons of human health and safety will be supported.	Disagree, policy needs to be proportionate to the scale of development in line with national guidance.	N
Graham Campbell	✓	27	Policy	10	✓		This policy should be more ambitious. A cycle path, separated from all traffic, and hard surfaced, between Chichester & West Wittering should be a long term aim, and Birdham Parish should be leading work towards that aim.	Plan can only deal with development proposals within the plan area, but the proposed route is noted.	N
<b>POLICY 11</b>									
Chichester District Council		28	Policy	11			See comment on Policy 2 regarding "any development".	Agreed Policy reworded to "new development....."	Y
Chichester District Council		28	Policy	11			Add a definition of a major road. It is not reasonable to ask for development to fix existing problems, may need to use Parish's percentage of CIL money for this. What is a 'lane network'?	It is considered reasonable to ask for a contribution to improvements if there is a traffic impact and improve the pedestrian and cycling environment by reducing the severance effect of the main road. Agreed no one development is likely to be significant enough to fix the problem, although some reasonably modest traffic measures would help considerably.	N
Chichester District Council		28	Policy	11			Need to add conformity references to NPPF and the emerging Chichester Local Plan.	This is assessed in the Basic Conditions Statement.	N
Somerley Residents Association	✓	28	Policy	11		✓	<i>Cover letter précis</i> - As nearly all amenities are located North of A286 recommend `support should be given to continuation of the existing sites for horticulture, and amenities to maintain social cohesion and the local economy. Recommend no further housing development is allocated further south than allowed for in the plan in order to maintain community integration as main community assets are remove and require negotiating 2 busy roads <i>Form response</i> - Development away from the main amenities of the village should be resisted to avoid severance.	Agree. The revised settlement boundary aims to do this.	N

Organisation or Individual Name	All boxes 'Support no change' unless detailed	Page No	Policy or Proposal	Policy or Proposal Number	Support with Modifications	Oppose	Comment Received	Birdham Parish Council (BPC) - Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group (NPSG) response	NP Amended Y/N
<b>POLICY 11</b>									
Chichester Harbour Conservancy		28	Policy	11			I would suggest this Policy is rather ambitious. The Inspector in the Tawny Nurseries decision - (APP/L3815/A/13/2199668, allowed 8.1.2014, paragraph 8 refers) - did not consider such severance to be a reason to with-hold planning permission. If the scale of development warrants CIL or S.106 contributions to make such improvements, then perhaps the wording needs to talk about the scale of development this Policy should refer to: for example, net gain of five dwellings, or be based upon net increase in trip generation from the application site as suggested earlier in these comments. If a pedestrian crossing across A286 is the community's priority, then identify where you would suggest it be located on a diagram in the plan, based upon a survey of where most people are observed to cross the road.	Policy has been reworded to take some of these points into consideration.	Y
Genesis Town Planning Trustees of Farquhar-Thompson Trust	Only Policies 7,9,11 ticked support no change		Policy	11			Following our comments on policy 7 and 9 we support Policy 1	noted	N
Anthony Monks	not marked	28	Policy	11			Delete (Should) Insert (Must) Add action plan to page 40	As in many cases a contribution will be sought not the full works implemented, it is not possible to use the word "must".	N
Mrs Mabel Evans	✓	28	Policy	11			Speed on the A286 (at present 40mph) should be restricted to 30mph. At least now that there are more housing developments on this road.	Highway issue not a planning policy concern.	N
Chris Adams	✓	28	Policy	11	✓		Suggest the construction of a pedestrian crossing on the A286. Perhaps opposite the Old School House. The sooner the better.	Highway issue not a planning policy concern.	N
Susan & Derrick Pope	✓	28	Policy	11	✓		Although sympathetic to the need to ensure safety, Birdham Straight is a B road, serving a wide community on the Manhood and is especially busy at certain times of day. We remain to be convinced that further speed restrictions are appropriate or necessary on Birdham Straight. We would very much support a pedestrian crossing in the vicinity of the Old School House and also across Bell Lane.	Noted	N
Mr Stephen R Crossley & Mrs Sarah E Crossley	✓	28	Policy	11	✓		It wont always be possible to secure all the finance for 'a connection', so Insert the words 'demonstrate having tried to avoid dead ends, but making provision for.....	Agree, policy re-drafted 'contributing to'	Y
Graham Campbell	✓	28	Policy	11	✓		Remarks on Policy 9 & 10 Apply This policy will have no effect at all. This issue is currently ignored by the planning process, and that situation will continue. A much stronger policy statement would at least register the intent of local people to do something about an issue which registers high on the scale of residents' concerns. This policy should be more ambitious. A cycle path, separated from all traffic, and hard surfaced, between Chichester & West Wittering should be a long term aim, and Birdham Parish should be leading work towards that aim.	Disagree, policy needs to be proportionate to the scale of development in line with national guidance.	N

Organisation or Individual Name	All boxes 'Support no change' unless detailed	Page No	Policy or Proposal	Policy or Proposal Number	Support with Modifications	Oppose	Comment Received	Birdham Parish Council (BPC) - Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group (NPSG) response	NP Amended Y/N
<b>POLICY 12</b>									
Chichester District Council		29	Policy	12			Suggest new policy title "Policy 12 Housing Development"	Agree title changed	Y
Chichester District Council		29	Policy	12			Suggest rewording the 1 <sup>st</sup> paragraph as follows "The indicative parish housing number for Birdham Parish in the emerging Local Plan is 50. The following sites are estimated to be capable of delivering growth of 79 units for the neighbourhood plan period 2014-2029, including a number of affordable units.	Policy altered to "The indicative parish housing number for Birdham Parish in the emerging Local Plan is 50. The following sites have planning permission or a resolution in favour of granting permission for an estimated delivered growth of 79 units for the neighbourhood plan period 2014-2029, including a number of affordable units.	Y
Chichester District Council		29	Policy	12			Delete "further" in the last sentence of the policy.	Agreed	Y
Chichester District Council		29	Policy	12			Not all the sites have planning permission, this should be highlighted in some text and there is no guarantee they will be built out. If not implemented and not identified, the neighbourhood plan may be vulnerable to other development sites.	Agreed Policy Reworded The sites, with planning permission or agreed in principle subject to a s106 agreement	Y
Chichester District Council		29	Policy	12			Suggest referring to the sites individually on a plan, although shown on the settlement boundary map so need to relate back to this.	Sites are already defined in planning applications. Not needed in this plan.	N
Birdham Village Residents Association	✓	29	Policy 5.5	12 ?			We would like to see policy 5 prioritise building on already developed sites first, and a comment to discourage developers using stock housing design. It is important that any development clearly visible from the road should be in keeping with the general design characteristics of the area, not the generic designs that are being uniformly used across the whole of the country 5.5 Housing Policy Under policies add after the first line In line with Governmental advice previously developed sites will be considered suitable for development Housing density & Design Stock Housing Design will not be supported.	Agree, but national policy supports this already, and policy 16 on housing design promotes non-standard design.	N
Somerley Residents Association	✓	29	Policy	12	✓		Form response - If Tawny camp site is development housing should be set back from the road and screening maintained in line with the current street-scape.	This is an issue for any detailed planning application on the site.	N

Organisation or Individual Name	All boxes 'Support no change' unless detailed	Page No	Policy or Proposal	Policy or Proposal Number	Support with Modifications	Oppose	Comment Received	Birdham Parish Council (BPC) - Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group (NPSG) response	NP Amended Y/N
<b>POLICY 12</b>									
Premier Marina CBRE Ltd on behalf of	✓		Policy	12	✓		Recognise housing target of 50 additional dwellings, the Plan identifies recent consents for 79 new dwellings and states that there is no requirement for more having exceeded the target of 50. This represents a misapplication of the principles of the Local Plan. (There is a detailed justification.) Quote from Para 47 & 48 of NPPF. Policies should not be used to restrict the development of housing, by virtue of existing targets being met. Instead principles of sustainable development should be applied and development to meet changing needs should be encouraged. The neighbourhood Plan should recognise the need to provide more than enough, not just enough housing supply and should be flexible to allow for additional supply to come forward to meet need.	The neighbourhood plan is not allocating sites for development as current permissions and sites with an intention to grant permission subject to s106 already provide more potential dwellings than the local plan indicates Birdham should find.	N
Premier Marina CBRE Ltd on behalf of	✓		Policy	12	✓		although consents exist for housing development sufficient to meet the Local Plan target for Birdham, there is no certainty that these consents will be brought forward. There should be greater flexibility in reviewing the future position and recognising additional need for residential development in line with the Chichester Local Plan.	The sites with consent have a firm indication that residential development will be welcome, subject to meeting planning policy requirements.	N
Premier Marina CBRE Ltd on behalf of	✓		Policy	12	✓		There should also be an acknowledgement of other forms of providing residential development. The Plan area already includes 31 established houseboats on Chichester Canal, and as such, they can be considered to contribute towards the character of Birdham. Further development of houseboats, in appropriate locations (specifically Chichester Canal and Chichester Marina due to its provision of local services) and of appropriate quantum, should be supported due to their relatively low impact on the Plan area.	Houseboats were not an issue identified for a specific planning policy during consultation. Any application in future will be considered on its merits.	N
Premier Marina CBRE Ltd on behalf of	✓		Policy	12	✓		Suggest change to policy wording to read first paragraph <b>“The Neighbourhood Plan acknowledges the identified housing target for the Neighbourhood Plan area of 50 additional dwellings, prescribed by the emerging Chichester District Council Local Plan. The following proposed developments, totalling 79 dwellings, all have the benefit of planning consent and are expected to come forward during the plan period:</b>  Site allocation as plan	The policy is considered adequate as it stands. The plan can be reviewed in future if required.	N

Organisation or Individual Name	All boxes 'Support no change' unless detailed	Page No	Policy or Proposal	Policy or Proposal Number	Support with Modifications	Oppose	Comment Received	Birdham Parish Council (BPC) - Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group (NPSG) response	NP Amended Y/N
<b>POLICY 12</b>									
Premier Marina CBRE Ltd on behalf of	✓		Policy	12	✓		Suggest change to policy wording to read Last paragraph "Although there are no plans to allocate further housing sites at the present time, it is recognised that there is no certainty that the above consents will be implemented and delivered in full. As such, due consideration will be given to additional housing proposals that come forward to assist in significantly boosting the supply of housing in the District and meeting housing need, which will be reviewed regularly. In addition, small housing proposals on other windfall sites will be considered (see Policy 14: Windfall Sites) and proposals for alternative forms of residential provision, such as houseboats, will be considered according to their suitability."	The policy is considered adequate as it stands. The plan can be reviewed in future if required.	N
Genesis Town Planning Trustees of Farquhar-Thompson Trust	Only Policies 7,9,11 ticked support no change		Policy	12		✓	Please Read comments alongside the plan & Sketches submitted. We object to this policy. The consented sites are not new identified Parish Housing Sites. They are either windfall developments or developments for affordable housing known as rural exception schemes. Some of the sites have been allowed expressly to help contribute to a pressing 5 year land supply shortfall and this has still not been remedied. In any event as required the NPPF (paragraph 16) Neighbourhood Plans must be prepared that support the strategic development needs set out in Local Plans and must not promote less development than set out in a local plan (paragraph 184)	The neighbourhood plan does not allocate sites. It has noted potential permissions or minded to grant decisions that exceed the current indicative housing requirement for Birdham in the Local Plan. The settlement boundary has been revised and the plan is felt to conform to the requirements of the NPPF.	N
Genesis Town Planning Trustees of Farquhar-Thompson Trust	Only Policies 7,9,11 ticked support no change		Policy	12		✓	Until the housing requirements of the Local Plan have been tested at Examination and actual targets agreed we therefore believe it prudent for the Birdham Neighbourhood Plan to make full provision for 50 new dwellings required by Local Plan Policy 5 even if they are regarded as 'contingencies' in the short term before the replacement Local Plan has been adopted See previous comments Planning Policy context	see above	N
Genesis Town Planning Trustees of Farquhar-Thompson Trust	Only Policies 7,9,11 ticked support no change		Policy	12		✓	paragraph with details of visibility splays as shown on the plan.	Not a relevant issue for the neighbourhood plan.	N
Bernice Culley	✓	29	Policy	12	✓		All affordable housing should be <u>granted to residents</u> only in <u>perpetuity</u> - otherwise the problem of providing affordable homes for locals continues to re-appear.	it is not possible to require the housing authority to do something in a planning policy, but they have undertaken to follow a local preference for lettings policy.	N
Marion Barker	not marked	29	Policy	12			.... Already be agreed please insert IN PRINCIPLE	Agree, policy re-drafted	Y

Organisation or Individual Name	All boxes 'Support no change' unless detailed	Page No	Policy or Proposal	Policy or Proposal Number	Support with Modifications	Oppose	Comment Received	Birdham Parish Council (BPC) - Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group (NPSG) response	NP Amended Y/N
<b>POLICY 12</b>									
Mr KJ Wright	✓	29	Policy	12	✓		However in policy 12, housing sites: perhaps this should be expanded to say that although the existing housing demand in the draft CDC local plan has already been satisfied. Something like this could bring the point home that we don't need any more housing units but are aware that nothing is yet finalized in the draft CDC local plan the NP steering group recognizes that this may change. Small future use sites have been identified through consultation but because of commercial considerations it is considered prudent to withhold this information until if and when it is required	The position is felt to be clear as stated.	N
Mrs Jane Pauline Russell	✓	29	Policy	12	✓		There is a need for sheltered housing for the elderly.	Noted. Negotiation on affordable housing design could take this into consideration.	N
Ron Green	✓	29	Policy	12	✓		Oppose Crooked Lane development	Noted, but not relevant for policy purposes.	N
Mr Stephen R Crossley & Mrs Sarah E Crossley	✓	29	Policy	12		✓	The proposed policy does not provide provision for sustainable future requirements. Recommend - <i>a small sites policy</i> , (in recognition of Birdhams status as a small village), and allow development <b>outside</b> of the current SPA, either on or to directly facilitate new homes on, <b>previously developed land only</b> Consider an opportunity has been missed/delayed to encourage proposals from owners of potential small sites outside of the SPA, so like other communities Birdham could be best placed and better informed as to what might be possible. A call for such sites and community showcase by developers would have provided for a better informed balance of options. However we completely understand the reasons for taking a defensive position in consideration of stealth developments encouraged by current policy. It is a shame it has compromised a good community planning process.	The plan reflects views of residents who wanted a settlement boundary maintained.	N
<b>POLICY 13</b>									
Chichester District Council		30	Policy	13			Suggest renaming to Settlement Boundaries to link with the emerging Local Plan.	Agreed	Y
Chichester District Council		30	Policy	13			Policies in the emerging Local Plan will also apply both inside and outside of the settlement boundary not just those listed in the neighbourhood plan.	Agree. Policy will refer to "settlement boundary" in line with emerging plan. Policy will also clarify that outside the boundary any development needs to comply with policy 45 'development in the countryside' in the emerging plan .	Y
Southern Water	Not marked	31	Policy	13		✓			N

Organisation or Individual Name	All boxes 'Support no change' unless detailed	Page No	Policy or Proposal	Policy or Proposal Number	Support with Modifications	Oppose	Comment Received	Birdham Parish Council (BPC) - Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group (NPSG) response	NP Amended Y/N
<b>POLICY 13</b>									
Chichester Harbour Conservancy		30	Policy	13			SPA diagram legend: this pre-supposes that people know where the existing boundary is. It would be better/clearer to label what is "Housing Site" in the legend as "proposed extension to SPA" and use the red line to show the current SPA. Whilst the text below the diagram does elaborate, people generally can immediately understand a diagram. A picture says a thousand words as they say.	The plan has not made any site allocations.	N
Somerley Residents Association	✓	30	Policy	13	✓		<i>Form response</i> - We support an SPA. However it has to be recognised in the Plan that the proposed housing has not yet been fully approved.	Agree, this has been noted in the policy and supporting text.	Y
Premier Marina CBRE Ltd on behalf of	✓		Policy	13	✓		restricts development outside of the Settlement Policy Area, which is tightly drawn around the settlement of Birdham, unless this is in accordance with Policy 15 regarding the re-use of rural buildings. Whilst the Birdham Settlement Policy Area is consistent with the emerging Chichester Local Plan , greater flexibility should be incorporated in accordance with the presumption for sustainable development as per the NPPF.	The settlement boundary needs to be firm, it has been reviewed for this plan. It could be considered again at any further review of the whole plan.	N
Premier Marina CBRE Ltd on behalf of	✓		Policy	13	✓		It should be acknowledged that areas of existing development outside the Birdham SPA, such as Chichester Marina can suitably accommodate future development, utilising the clustering of supporting services and facilities and the critical mass provided by an established developed area.	The plan has not considered any site allocations.	N
Premier Marina CBRE Ltd on behalf of	✓		Policy	13	✓		Premier Marinas suggests that the final line of draft Policy 13 be removed and replaced with the following sentence: <b>"Outside of the SPA, development will be resisted unless it is of appropriate scale and design relevant to its surrounds and location, having regard to the principles of sustainable development and complies with other policies in this plan."</b>	This would be contrary to the emerging policy in the CDC Local Plan	N
Genesis Town Planning Trustees of Farquhar-Thompson Trust	Only Policies 7,9,11 ticked support no change		Policy	13	✓		In the event the principle of an allocation is accepted for the site, it will also need to be included within a new Settlement Policy Area for Birdham.	The settlement boundary has been considered and it is not proposed to alter it further.	N
Mr KJ Wright	✓	30	Policy	13	✓		?? Should be this Policy SPA Looks a little contrived on the map	the boundary has been reviewed and the policy complies with the adopted local plan and the emerging local plan	N
Sarah Backhouse	✓	30	Policy	13	✓		It is very important that the rural gap between Birdham and Somerley is maintained. With the development of 55 homes at the top end of Bell Lane, any further encroachment down the lane should be resisted to preserve the semi-rural ambience of nurseries and well-screened camping and caravan sites into the rural open farmland.	Noted, see additional text in Policy 1.	Y
Enid Mary Strange	✓	30	Policy	13	✓		Preserve the semi-rural and open landscape between Birdham and Somerley	Noted, see additional text in Policy 1.	Y
Mrs Jane Pauline Russell	✓	30	Policy	13	✓		It is important to retain the rural gap between Birdham and Somerley	Noted, see additional text in Policy 1.	Y



Organisation or Individual Name	All boxes 'Support no change' unless detailed	Page No	Policy or Proposal	Policy or Proposal Number	Support with Modifications	Oppose	Comment Received	Birdham Parish Council (BPC) - Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group (NPSG) response	NP Amended Y/N
<b>POLICY 13</b>									
Mr Stephen R Crossley & Mrs Sarah E Crossley	✓	30	Policy	13	✓		The proposed policy does not provide provision for sustainable future requirements. Recommend - <i>a small sites policy</i> , (in recognition of Birdhams status as a small village), and allow development <b>outside</b> of the current SPA, either on or to directly facilitate new homes on, <b>previously developed land only</b> Consider an opportunity has been missed/delayed to encourage proposals from owners of potential small sites outside of the SPA, so like other communities Birdham could be best placed and better informed as to what might be possible. A call for such sites and community showcase by developers would have provided for a better informed balance of options. However we completely understand the reasons for taking a defensive position in consideration of stealth developments encouraged by current policy. It is a shame it has compromised a good community planning process.	The plan reflects views of residents who did not want further development sites at this time.	N
<b>POLICY 14</b>									
Chichester District Council		31	Policy	14			Windfall sites are 1-5 dwellings.	Agreed policy reworded	Y
Chichester District Council		31	Policy	14			Suggest adding in protecting amenities of occupiers of neighbouring properties.	Agreed Policy reworded	Y
Earnley Parish Council	✓	28	Policy	14	✓		Earnley Parish Council support the introduction of further speed restrictions and traffic calming measures and would request the inclusion of a reduction to 30mph for the whole length of Bell Lane.	Note support, but the plan cannot specify particular highway solutions.	N
English Heritage		31	Policy	14			welcome and support the requirement in Policy 14 that windfall schemes should not adversely affect any heritage assets	Noted with thanks	N
Somerley Residents Association	✓	31	Policy	14	✓		<i>Form response</i> - The size of windfall development should be increased to 10 to allow diversity of homes.	CDC define windfall sites up to a maximum of 5 dwellings, and we are content to also use this standard. In a village such as Birdham 10 dwellings on one site is a significant development.	N
Natural England		31	Policy	14			It may be helpful to make reference in Policy 14 (Windfall Sites), to the interim and the evolving Chichester policies relating to the designated sites at Chichester and Pagham Harbours.	The Neighbourhood Plan can only deal with land in the Neighbourhood Plan area.	N
Chichester Harbour Conservancy		30	Policy	14			I am curious as to where the figure of 6 dwellings - (also last paragraph, page 32, 1st line) - came from? May also be better to say a net gain of dwellings, because most coming forward like this will probably involve the demolition of the existing dwelling on the site. Also the last criterion of "well integrated with": does this really need to be said? If it is within the SPA, it surely is recognised as being integrated into the village. Fair enough to talk about connectivity and legible developments, to avoid gated communities, which turn their back on the street/neighbours though.	The figure comes from the CDC definition of 'windfall sites', but has been revised to 5 to fit this definition.	Y

Organisation or Individual Name	All boxes 'Support no change' unless detailed	Page No	Policy or Proposal	Policy or Proposal Number	Support with Modifications	Oppose	Comment Received	Birdham Parish Council (BPC) - Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group (NPSG) response	NP Amended Y/N
<b>POLICY 14</b>									
Genesis Town Planning Trustees of Farquhar-Thompson Trust	Only Policies 7,9,11 ticked support no change		<b>Policy</b>	<b>14/16</b>		✓	We believe Policy 14 duplicates the objectives of Policy 13 and Policy 16. It duplicates Policy 13 which already allows the development of sites within the Settlement Policy Area. The allowable threshold of 6 dwellings in Policy 14 has been set to avoid over development. However this objective duplicates guidance in Policy 16 which requires the density of new development to be in keeping with existing character. Policy 14 could therefore be deleted and the tests for new development added to Policy 16.	The definition of windfall sites is to be altered to that CDC recommend. The policy is felt to adequately reflect local concerns as it is.	<b>N</b>
Premier Marina CBRE Ltd on behalf of	✓		<b>Policy</b>	<b>14</b>	✓		currently restricts the development of windfall sites to six or fewer dwellings. To reflect the points highlighted above, Policy 14 should not restrict the number of units and should seek to include a level of flexibility for future need beyond the sites identified within Policy 12.	CDC define windfall sites up to a maximum of 5 dwellings, and we are content to also use this standard. In a village such as Birdham 10 dwellings on one site is a significant development.	<b>N</b>
Premier Marina CBRE Ltd on behalf of	✓		<b>Policy</b>	<b>14</b>	✓		Premier Marinas supports the list of criteria identified for windfall site proposals, but suggests that greater flexibility should be incorporated with the removal or rewording of the final criteria point relating to integration with the existing village.	The policy expresses local desires as it is, windfall sites will be expected to integrate well into the existing village.	<b>N</b>
Premier Marina CBRE Ltd on behalf of	✓		<b>Policy</b>	<b>14</b>	✓		The following revised wording is suggested: <b>“the development is well integrated with its existing surroundings and enhances or benefits from local facilities in line with Community &amp; Leisure Policies 7 &amp; 8.”</b>	see above.	<b>N</b>
Trevor Butress	✓	<b>31</b>	<b>Policy</b>	<b>14</b>		✓	There is a risk that small developments could be increased in the future	Windfall sites will be defined as 5 dwellings or less on the advice of CDC	<b>N</b>
Mrs Sandra M Vernon	✓	<b>31</b>	<b>Policy</b>	<b>14</b>		✓	No more Development	National policy requires a positive approach to planning.	<b>N</b>
Ron Green	✓	<b>31</b>	<b>Policy</b>	<b>14</b>	✓		Max 2 dwellings per site	Windfall sites will be defined as 5 dwellings or less on the advice of CDC	<b>N</b>
Mr Stephen R Crossley & Mrs Sarah E Crossley	✓	<b>31</b>	<b>Policy</b>	<b>14</b>	✓		The proposed policy does not provide provision for sustainable future requirements. Recommend - <i>a small sites policy</i> , (in recognition of Birdhams status as a small village), and allow development <b>outside</b> of the current SPA, either on or to directly facilitate new homes on, <b>previously developed land only</b> Consider an opportunity has been missed/delayed to encourage proposals from owners of potential small sites outside of the SPA, so like other communities Birdham could be best placed and better informed as to what might be possible. A call for such sites and community showcase by developers would have provided for a better informed balance of options. However we completely understand the reasons for taking a defensive position in consideration of stealth developments encouraged by current policy. It is a shame it has compromised a good community planning process.	see above	<b>N</b>

Organisation or Individual Name	All boxes 'Support no change' unless detailed	Page No	Policy or Proposal	Policy or Proposal Number	Support with Modifications	Oppose	Comment Received	Birdham Parish Council (BPC) - Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group (NPSG) response	NP Amended Y/N
<b>POLICY 15</b>									
Chichester District Council		31	Policy	15			Conversions would only be for agricultural workers dwellings, which is contrary to the NPPF.	See policy re-wording.	Y
Chichester District Council		31	Policy	15			This is a very restrictive policy, suggest looking at Loxwood Neighbourhood Plan and the comments the examiner made in relation to their rural policy.	Agreed Policy reworded as follows: Suggested new Rural Policy 15 for Birdham Plan: Development within the rural area will be in accordance with the NPPF paragraph 55, the CDC Emerging Local Plan policy 45 and the General Permitted Development Order. The re-use of farm and rural buildings outside the Settlement Boundary for agricultural/ horticultural/business purposes or to provide dwellings for agricultural workers will be supported subject to the following criteria: a. The proposed re-use would not have significant harmful impacts on the surrounding rural landscape and is sensitive to its setting by means of size, bulk and location. b) The proposed re-use would not have any unacceptable impact on the local road network. c) The proposed re-use would not cause any unacceptable conflict with agriculture, horticultural and other land and water-based economic and leisure activities. d) The proposals would not have any significant harmful impact on the amenities of neighbouring residents and other users. e) The buildings concerned would not require substantial rebuilding or extension  Conformity Refs: NPPF para 55; CDC Local Plan Policy 45	Y
West Itchenor Parish Council		31	Policy	15			Concerned how widely drawn the 2 parts of the Rural Area Policy are drafted. 1 - All farm & rural Buildings. 2 All land already in agricultural or commercial use lying outside the SPA. Suggest : 1 that the policy should not apply to land or buildings inside the AONB unless they are listed buildings. 2 - that another criteria is added to your list of four on Page 31: any proposal should comply with <b>the provisions of Policy 45 of the Chichester District Local Plan (Development in the Countryside) and Policy 46 (Alterations, change of use and / or re-use of existing buildings in the countryside)</b>	Policy to be re-written to specifically require compliance with policy 45 and the NPPF.	Y

Organisation or Individual Name	All boxes 'Support no change' unless detailed	Page No	Policy or Proposal	Policy or Proposal Number	Support with Modifications	Oppose	Comment Received	Birdham Parish Council (BPC) - Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group (NPSG) response	NP Amended Y/N
<b>POLICY 15</b>									
Southern Water	Not marked	30	Policy	15			Southern Water understands Birdham Parish Council's desire to protect the countryside. However, we can not support the current wording of the policy as it could create a barrier to statutory utility providers, such as Southern Water, from delivering its essential infrastructure required to serve existing and planned development. Southern Water considers that should the need arise, the provision of essential wastewater or sewerage infrastructure (e.g. a new pumping station) required to serve new and existing customers is in the public interest. There are limited options available with regard to location, as the infrastructure would need to connect onto existing networks. The National Planning Practice Guidance recognises this scenario and states that it 'it will be important to recognise that water and wastewater infrastructure sometimes has locational needs (and often consists of engineering works rather than new buildings) which mean otherwise protected areas may exceptionally have to be considered'. Also Policy 45 of the Chichester Local Plan accepts that development will be granted 'where it requires a countryside location and meets the essential, small scale and local need which can not be met within or immediately adjacent to existing settlements'.	see below	N
Southern Water	Not marked	30	Policy	15			<b>Response continues</b> Although the Parish Council is not the planning authority in relation to wastewater or sewerage development proposals, support for essential infrastructure is required at all levels of the planning system. Accordingly, we propose the following additional wording for Policy 15: <u>New or improved utility infrastructure will be supported, where the benefit outweighs any harm, or it can be demonstrated there are no reasonable alternative sites available.</u>	Policy has been redrafted to include compliance with NPPF para 55 and CDC policy. This would allow the circumstances referred to being considered more favourably.	N
English Heritage		31	Policy	15			we would welcome a similar caveat in Policy 15 to that contained in Policy 14, that windfall schemes should not adversely affect any heritage assets	not considered necessary here as other policy will apply to any development.	N
Somerley Residents Association	✓	31	Policy	15	✓		<i>Form response</i> - Remove last bullet point as too restrictive but include an added point stating that the rural character of agricultural/horticultural sites should be maintained and/or enhanced.	Policy has been redrafted to make policy less restrictive. Final bullet point is considered necessary to maintain the visual character of the rural area.	Y
Chichester Harbour Conservancy		31	Policy	15			final criterion: better to put a % as to what you feel 'substantial' means. I would suggest no greater than 50% increase in the building's footprint.	Prefer a flexible wording as sometimes intrusive depends on other factors besides just size.	N

Organisation or Individual Name	All boxes 'Support no change' unless detailed	Page No	Policy or Proposal	Policy or Proposal Number	Support with Modifications	Oppose	Comment Received	Birdham Parish Council (BPC) - Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group (NPSG) response	NP Amended Y/N
<b>POLICY 15</b>									
Premier Marina CBRE Ltd on behalf of	✓		Policy	15		✓	seeks to manage development in rural areas. The aim to reuse buildings which otherwise may not find occupancy for agricultural or business purpose is positive. However, limiting residential potential for agricultural workers only does not provide enough viable options to continue the retention or economic endurance of the building. Furthermore, there should be provision to permit development within rural areas (outside the SPA) where it is sustainable and appropriate. In scenarios of housing shortfall and sustained under-delivery, managing development within areas outside of the SPA could be crucial to delivering housing.	Policy has been redrafted to be less restrictive and comply with national and local plan policy.	Y
Bernice Culley	✓	31	Policy	15	✓		concern that 'Business' development on agricultural land can lead to barn conversions for rental. This has already happened. Leads to noise, traffic problems. Needs more restrictions.	policy 15 has been redrafted to comply with national guidance.	Y
Timothy Firmstone	✓	31	Policy	15	✓		Include the term 'horticulture' in the phrase 'agriculture/business purposes or ....'	Agree, and included in new draft of the policy.	Y
Mr Rodney S de Chair	not marked	31	Policy	15	✓		In a previous submission content we identified a site that would be suitable for single dwelling development. The land concerned, whilst previously in horticultural/business use (and still shown as 'Nursery' in OS plans) has long been wholly residential. The existing text of this policy refers exclusively to development of BUILDINGS on such site (one was demolished long ago on the site in question) whilst the site concerned shares characteristics with 'Windfall sites', being outside the SPA, it could presumably not be regarded as being in that category. It is possible that Policy 15 be amended as follows: ADD NEW PARAGRAPH. 'The development of land previously used for agricultural, horticultural or business, but subsequently reclassified as residential may be supported subject to meeting the foregoing criteria for re-use of farm and rural buildings and with the criteria in Policy 16 for housing density and design.	policy 15 has been redrafted to comply with national guidance.	Y

Organisation or Individual Name	All boxes 'Support no change' unless detailed	Page No	Policy or Proposal	Policy or Proposal Number	Support with Modifications	Oppose	Comment Received	Birdham Parish Council (BPC) - Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group (NPSG) response	NP Amended Y/N
<b>POLICY 15</b>									
Susan & Derrick Pope	✓	31	Policy	15	✓		<p>We are concerned that this policy is expressed in a very broad way and that it does not comply with Policy 45 and 46 of the Chichester Draft Local Plan.</p> <p>The first premise of Policy 45 is that 'Within the countryside, outside settlement policy boundaries, development will be granted where it requires a countryside location and meets the essential small scale and local needs which cannot be met within or immediately adjacent to existing settlements.'</p> <p>The Policy Statement of the CDC Local Plan says at para 19.23 - 'Where essential development in the countryside is proposed to meet a demonstrable need, the following preferences for development should be applied: Conversion of existing buildings worthy of retention; or Redevelopment of sustainably located previously developed sites; or If no appropriately located and deliverable previously developed sites exist in the local area, greenfield sites within or immediately adjacent to existing settlements may be considered.'</p> <p>Policy 46 addresses the Alterations, Change of Use and/or Re-use of Existing Buildings in the Countryside. The first criterion to be met is '1. The building is structurally sound and is capable of conversion for employment uses .without the need for significant extension, alteration or rebuilding'. It also has to be considered whether '4. The form, bulk and general design of the building is in keeping with its surroundings and the proposal and any associated development will not harm its landscape character and setting;'</p>	policy 15 has been redrafted to comply with national guidance.	Y
Susan & Derrick Pope	✓	31	Policy	15	✓		<p><i>Response continues</i> - The policy statement says; 19.30 Where appropriate, permitted development rights will be withdrawn to protect the visual amenities of the area, the size, rural character and appearance of the building or structure, and affordability of the development. It may also be necessary to impose conditions to ensure retention of the proposed use through restricted occupancy for that purpose. 19.31 Not all buildings in the countryside will be suitable for reuse. In order to maintain the character and appearance of the countryside, and promote sustainable rural communities, only appropriate buildings in sustainable locations should be converted and reused. It is unlikely that the conversion of remote or isolated rural buildings to residential use will be acceptable.</p>	policy 15 has been redrafted to comply with national guidance.	Y

Organisation or Individual Name	All boxes 'Support no change' unless detailed	Page No	Policy or Proposal	Policy or Proposal Number	Support with Modifications	Oppose	Comment Received	Birdham Parish Council (BPC) - Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group (NPSG) response	NP Amended Y/N
<b>POLICY 15</b>									
Mr Stephen R Crossley & Mrs Sarah E Crossley	✓	31	Policy	15	✓		<p>The proposed policy does not provide provision for sustainable future requirements.</p> <p>Recommend - <i>a small sites policy</i>, (in recognition of Birdhams status as a small village), and allow development <b>outside</b> of the current SPA, either on or to directly facilitate new homes on, <b>previously developed land only</b></p> <p>Consider an opportunity has been missed/delayed to encourage proposals from owners of potential small sites outside of the SPA, so like other communities Birdham could be best placed and better informed as to what might be possible. A call for such sites and community showcase by developers would have provided for a better informed balance of options.</p> <p>However we completely understand the reasons for taking a defensive position in consideration of stealth developments encouraged by current policy. It is a shame it has compromised a good community planning process.</p> <p>Also in the interests of sustainability and enhancement, recommend remove</p> <p>“Did not require any substantial rebuilding or extension to an existing building”,</p> <p>Without this allowance it may render a project unviable.</p>	policy 15 has been redrafted to comply with national guidance.	Y
<b>POLICY 16</b>									
Chichester District Council		32	Policy	16			Suggest referring to West Sussex County Council parking standards or provide local evidence if setting own standards.	Evidence from Birdham Neighbourhood Plan Survey, backed up by census data	N
Chichester District Council		32	Policy	16			Development outside the AONB does not need to be designed in accordance with the harbour conservancy design guidelines, suggest following the principles of the guidelines.	The point of using the HC design guidance is to widen the remit of this work to the whole parish, reasonable considering there is little difference between the majority of the parish dwellings in the AONB and the rest outside of it.	N
Birdham Village Residents Association	✓	32	Policy	16	✓		(No reason given)		N
English Heritage		32	Policy	16			We welcome and support the requirement of Policy 16 that the design and materials should be in keeping with the individual character and local distinctiveness of the Parish, although this seems to be at odds with the requirement that building styles should be “diverse”.	Noted.	N

Organisation or Individual Name	All boxes 'Support no change' unless detailed	Page No	Policy or Proposal	Policy or Proposal Number	Support with Modifications	Oppose	Comment Received	Birdham Parish Council (BPC) - Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group (NPSG) response	NP Amended Y/N
<b>POLICY 16</b>									
Somerley Residents Association	✓	32	Policy	16	✓		<i>Cover letter précis</i> - Welcome statement concerning liaising with neighbouring Parishes, request that a policy is also included stating that coalescence or perceived coalescence between individual settlements within and neighbouring the parish should be prevented. <i>Form response</i> - Any Development along the A2186, B2198 & B2179 should be set well back from roads and screened to reserve the rural character.	See redrafting of policy 1 re maintaining settlement separation.	Y
Natural England		32	Policy	16			Policy 16 could make reference to the protection of habitats and protect species on development sites and any use of these sites by wildlife from the designated international habitats - although you may consider this to be adequately covered in the Chichester Plan.	Adequately covered in CDC plan	N
Chichester Harbour Conservancy		32	Policy	16			think very carefully about setting a minimum parking standard per 'unit'. What are you trying to achieve? Why should parking for a 1 bed flat be the same as that for a 4 bed house? You will need to convince CDC as to why their adopted Car Parking Standards should be set aside. Whilst some also shy away from on-street parking, it does serve another purpose – to slow traffic, where the Parish is desirous of achieving 20 mph in side streets in the village. Overall, it may be simpler to refer to the CDC adopted parking standards, unless you have survey evidence to support your position above and beyond the census quoting 63% of Birdham Parish households having 2 or more cars	Noted.	N
Chichester Harbour Conservancy		32	Policy	16			it may be good to point at a few recent developments and say what their density is, compared to an average for the village. Some parts are bound to be denser than others. What effect has this had? What should be avoided? It could be good to split the parish up into character areas, much in the same way as the Bosham Village Design Statement does, with characteristics and features that define what is so distinct about each area, which a developer is being asked to 'respect'. So characteristics could include, heritage assets, scale, mass, materials, set back from the street, whether there is an established building line, building to plot ratios, prominent trees, etc.	Noted, however a design appraisal has not been undertaken for the plan.	N
Premier Marina CBRE Ltd on behalf of	✓		Policy	16			Premier Marinas considers that the requirement of draft Policy 16 for off street parking for at least 2 cars per unit and additional unallocated is too onerous and not realistic for smaller units. This does not promote the use of sustainable modes of transport and greater flexibility should be incorporated to allow for appropriate consideration on a case by case basis.	The policy reflects WSCC guidelines for rural areas.	N
Genesis Town Planning Trustees of Farquhar-Thompson Trust	Only Policies 7,9,11 ticked support no change		Policy	16	✓		However this objective duplicates guidance in Policy 16 which requires the density of new development to be in keeping with existing character. Policy 14 could therefore be deleted and the tests for new development added to Policy 16.	see above	N



Organisation or Individual Name	All boxes 'Support no change' unless detailed	Page No	Policy or Proposal	Policy or Proposal Number	Support with Modifications	Oppose	Comment Received	Birdham Parish Council (BPC) - Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group (NPSG) response	NP Amended Y/N
<b>POLICY 16</b>									
Mr Rodney S de Chair	not marked	32	Policy	16	✓		Line 1 - Amend to read '..... in policies 12,14 and 15 will be.....'	Policy is specifically applied to policies 12 and 14 dealing with new residential development.	N
Chris Adams	✓	32	Policy	16	✓		Developer should be forced by law to provide off street parking for 2 cars per property - the chaotic state on the new estate built on Birdham Straight (old Common Close) Is appalling and CDC should never have approved the plans.	Noted.	N
Mr Stephen R Crossley & Mrs Sarah E Crossley	✓	32	Policy	16	✓		It is a good idea to give guidance and the design principles from CHC are good in this respect. However exception should be allowed for exceptional architectural design, perhaps some new innovation, and if any such high quality design was considered to be of merit to the environment then would not wish to see this prohibited. Recommend insert " Unless considered to be of exceptional architectural merit".	We do not consider the policy rules out innovative good new design.	N
<b>POLICY 17</b>									
Chichester District Council		32	Policy	17			Suggest referring to a mix of housing sizes and types.	Agree	Y
Chichester District Council		32	Policy	17			Suggest rewording the last paragraph "A local lettings policy will be encouraged for all new affordable housing".	Agreed Policy reworded.	Y
Birdham Village Residents Association	✓	32	Policy	17	✓		(No reason given)		N
Genesis Town Planning Trustees of Farquhar-Thompson Trust	Only Policies 7,9,11 ticked support no change		Policy	17	✓		Policy 17 should be revised to reflect the policy wording of Local Plan	This is a matter for the Local Plan and its policies.	N
Mrs Sandra M Vernon	✓	32	Policy	17		✓	We have agreed to enough development.	National policy requires a positive approach to planning.	N
Mr KJ Wright	✓	32	Policy	17	✓		(No reason given)		N
Sarah Backhouse	✓	33	Policy	17	✓		There should be more emphasis on housing for the elderly. There is an above-average population of retired people in this area, and providing housing specifically for them frees up larger, family homes for younger people. It can also lead to development which might be more acceptable to the local community when meeting housing targets.	Noted. Negotiation on affordable housing design could take this into consideration.	N
Enid Mary Strange	✓	33	Policy	17	✓		There is no housing for the elderly in Birdham, and providing some should be a priority.	Noted. Negotiation on affordable housing design could take this into consideration.	N
Mrs Jane Pauline Russell	✓	35	Policy	17	✓		(No reason given)		N
Mr Stephen R Crossley & Mrs Sarah E Crossley	✓	32	Policy	17	✓				N

Organisation or Individual Name	All boxes 'Support no change' unless detailed	Page No	Policy or Proposal	Policy or Proposal Number	Support with Modifications	Oppose	Comment Received	Birdham Parish Council (BPC) - Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group (NPSG) response	NP Amended Y/N
<b>POLICY 18</b>									
Chichester District Council		34	Policy	18			Any development outside a flood risk area, does this mean flood zone 1 as outside a flood zone does not exist.	Amendments to policy have been made to allow for this point.	Y
Chichester District Council		34	Policy	18			Need to be very careful about the reference to any development, nationally there are different triggers for different types of development.	Wording Amended	Y
Chichester District Council		34	Policy	18			It is not possible to ask for a sequential test in flood zone 1 as this is contrary to the NPPF; it will not make an application invalid as no FRA is required in flood zone 1.	Amendments to policy have been made to allow for this point.	Y
Chichester District Council		34	Policy	18			Check on the trigger for an exception test as is must be in compliance with the NPPF.	We say 'where appropriate' to cover the trigger issue.	N
Chichester District Council		34	Policy	18			The SRFA has not been used as evidence for assessing flooding on sites. The Environment Agency is the Statutory Body that is consulted on flooding issues and their evidence is used.	We wish the SFRA to be used as evidence in future	N
West Sussex County Council		34	Policy	18			Please specify that the Chichester DC SFRA will be used for this process	Agreed, change to be made.	Y
West Sussex County Council		35	Policy	18			In the second paragraph, please remove reference to the 'proposed WSCC Strategic Flood Risk Assessment' and refer to the Chichester DC SFRA	Agreed, change to be made.	Y
Somerley Residents Association	✓	34	Policy	18		✓	<i>Cover Letter Précis</i> - Any further development should take into account Surface Water Management Plans and aim to reduce addition flow into the existing overburdened ditch network. Drainage system is not fit for purpose and requires clearance of a number of bottlenecks in the ditch network. Request that any further development south of the A286 is restricted until it is shown that the drainage system is functioning properly. <i>Form response</i> - The sever surface water management problems south of the A2186 have not yet been resolved and are not sufficiently accounted for in the Plan.	This is a matter for the LPA in consultation with the water authorities when a development proposal is submitted.	N
Anthony Monks	not marked	34	Policy	18			All too woolly & vulnerable to wriggling by developer. Development.....should (delete) Insert (Shall). Any..... should (delete) Insert (shall) Where appropriate (delete) In all cases, due to the flat nature of the land (insert) .....Exception tests .....	Policy felt to be as firm as is reasonable.	N
Eric C Hall	✓	34	Policy	18			Very important for future as well as needing present improvements	Noted	N
Mr Stephen R Crossley & Mrs Sarah E Crossley	✓	34	Policy	18	✓		European Directives dictate overarching guidelines and model scenarios for all types of flood risk. Having been specifically interested in this subject, I do not believe that at present our community and the wider community is best informed/served. Recommend advice line giving active support to help our local community flood prevention groups to help lobby government to ensure more realistic measures are taken into account, so that the selection of the most suitable areas proposed for development in flood risk terms are fully considered and worked on first.	Noted but not an issue for planning policy. CB Agree. But there is reference in the Action Plan to lobby for FRA.	N

Organisation or Individual Name	All boxes 'Support no change' unless detailed	Page No	Policy or Proposal	Policy or Proposal Number	Support with Modifications	Oppose	Comment Received	Birdham Parish Council (BPC) - Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group (NPSG) response	NP Amended Y/N
<b>POLICY 19</b>									
Chichester District Council		35	Policy	19			Need a definition of significant.	Removed significant	Y
Chichester District Council		35	Policy	19			Chichester DC may require this provision before it gets to significant, depending on soil profiles;	Covered in Policy 20	N
Chichester District Council		35	Policy	19			Percolation tests and capacity tests are often sought by way of a condition, following the approval of an application.	Noted	N
Somerley Residents Association	✓	35	Policy	19	✓		Form response - All SUDs systems may not always be appropriate & designs should be robustly examined by CDC and WSCC.	Detail will be considered when a development proposal is submitted.	N
Anthony Monks	not marked	35	Policy	19			MUST - GOOD !! Add action Plan Page 40	Noted	N
Trevor Buttress	✓	35	Policy	19	✓		It is <u>important</u> that ditches etc are properly maintained and cleared annually	Noted, proposal 4 promotes this.	N
Eric C Hall	✓	35	Policy	19			Very important for future as well as needing present improvements	noted. .	N
Mr Stephen R Crossley & Mrs Sarah E Crossley	✓	35	Policy	19	✓		European Directives dictate overarching guidelines and model scenarios for all types of flood risk. Having been specifically interested in this subject, I do not believe that at present our community and the wider community is best informed/served. Recommend advice line giving active support to help our local community flood prevention groups to help lobby government to ensure more realistic measures are taken into account, so that the selection of the most suitable areas proposed for development in flood risk terms are fully considered and worked on first.	Noted but not an issue for planning policy	N
<b>POLICY 20</b>									
Anthony Monks	not marked	35	Policy	20			MUST - GOOD !! Add action Plan Page 40	Noted	N
Eric C Hall	✓	35	Policy	20			Very important for future as well as needing present improvements	Noted	N
Ian Lockwood	✓	35	Policy	20			I would like to emphasis the impact that surface water management has on the adjacent area of Somerley. All surface water South of the A286 from the top Bell Lane, including water pumped from the fields at Whitestone Farm across the A286 from the Birdham Nisa Store, runs South in a network of ditched through Somerley to a crossing under Bell Lane at the corner of Bookers Lane where it joins the Earnley Rife. Along the network of ditches there are a number of bottlenecks which have contributed to the recent flooding of a number of properties in the Somerley area. Any further development within this area must take into account Surface Water Management Plans and aim to reduce the flow of water into an overburdened system of ditches which would otherwise increase the likelihood of flooding within Somerley.	Noted with thanks for the information.	N

Organisation or Individual Name	All boxes 'Support no change' unless detailed	Page No	Policy or Proposal	Policy or Proposal Number	Support with Modifications	Oppose	Comment Received	Birdham Parish Council (BPC) - Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group (NPSG) response	NP Amended Y/N
<b>POLICY 20</b>									
Chris Adams	✓	35	Policy	20	✓		It has been an ?? problem for many residents of Bell Lane, and with the new developments of both Rowan and Tawny nurseries now approved many residents are very apprehensive about the impact.	Noted.	N
Mrs Jane Pauline Russell	✓	36	Policy	20	✓		Who takes responsibility for flood damage to the listed buildings in Bell Lane when it is found that the suggested controls on surface water to be introduced by developers of Rowan/Tawny estates are insufficient and/or unsatisfactory?	This issue is beyond the scope of the plan	N
Mr Stephen R Crossley & Mrs Sarah E Crossley	✓	35	Policy	20	✓		European Directives dictate overarching guidelines and model scenarios for all types of flood risk. Having been specifically interested in this subject, I do not believe that at present our community and the wider community is best informed/served. Recommend advice line giving active support to help our local community flood prevention groups to help lobby government to ensure more realistic measures are taken into account, so that the selection of the most suitable areas proposed for development in flood risk terms are fully considered and worked on first.	Noted but not an issue for planning policy	N
Graham Campbell	✓	35	Policy	20	✓		This policy only tries to ensure things do not get worse. There should be a requirement that any development actually does something significant to improve the current, untenable, position.	This is not considered reasonable in planning terms.	N
<b>POLICY 21</b>									
Chichester District Council		36	Policy	21			May be stepping into alternative legislation, which would not come under development management.	Accept policy will be applied where appropriate	N
Chichester District Council		36	Policy	21			Need a better trigger as this level of detail cannot be required for any development.	Accept policy will be applied where appropriate	N
Chichester District Council		36	Policy	21			Need to be careful that they aren't giving a green light to private treatment plans. EA position may change on this in the future.	Noted	N
Chichester District Council		36	Policy	21			Need to make sure whole route to the WwTW has capacity (not just the nearest pumping station).	Policy amended to ... "Sidesham Wastewater Treatment Works and infrastructure to it has sufficient headroom..."	Y
Chichester District Council		36	Policy	21			Supporting text (2 <sup>nd</sup> para), Policy 7 is not relevant as this is master planning for strategic sites and Birdham does not have any strategic sites.	Reference in justification of policy is relevant as it is evidence of a general problem.	N
Birdham Village Residents Association	✓	36	Policy	21	✓		(No reason given)		N
Southern Water	Not marked	36	Policy	21	✓			No detailed comment received.	N
Chichester Harbour Conservancy		36	Policy	21			I think it likely that CDC will ask you to put the text "The local planning authority....do not endanger the ecology" as supporting text, rather than in the policy wording itself.	Policy considered acceptable as it is.	N
David Nightingale	✓	36	Policy	21			Appendix 7.5 Should read Appendix 7.6	Agree, changed in text.	Y
Eric C Hall	✓	36	Policy	21			Very important for future as well as needing present improvements	Noted	N

Organisation or Individual Name	All boxes 'Support no change' unless detailed	Page No	Policy or Proposal	Policy or Proposal Number	Support with Modifications	Oppose	Comment Received	Birdham Parish Council (BPC) - Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group (NPSG) response	NP Amended Y/N
<b>POLICY 21</b>									
Mr KJ Wright	✓	36	Policy	21	✓		(No reason given)		N
John F Dyer	✓	36	Policy	21	✓		Surprised that no mention of Shipton Green Lane and cesspits which cause awful problems - in flooding times it is a waste of time trying to control them!	This issue is beyond the scope of the plan	N
Chris Adams	✓	36	Policy	21	✓		Following all the problems of flooding in Bell Lane in 2012, much of it ?? by tons of surface water entering the system. <u>How on earth with Sidlesham PS cope with all the additional developments.</u>	The future situation will be assessed by experts who are hopefully becoming better informed about the local situation.	N
Mrs Jane Pauline Russell	✓	36	Policy	21	✓		It is not right that owners of listed buildings should have to privately fund so much to protect and defend their own homes as well as providing waste water treatment facilities.	This issue is beyond the scope of the plan	N
Mr Stephen R Crossley & Mrs Sarah E Crossley	✓	36	Policy	21	✓		European Directives dictate overarching guidelines and model scenarios for all types of flood risk. Having been specifically interested in this subject, I do not believe that at present our community and the wider community is best informed/served. Recommend advice line giving active support to help our local community flood prevention groups to help lobby government to ensure more realistic measures are taken into account, so that the selection of the most suitable areas proposed for development in flood risk terms are fully considered and worked on first.	Noted but not an issue for planning policy.	N
Graham Campbell	✓	36	Policy	21	✓		Southern Water cannot be trusted to ensure that an adequate sewerage system is provided. They seem to think heavy rainfall justifies allowing raw sewerage onto our roads & into Chichester Harbour. The NP needs to state this more robustly.	This issue is beyond the scope of the plan.	N
<b>POLICY 22</b>									
Chichester District Council		37	Policy	22			Suggest moving the last sentence of 1 <sup>st</sup> para of supporting text to the policy.	Agreed Policy reworded Horticulture added, Change SPA to SBA	Y
West Itchenor Parish Council		37	Policy	22			Concerned how widely the first paragraph of this policy has been drafted. Suggest 2 amendments 1 - that the policy should not apply to land or buildings inside the AONB unless they are listed buildings. 2 - that any proposal should comply with the <b>provisions of Policy 45 of the Chichester District Local Plan (Development in the Countryside) and Policy 46 (Alterations, change of use and / or re-use of existing buildings in the countryside)</b> The second paragraph refers to development proposals with the SPA on which we have no comment.	The AONB is protected by the CHC, national legislation and the LPA. It is not necessary for the neighbourhood plan to repeat the extra protection afforded the AONB.	N

Organisation or Individual Name	All boxes 'Support no change' unless detailed	Page No	Policy or Proposal	Policy or Proposal Number	Support with Modifications	Oppose	Comment Received	Birdham Parish Council (BPC) - Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group (NPSG) response	NP Amended Y/N
<b>POLICY 22</b>									
Premier Marina CBRE Ltd on behalf of	✓		Policy	22	✓		Policy 22 relates to policy 15, which restricts business conversion and small scale development outside of the SPA. The objective for development and growth states that it will "support the retention, development and sustainable growth of new and existing businesses", which Policy 22 is not in accordance with, as it provides no material growth potential for existing businesses outside of the SPA. Chichester Marina is a key local employer and economic driver, and as such, to ensure continued economic performance, should not be restricted.	Policy 15 has been redrafted to ensure that it does not clash with the intent to support business in this policy.	Y
Premier Marina CBRE Ltd on behalf of	✓		Policy	22	✓		Premier Marinas requests that greater flexibility be incorporated into draft Policy 22, giving support for development outside of the SPA in line with the principles suggested above under comments for draft policies 13, 14 and 15 above.	see above.	N
Timothy Firmstone	✓	37	Policy	22	✓		Include the term 'horticulture' in the phrase '...existing business and agricultural premises ....'	Agree, policy re-drafted	Y
Susan & Derrick Pope	✓	37	Policy	22	✓		Our comments on Policy 15 also have relevance to Policy 22. We would further suggest that the reference to 'employment opportunities' should be amended to 'local employment opportunities' in order to emphasise the need for sustainable development. We have known of people travelling from Portsmouth to work in Birdham – not something we would like the NP to encourage.	Agree, policy re-drafted	Y
Mr Stephen R Crossley & Mrs Sarah E Crossley	✓	37	Policy	22		✓	See previous comments on development outside of SPA / rural housing policy	see previous response	N
<b>POLICY 23</b>									
Chichester District Council		38	Policy	23			Suggest adding second paragraph of the supporting text to the policy.	Noted	N
Chichester District Council		38	Policy	23			Second paragraph, the emerging Chichester Local Plan has its own marketing guidance, it might be more relevant to refer to this.	Noted	N
Chichester District Council		38	Policy	23			Add Chichester Local Plan policies 26 and 29	This will be noted in the Basic Conditions Statement.	N
Chichester Harbour Conservancy		38	Policy	23			2nd paragraph under Policy 23: hopefully people will seek assistance to run their business rather than run at 2 years at a loss! Perhaps more weblinks are needed to allow such people to find and receive help so their business can thrive	Noted, but this is not a matter for a development plan.	N
Premier Marina CBRE Ltd on behalf of	✓		Policy	23	✓		Further to the above, draft policy 23 seeks to retain businesses, which should allow a degree of flexibility so that local economies can adapt and growth successfully, supporting Birdham economically. Support is expressed only for business related to tourism, marine, horticulture and agriculture. It should be recognised that whilst the local economy has characteristics, that business needs change and adapt, and as such, the policy should contain a level of flexibility.	Business proposals will be supported as long as they do not have an adverse effect on existing business.	N

Organisation or Individual Name	All boxes 'Support no change' unless detailed	Page No	Policy or Proposal	Policy or Proposal Number	Support with Modifications	Oppose	Comment Received	Birdham Parish Council (BPC) - Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group (NPSG) response	NP Amended Y/N
<b>POLICY 23</b>									
Jerold Alexander	✓	38	Policy	23	✓		Development of Birdham at Birdham Pool should be fiercely resisted rather than merely "discouraged"	Wording is considered appropriate as it is for a planning policy.	N
Giles Nicklin	✓	38	Policy	23	✓		I understand the desire to support local business but it is not clear to me that the village could support a business that is clearly failing.	Planning policy will not require financial support of failing business	N
Mr Stephen R Crossley & Mrs Sarah E Crossley	✓	38	Policy	23		✓	The growing population will naturally provide more tourists which can support Birdham's sustainable future. If Birdham fairly accepts and recognizes the increase (and social responsibility) it should provide further quality recreation and space for the needs of more visitors. Existing business should be encouraged to consider innovation and diversification, making business <i>more sustainable while providing a more</i> interesting offer to tourists. New business should be warmly encouraged to put forward proposals for community consideration and then if accepted, again supported at planning level.	Noted	N
<b>POLICY 24</b>									
Eric C Hall	✓	38	Policy	24			Definitely needs improvement.	Noted	N
<b>PROPOSAL 1</b>									
David Nightingale	✓	25	Proposal	1	✓		It should be remembered this is a village playing field and therefore excessive 'improvements' are not necessary. Features such as tennis courts and basketball courts will require on-going maintenance.	Noted - final decisions on proposals will be taken when funding found.	N
Timothy Firmstone	✓	25	Proposal	1	✓		The provision of changing facilities could include toilets and showers which are expensive to clean and maintain for the Parish. Suggest clarify the type of 'changing facilities' being considered	Noted with thanks	N
Giles Nicklin	✓	25	Proposal	1			I strongly support this Excellent proposal	Noted with thanks	N
Chichester District Council		25	Proposal	1			Suggest using "young people" rather than "youngsters".	Amended to young children	Y
Chichester District Council		25	Proposal	1			Delete reference to S106 agreements as it will not be possible to secure contributions through S106 agreement to sort out the existing problem at the playing field.	Improvements will be sought as part of a development's contribution to open space provision. S106 References updated throughout	Y
Chichester District Council		25	Proposal	1			Suggest adding the timeframe to spend the money as the life of the Neighbourhood Plan 2014-2029.	Wording amended	Y
Susan & Derrick Pope	✓	25	Proposal	1	✓		Whilst supporting in principle improvements to facilities at the Village Playing Field, the wording is far too wide in suggesting that any scheme will be supported. We would suggest that it is made explicit that the open green character of the Playing Field must be retained and that 'appropriate scheme's consistent with the Plan's objectives will be supported.'	Noted - final decisions on proposals will be taken when funding found.	Y

Organisation or Individual Name	All boxes 'Support no change' unless detailed	Page No	Policy or Proposal	Policy or Proposal Number	Support with Modifications	Oppose	Comment Received	Birdham Parish Council (BPC) - Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group (NPSG) response	NP Amended Y/N
<b>PROPOSAL 1</b>									
Susan & Derrick Pope	✓	25	Policy (Proposal)	8 (1)	✓		Whilst supporting in principle improvements to facilities at the Village Playing Field, the wording is far too wide in suggesting that any scheme will be supported. We would suggest that it is made explicit that the open green character of the Playing Field must be retained and that 'appropriate scheme's consistent with the Plan's objectives will be supported.'	Comment refers to a proposal - agree change 'any' to 'suitable' in proposal 1	Y
<b>PROPOSAL 2 &amp; 3</b>									
Chichester District Council		28	Proposal	2 & 3			Other Proposals Before proposal 2 "contribution for traffic calming measures may be sought through developer contributions in development locations". Suggest adding to a specific policy with a trigger for the size of development not as a sentence in the supporting text.	Noted	N
West Sussex County Council		28	Proposal	2 & 3			These aspirations have been noted. The County Council is in ongoing discussions with the community regarding the South Chichester Local Infrastructure Plan, which is used to guide local investment in highway improvement schemes identified as community priorities. Further discussion will be undertaken and the plan will be updated at appropriate intervals to ensure that it continues to reflect issues of current interest within communities.	Noted with thanks	N
Chichester Harbour Conservancy		28	Proposal	2			Perhaps use of S.106/CIL monies should be directed towards matched funding for the bus company to provide real-time information systems at certain bus stops, predicting proximity of buses held in congestion and their likely time of arrival. This will help villagers to make informed travel choices and commit to using public transport instead of the car.	Noted - final decisions on proposals will be taken when funding found.	N
John F Dyer	✓	28	Proposal	2	✓		Yes - Cannot use my bus pass because it involves (i) walking to Russells or Harbour Way - too far for an oldie and dangerous or (ii) get the car out and drive to some where to park! May as well drive the whole way.	Noted - final decisions on proposals will be taken when funding found.	N
Ron Green	✓	28	Proposal	2	✓		not applicable if bus timings un-reliable	Noted - final decisions on proposals will be taken when funding found.	N
<b>PROPOSAL 3</b>									
Chichester Harbour Conservancy		28	Proposal	3			If the community has a preferred speed limit for the Birdham straight, then perhaps it would be better to say what that was. It is currently 40mph. If 30 mph is aspired to, then set this out and identify on a diagram to be included in the plan where this lower limit would be applied to.	Speed limits are a highway issue not a landuse planning issue.	N
Earnley Parish Council	✓	31	Proposal	3	✓		Earnley Parish Council would respectfully request that this policy is strengthened to prevent coalescence and further ribbon development in particular south of A286 along the B2198.	Policy 1 has been redrafted to do this.	Y
David Nightingale	✓	28	Proposal	3		✓	There is no need to reduce speed limits. When there is heavy traffic is slows anyway and when not heavy traffic the current 30 and 40 mph's are reasonable	Noted - final decisions on proposals will be taken when funding found.	N
Bernice Culley	✓	28	Proposal	3	✓			Noted - final decisions on proposals will be taken when funding found.	N



Organisation or Individual Name	All boxes 'Support no change' unless detailed	Page No	Policy or Proposal	Policy or Proposal Number	Support with Modifications	Oppose	Comment Received	Birdham Parish Council (BPC) - Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group (NPSG) response	NP Amended Y/N
<b>PROPOSAL 3</b>									
Elizabeth Campbell	✓	28	Proposal	3	✓		..... 20mph restriction in roads off the A286 within the village. + 30mph restriction on A286 through the village (as is the case on A286 through Wes Dean, Singleton etc)	Noted - final decisions on proposals will be taken when funding found.	N
Jerold Alexander	✓	28	Proposal	3	✓		Please NO village wide 20mph limits.	Noted - final decisions on proposals will be taken when funding found.	N
Mrs Mabel Evans	✓	28	Proposal	3	✓		Speed on the A286 (at present 40mph) should be restricted to 30mph. At least now that there are more housing developments on this road.	Noted - final decisions on proposals will be taken when funding found.	N
Sarah Backhouse	✓	28	Proposal	3	✓		Speeding in Bell Lane is a constant problem. With the development of 55 new homes at the northern end of Bell Lane, speed reduction and safety measures should be a priority. Perhaps some "islands" as on the Birdham Straight might be considered together with a 30mph speed limit.	Noted - final decisions on proposals will be taken when funding found.	N
Hugh Charles Rawlinson	✓	28	Proposal	3	✓		No objection to speed restrictions but feel that traffic calming could cause other problems.	Noted - final decisions on proposals will be taken when funding found.	N
Phyllis Irene Rawlinson	✓	28	Proposal	3	✓		No objection to speed restrictions but traffic calming could cause other problems.	Noted - final decisions on proposals will be taken when funding found.	N
Enid Mary Strange	✓	28	Proposal	3	✓		Speeding has always been a problem in Bell Lane. Any measures to reduce it would be very welcome	Noted - final decisions on proposals will be taken when funding found.	N
Chris Adams	✓	28	Proposal	3	✓		Speed restrictions. Bell Lane is supposedly subject to 40mph limit, but it is very poorly indicated. Motorists enter Bell Lane at speed, and accelerate away to 60-70plus, some even overtaking alongside the ?? . A regular speed trap is required.	Noted - final decisions on proposals will be taken when funding found.	N
Susan & Derrick Pope	✓		Proposal	3	✓		Although sympathetic to the need to ensure safety, Birdham Straight is a B road, serving a wide community on the Manhood and is especially busy at certain times of day. We remain to be convinced that further speed restrictions are appropriate or necessary on Birdham Straight. We would very much support a pedestrian crossing in the vicinity of the Old School House and also across Bell Lane.	Noted - final decisions on proposals will be taken when funding found.	N
<b>PROPOSAL 4</b>									
West Sussex County Council		36	Proposal	4			It is the responsibility of the owner of the land to maintain ditches. The policy should suggest continued obligation on owners to encourage suitable maintenance as well as using developer contributions for local works.	This is not a policy but a project/proposal in line with local wishes.	N
Anthony Monks	not marked	36	Proposal	4			This should be policy otherwise it will be ignored. Developers must meet the full costs of all downstream improvements.	Disagree, this is a maintenance issue and therefore not a planning policy issue.	N
Anthony Monks	not marked	36	Proposal	4			Policy not Proposal.	Disagree, this is a maintenance issue and therefore not a planning policy issue.	N

Organisation or Individual Name	All boxes 'Support no change' unless detailed	Page No	Policy or Proposal	Policy or Proposal Number	Support with Modifications	Oppose	Comment Received	Birdham Parish Council (BPC) - Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group (NPSG) response	NP Amended Y/N
<b>PROPOSAL 4</b>									
Janet M Hall	✓	36	Proposal	4			VERY VERY IMPORTANT. Ditches MUST be dug out, cleared and allowed to do their job - connecting with each other and allowing water to flow freely. Too many ditches have been allowed to silt up because of non-clearance + because nobody knows to whom they belong. Therefore nobody takes responsibility for the I have notices a lot of deterioration in this matter over the last 24 years.	Noted - final decisions on proposals will be taken when funding found.	N
Eric C Hall	✓	36	Proposal	4			Very Important - particularly affects Westlands Lane	Noted - final decisions on proposals will be taken when funding found.	N
Mr KJ Wright	✓	36	Proposal	4	✓		(No reason given)		N
Giles Nicklin	✓	36	Proposal	4			Strongly support	Noted with thanks	N
Graham Campbell	✓	36	Proposal	4	✓		See remarks on Policy 20 Southern Water cannot be trusted to ensure that an adequate sewerage system is provided. They seem to think heavy rainfall justifies allowing raw sewerage onto our roads & into Chichester Harbour. The NP needs to state this more robustly.	Noted with thanks	N
<b>PROPOSAL 5</b>									
Mr Stephen R Crossley & Mrs Sarah E Crossley	✓	39	Proposal	5	✓		The growing population will naturally provide more tourists which can support Birdham's sustainable future. If Birdham fairly accepts and recognizes the increase (and social responsibility) it should provide further quality recreation and space for the needs of more visitors. Existing business should be encouraged to consider innovation and diversification, making business <i>more sustainable while providing a more</i> interesting offer to tourists. New business should be warmly encouraged to put forward proposals for community consideration and then if accepted, again supported at <u>planning level</u> .	Noted - final decisions on proposals will be taken when funding found.	N
Susan & Derrick Pope	✓	39	Proposal	5	✓				N
Giles Nicklin	✓	39	Proposal	5	✓				N
<b>VISION</b>									
Birdham Village Residents Association	✓	15	Vision				4.1 Vision Statement Change to read : To enhance and maintain:- • Birdham as a beautiful harbour side Parish with a close, supportive community at its heart, and to promote a sustainable thriving economy with robust infrastructure • Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, ecology and character of the Harbour, Canal and agricultural surroundings.	The vision statement has been agreed and any changes would need to be made at a future review of the plan when everyone can consider them.	N

Organisation or Individual Name	All boxes 'Support no change' unless detailed	Page No	Policy or Proposal	Policy or Proposal Number	Support with Modifications	Oppose	Comment Received	Birdham Parish Council (BPC) - Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group (NPSG) response	NP Amended Y/N
<b>VISION</b>									
English Heritage		15	Vision				We are pleased to see that "Rich heritage" is considered to be one of the strengths of the Parish a fundamental quality of the Parish. However, we are disappointed that neither heritage nor the historic environment is included within the Vision Statement, which would then provide the justification for the Heritage Objectives and Policies 1 and 2 which we welcome and support.	Heritage importance is the first objective, and based on the implementation needs of the vision.	N
Premier Marina CBRE Ltd on behalf of	✓		Vision				The vision statement is supported by Premier Marinas, balancing growth and economy against the environmental quality of Birdham. Broad support for Plan that seeks to protect and enhance the area. Although Premier Marinas is supportive of the Plan's objectives and vision statement, there are concerns over restrictions in some of the policies, which are not in accord with NPPF sustainable development agenda specifically the notion that "development that is sustainable should go ahead, without delay" Furthermore, Neighbourhood Plans should set out a 'positive vision', as per paragraph 17 of the NPPF. Whilst Neighbourhood Plans should ensure that the right type of development is promoted within their communities, they should not promote less development than set out in the Local Plan.	With suggested alterations to policy 15 the plan is felt to comply with the NPPF and paras 17 and 184.	Y
<b>OBJECTIVE HERITAGE</b>									
Mrs Mabel Evans	✓	18	Objective	5.1	✓		The wording in 'Objective' should be changed to put 'existing residents and education of present and future generations' BEFORE 'tourists'	Wording amended	Y
<b>OBJECTIVE BUSINESS</b>									
Haines Boatyard		37	Objective	5.7			5.7 the board support the statement that the parish council makes regarding supporting the development and growth of business infrastructure	Noted with thanks	N
<b>APPENDICES</b>									
Roger Tilbury	✓	41	Appendix	7.1			Omit 'Broomers Farmhouse' (removed from listing by owners application) Separate 'Holt Place, Shipton Green Lane' and 'The thatched Cottage, Shipton Green Lane' (now in separate ownership) (Note that Manhood End Farm Cottage has been known in recent years as (confusingly) The Thatched Cottage, but is about to change again under new ownership)	Amended	Y
Susan & Derrick Pope	✓	43	Appendix	7.3			We note also that the Road Accident Map does not include the A2179, but there have been a number of accidents in recent years, including a fatality, in the vicinity of the junction with Shipton Green Lane. If possible, the map and text should be updated to include these, although no improvements to the highway are to be sought in this area which has relatively few pedestrian movements.	Noted	N

Organisation or Individual Name	All boxes 'Support no change' unless detailed	Page No	Policy or Proposal	Policy or Proposal Number	Support with Modifications	Oppose	Comment Received	Birdham Parish Council (BPC) - Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group (NPSG) response	NP Amended Y/N
<b>APPENDICES</b>									
Natural England		46	Appendix	7.4			The justification for the extension of the settlement policy area is unclear insofar as there seems to be more housing already consented than is required for the plan period. Is it the intention to formally release these sites now or when there is demonstrable need?	The settlement boundary extension includes land already granted planning permission or where there is an intention to grant planning permission subject to a 106 agreement.	N
Birdham Village Residents Association	✓	52	Appendix	7.6			The information on sewage is completely misleading. We have suggested that the data obtained from Southern Water in 2012, and confirmed by SW to Andrew Tyrie in Jan 2013, be added as a comment to give the true picture. 7.6 Position on Statement of Waste Water <u>Add</u> Note These numbers A – D refer only to free head room. They fail to mention that the informed capacity of the plant is 29041, and the informed load is 26985.	This will be a matter to discuss during negotiations on development proposals, not immediately relevant to plan policy.	N
<b>GENERAL COMMENTS</b>									
Chichester District Council			General				Conformity references are the National Planning Policy Framework and the Chichester Local Plan policies (adopted or 2014-2029).	Conformity is required with the NPPF and other government policy and 'general conformity' with the strategic policies of the adopted Chichester District Local Plan 1999. Conformity is not required with the emerging Chichester Local Plan (CLP actual name noted and corrected), but for reasons of future proofing the NP this has been an important guide.	Y
Chichester District Council			General				It is the Chichester Local Plan not CDC Local Plan.	emerging Chichester Local Plan (CLP actual name noted	Y
Chichester District Council			General				No paragraph numbers within the Policies section, which make it extremely difficult to reference.	Noted. Format retained as plan is a small document.	N
Chichester District Council			General				The Birdham neighbourhood plan can give more weight to the Chichester Harbour Management Plan by referencing it in the policies.	Referenced in justifications	N
Chichester District Council			General				Clarification is needed on whether Birdham Parish do mean "any development". This is mentioned specifically under the relevant policies.	For Clarity text amended in line with this recommendation	Y
Chichester District Council			General				Many of the policies repeat existing legislative tests and add nothing for example Policy 20 – Surface Water Run-off.	It is not necessary for each policy to include a conformity reference to each document. The basic Conditions Statement will check conformity of each policy with the adopted plan and NPPF (and perhaps the emerging CLP? It doesn't have to).	N

Organisation or Individual Name	All boxes 'Support no change' unless detailed	Page No	Policy or Proposal	Policy or Proposal Number	Support with Modifications	Oppose	Comment Received	Birdham Parish Council (BPC) - Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group (NPSG) response	NP Amended Y/N
<b>GENERAL COMMENTS</b>									
Chichester District Council			<b>General</b>				There are some "policy" requirements in the supporting text rather than the policy, for example Policy 5 Light Pollution. If these sentences are left in the supporting text they have limited weight.	Comments on Policy: For clarity, where changes were agreed to be necessary, text has been removed from the policy brought from its justification – in line with CDC's recommendations	<b>Y</b>
Chichester District Council			<b>General</b>				Within the policies section there are "proposals", although they are a different colour they could be confused as policies, we suggest moving them to Vision and Objectives.	Proposals to be moved to Action section	<b>Y</b>
Chichester District Council		<b>5</b>	<b>General</b>				3.0 About Birdham Key Statistics • Suggest using only the census information to project the population age breakdown as it looks like the neighbourhood survey results have been increased to the population number of that in 2011 and does not take account of the increase in the population over the past 3 years. In addition it is also suggested that the housing type is referred to the 2011 census information as per the reasons above	Data amended to census	<b>Y</b>
Chichester District Council		<b>5</b>	<b>General</b>				3.0 About Birdham Key Statistics • Clarity needed on the definition of "planning consents unbuilt", is suggests the total number of developments in the pipeline, however the total units include market and affordable. This applies to "affordable planning consents unbuilt" this is the total number of units of the 79 that are allocated as affordable.	Clarified	<b>Y</b>
Chichester District Council		<b>11</b>	<b>General</b>				3.5 Housing • Is the breakdown of ownership derived from the census information or the neighbourhood survey?	Clarified	<b>Y</b>
Chichester District Council		<b>17</b>	<b>General</b>				5 Planning Policy Context 2nd sentence, 1st para – "adopted emerging policies" delete "adopted".	Amended	<b>Y</b>
Chichester District Council		<b>40</b>	<b>General</b>				Section 6 List policies first followed by proposals	Agreed	<b>Y</b>
Chichester District Council		<b>42</b>	<b>General</b>				7.2 List of Conformity Reference Documents The neighbourhood plan should conform to the NPPF and emerging Chichester Local Plan, suggest the others are listed as either reference or background evidence.	Basic conditions statement will show compliance. There is no requirement to comply with the emerging plan, although we have aimed to do so.	<b>N</b>
Chichester District Council		<b>46</b>	<b>General</b>				Birdham SPA Suggest renaming to Settlement Boundaries in line with the emerging Local Plan.	Agreed Renamed to Settlement Boundary Area	<b>Y</b>
Chichester District Council		<b>46</b>	<b>General</b>				Birdham SPA 3 <sup>rd</sup> para, Tawny Nurseries is an outline application and the argument for it to be set back was lost at appeal, unsure that NP can reintroduce this argument.	Noted	<b>N</b>
Chichester District Council		<b>46</b>	<b>General</b>				Birdham SPA Planting of screening along western boundary, please see comments above.	Noted	<b>N</b>

Organisation or Individual Name	All boxes 'Support no change' unless detailed	Page No	Policy or Proposal	Policy or Proposal Number	Support with Modifications	Oppose	Comment Received	Birdham Parish Council (BPC) - Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group (NPSG) response	NP Amended Y/N
<b>GENERAL COMMENTS</b>									
Chichester District Council		46	General				Birdham SPA Suggest checking the outline permission and reading the appeal decision regarding layout.	Noted	N
Chichester District Council		46	General				Birdham SPA Suggest adding most of this text to the policy rather than in this section.	Keep as is	N
Chichester District Council		46	General				7.6 Position Statement on Wastewater Suggest removing the table/information and adding text to refer to the Council's website	Keep as is	N
Portsmouth Water			General				Considered plan from Point of view of water supply and do not see any problems. The housing sites identified are close to existing mains and our Water Resource Management Plan includes for housing growth. As sites come forward for development we will carry out a detailed design and it is possible that off site reinforcements may be required. If mains are required they will be paid for by the developer rather than through the CIL system.	Noted	N
Sports England			General				Extract 'It is important that the NP reflects National Policy for sport as set out in the NPPF Particular ref paras 73 +74 to ensure proposals comply with National Policy. It is also important that Sports England role in protecting playing fields and the presumption against the loss of playing fields' Sports England also work with Local Authorities to ensure Local Plan policy is underpinned by robust up to date assessment and strategies for indoor and outdoor sports. If new sports facilities are proposed Sports England recommend ensure they are fit for purpose and designed in accordance with their design guidance (various links supplied) <a href="http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20140328084622/http://cdn.environment-agency.gov.uk/LIT_6524_7da381.pdf">http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20140328084622/http://cdn.environment-agency.gov.uk/LIT_6524_7da381.pdf</a> . We have worked with and supported your Local Planning Authority as they are developing their Charging Schedule.	Noted	N
Chichester Ship Canal Trust			General				I visited your open day and congratulate you on the very professional manner in which the plan is being conducted,. At this stage, there appears nothing which the Canal Trust would wish to raise.	Noted with thanks	N

Organisation or Individual Name	All boxes 'Support no change' unless detailed	Page No	Policy or Proposal	Policy or Proposal Number	Support with Modifications	Oppose	Comment Received	Birdham Parish Council (BPC) - Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group (NPSG) response	NP Amended Y/N
<b>GENERAL COMMENTS</b>									
Environment Agency			<b>General</b>				Thank you for consulting the Environment Agency on your Draft Neighbourhood Plan. We are a statutory consultee in the planning process providing advice to Local Authorities and developers on pre-application enquiries, planning applications, appeals and strategic plans. We aim to reduce flood risk, while protecting and enhancing the water environment. We have had to focus our detailed engagement to those areas where the environmental risks are greatest. We recognise that allocations are proposed through this plan but note that they have already gained planning permission. Based on this, we therefore have no detailed comments to make in relation to your Plan at this stage. However together with Natural England, English Heritage and Forestry Commission we have published joint advice on neighbourhood planning which sets out sources of environmental information and ideas on incorporating the environment into plans. This is available at: <a href="http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20140328084622/http://cdn.environment-agency.gov.uk/LIT_6524_7da381.pdf">http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20140328084622/http://cdn.environment-agency.gov.uk/LIT_6524_7da381.pdf</a> We would also welcome the opportunity to work with your neighbourhood forum on this to ensure environmental infrastructure is taken into consideration when looking to fund local infrastructure	Noted	<b>N</b>
Birdham Village Residents Association	✓	5	<b>General</b>				We want the real housing need which central government require us to fulfil, Band A-C specified, not just the overall number which the housing associations want the council to use. Key Statistics, Housing waiting list Under Total Housing List Total 35 Add Band A-C 9	We feel the housing need in Birdham is adequately provided for in dwellings permitted or with an intention to grant planning permission	<b>N</b>
Birdham Village Residents Association	✓	5	<b>General</b>				The wording on the AONB needs to be made more robust; its the key strength of the SWAT analysis (page 14), is considered by 75% as great importance and 83% consider it conservation as very important (page 20).	We feel it is robust enough as it is, and protected by other agencies as well as national and local plan policy.	<b>N</b>
Birdham Village Residents Association	✓	5	<b>General</b>				3.1 Heritage, Add After first paragraph: WSSC Landscape Character Assessment 2003, Chichester Harbour Landscape Assessment 2009-2014 describe Birdham as 'one of the main surviving historic settlement within the AONB'; the 'small scale hedged paddocks have intimate character;' and 'clusters of flint and brick cottages.' They define the historic centre as centred on the village as the 15thC Church and the village Green.	This section emphasises the wider heritage of the Parish and is not intended to focus on one area	<b>N</b>

Organisation or Individual Name	All boxes 'Support no change' unless detailed	Page No	Policy or Proposal	Policy or Proposal Number	Support with Modifications	Oppose	Comment Received	Birdham Parish Council (BPC) - Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group (NPSG) response	NP Amended Y/N
<b>GENERAL COMMENTS</b>									
Birdham Village Residents Association	✓	5	General				On the AONB add : It should be noted that Birdham was largely as it is today when the boundary of the AONB was drawn; therefore that part of Birdham within the AONB was considered important enough to be included	Agree but this has already been implied in the designation.	N
Birdham Village Residents Association	✓	8	General				3.2 Environment <u>Remove</u> : The parish lies between four nationally and internationally designated areas of special beauty and habitat <u>Replace with</u> : In addition to the Chichester Harbour AONB; in which 50% of the village, 80% of the dwellings; is included, other nationally and internationally designated areas of special beauty and habitat are locally placed.	Current wording reflects proximity to four national sites. Data included elsewhere in NP.	N
Birdham Village Residents Association	✓	10	General				We want the plan to point out deficiencies in the local foot and wheel chair routes, which need to be addressed. 3.4 Transport: Salterns Way - Cycle and Wheelchair Route. <u>Add</u> : Significant parts of the route are yet to be made wheelchair friendly.	Agreed	Y
West Itchenor Parish Council		8	General				Liaising with adjoining Parishes. Would you consider mentioning the 'Zone of influence earlier in the document eg in Chapter 3.2 Environment by adding the Following at the end of the last paragraph on page 9. <b>'any development within Birdham Parish that is adjacent or close to other Parishes must give consideration to their design statement, character appraisals or management proposals and consultation take place with them. In view of the agreed crossover between Parishes of Birdham an West Itchenor, the West Itchenor Village Design Statement 2nd edition 2012 "Zone of Influence", as shown on the relevant plan must be considered' (See appendix 7)</b>	Any development proposals within the zone of influence will need to pay regard to the West Itchenor Design Statement as it will be required by the LPA.	N
West Itchenor Parish Council		16	General				Liaising with Adjoining parishes, Consider adding an additional panel into Chapter 4 Summary of Objectives <b>Liaising with adjoining parishes In the light of the agreement reached with West Itchenor for their Village Design Statement 2012, consultation must take place with them on any development that is proposed within their Zone of Influence.</b>	Any development proposals within the zone of influence will need to pay regard to the West Itchenor Design Statement as it will be required by the LPA. We do not consider this a matter for the objectives. This statement can be found on Page 32	N
West Itchenor Parish Council		27	General				Chapter 5.4 Transport Policies Page 28 references the number of accidents along the Birdham Road/Main Road (B2189). Unfortunately there have been a number of accidents between Birdham roundabout and Shipton Green Lane, including a fatality. Please consider including this additional stretch of road in the Transport Policies.	Added to policy 11	Y



Organisation or Individual Name	All boxes 'Support no change' unless detailed	Page No	Policy or Proposal	Policy or Proposal Number	Support with Modifications	Oppose	Comment Received	Birdham Parish Council (BPC) - Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group (NPSG) response	NP Amended Y/N
<b>GENERAL COMMENTS</b>									
Thames Water Utilities Ltd			<b>General</b>				Savills have responded on behalf of Thames Water, Thames Water are the statutory Sewerage Authority for a small part of the northern part of the authority area. However Thames Water do not cover the Birdham area and therefore have no comments on the draft document	Noted	<b>N</b>
West Sussex County Council			<b>General</b>				County Council looks for draft Neighbourhood Plans to be in conformity with the District and Borough Councils' latest draft or adopted development plans. The County Council supports the District and Borough Councils in preparing the evidence base for these plans and aligns its own infrastructure plans with them.	Noted	<b>N</b>
West Sussex County Council			<b>General</b>				The County Council encourages Parish Councils to make use of this information which includes transport studies examining the impacts of proposed development allocations. Where available this information will be published on its website or that of the relevant Local Planning Authority.	Noted	<b>N</b>
West Sussex County Council			<b>General</b>				In relation to its own statutory functions, the County Council expects all Neighbourhood Plans to take due account of its policy documents and their supporting Sustainability Appraisals. These documents include the West Sussex Waste Local Plan, Minerals Local Plan and West Sussex Transport Plan.	Noted	<b>N</b>
West Sussex County Council			<b>General</b>				It is also recommended that published County Council service plans, for example Planning School Places, are also taken into account.	Noted	<b>N</b>
English Heritage			<b>General</b>				The nature of the locally-led neighbourhood plan process is that the community itself should determine its own agenda based on the issues about which it is concerned. At the same time, as a national organisation able increasingly to draw upon our experiences of neighbourhood planning exercises across the country, our input can help communities reflect upon the special (heritage) qualities which define their area to best achieve aims and objectives for the historic environment. To this end information on our website might be of assistance <a href="http://www.english-heritage.org.uk/caring/get-involved/improving-your-neighbourhood/">http://www.english-heritage.org.uk/caring/get-involved/improving-your-neighbourhood/</a>	Noted	<b>N</b>
English Heritage		5	<b>General</b>				We welcome the reference to the 24 listed buildings within the Parish and the recognition of other buildings important to the heritage of the village because of their contribution to its history in the section on History and Heritage. However, we would welcome specific mention of the Parish Church of St James as a grade I listed building (although this is noted later). It would be more appropriate to refer to the Somerley Conservation Area lying partly within the parish in this section, with its date and reason for designation and date of its Character Appraisal, and we would welcome a reference to the Sussex Historic Landscape Characterisation.	Listed buildings and conservation areas are dealt with by the LPA rather than the neighbourhood plan, so it is not considered important to duplicate policy regarding these.	<b>N</b>

Organisation or Individual Name	All boxes 'Support no change' unless detailed	Page No	Policy or Proposal	Policy or Proposal Number	Support with Modifications	Oppose	Comment Received	Birdham Parish Council (BPC) - Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group (NPSG) response	NP Amended Y/N
<b>GENERAL COMMENTS</b>									
English Heritage		5	General				The earliest references to Birdham are interesting, but we would welcome a greater explanation of the historical development of the village. There are tantalising references to the development of the village in the description of the various areas within the Parish, which are also interesting and help set the context for the Plan, but we feel it would be helpful to explain more about the medieval hamlet and Birdham in the 17 <sup>th</sup> , 18 <sup>th</sup> , 19 <sup>th</sup> and 20 <sup>th</sup> centuries	the historic background has been kept brief to ensure the document is concise.	N
English Heritage		5	General				The paragraph on the Chichester Harbour AONB would sit more logically in the section on Environment	The order of the document is felt to read best for local people.	N
English Heritage		5,6,7	General				English Heritage promotes a thorough understanding of the character and special qualities of a place as a basis for a neighbourhood plan. We therefore welcome the description of various areas within the Parish. However, as someone not familiar with Birdham I found the description of the various areas rather disjointed. It would be helpful if these were shown on a map. This could also show the listed buildings	See above for comments re listed buildings. It is felt there are enough maps to explain the area to a stranger.	N
English Heritage		5	General				Is this description based on any characterisation exercise of the Parish/village ? A characterisation study can help inform locations and detailed design of proposed new development, identify possible townscape improvements and establish a baseline against which to measure change. We promote the use of characterisation toolkits such as "Placecheck", "Understanding Place" or the Oxford Toolkit, links to which can be found in the appendix to this letter.	Noted	N
English Heritage							An appendix was included which contained links and descriptions about the links to various websites. The National Heritage List for England: Heritage Gateway: Heritage Counts: <a href="http://www.english-heritage.org.uk/caring/get-involved/improve-your-neighbourhood/">http://www.english-heritage.org.uk/caring/get-involved/improve-your-neighbourhood/</a> : HELM (Historic Environment Local Management) : Heritage at Risk : Placecheck : The Building in Context : Knowing Your Place : Planning for the Environment at the Neighbourhood Level : Good Practice Guide for Local Heritage Listing : Understanding Place : Oxford Character Assessment Toolkit	Noted	N
Highways Agency							The Highways Agency is an executive agency of the Department for Transport. We are responsible for operating, maintaining and improving England's strategic road network (the Trunk Road and Motorway network) on behalf of the Secretary of State for Transport. The Agency will be concerned with proposals that have the potential to impact the safe and efficient operation of the strategic road network. <b>We have reviewed the consultation and do not have any comment at this time.</b>	Noted	N

Organisation or Individual Name	All boxes 'Support no change' unless detailed	Page No	Policy or Proposal	Policy or Proposal Number	Support with Modifications	Oppose	Comment Received	Birdham Parish Council (BPC) - Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group (NPSG) response	NP Amended Y/N
<b>GENERAL COMMENTS</b>									
Somerley Residents Association	✓		<b>General</b>				<i>Cover Letter Précis</i> - Plan is thorough, detailed , offers balanced sustainable approach for the parish. Protects economy, environment and ensures housing supply in excess of Local Plan requirement with supply of affordable housing. Allows for opportunity o create ecological sites to act as stepping-zones and corridors and protects parish heritage and assets.	Noted with thanks	<b>N</b>
Somerley Residents Association	✓		<b>General</b>				<i>Cover letter précis</i> - Somerley is one of the oldest settlements in Manhood peninsula with strong sense of community and benefits from being an individual settlement. As noted Appendix 7.4 there is transitional Zone between Birdham SPA & Somerley. This separation is an important visual and physical gap. Request there are stronger wording in housing policies protecting strategic gaps. This would conform with ICZM strategy, the Destination Management Plan, and going Dutch planning guidance for the area	See redrafting of policy 1 re maintaining settlement separation.	<b>Y</b>
Somerley Residents Association	✓		<b>General</b>				We believe that the character appraisal of Bell Lane as a lane with long, wide vistas north and south and with houses set well back or well screened from the road (see CDC Character Appraisal of Somerley) should be included in the plan, with a request that any new development adjacent to Bell Lane is set back from the road. This would prevent ribbon-type development caused by suburban housing lining what is currently a rural/semi-rural streetscape. It is also important that the expansive rural views from the public rights of way are preserved, particularly the western end of Hundredsteddle Lane.	Policy 1 has been redrafted. In addition important views added to Policy 4	<b>Y</b>
Bracklesham & Earnley Flood Forum		<b>10</b>	<b>General</b>				A minor point, but can I suggest that the second sentence of the final paragraph of page 10 is reworded. Although perhaps not so minor - in my role as parish councillor, I have been dealing with Wates the developers, who claim that the bus service is good for young people to travel into Chichester for leisure purposes. Currently Reads "However, the buses do not operate from Chichester after 10.15pm at night and there is only a half-hourly service for most of Sundays and Public Holidays, with the last bus leaving Chichester at 6.15pm Should read "However, the buses do not operate from Chichester after 8.21pm in the evening, Monday to Thursday, and 10.21pm on Fridays and Saturdays and there is only a half-hourly service for most of Sundays and Public Holidays, with the last bus leaving Chichester at 6.21pm." The times are based on the departure from the bus station think the current wording is based on the timetable of a year and a half ago, before the withdrawal of government subsidies meant that the later 10.21pm departure was restricted to Friday and Saturday evenings only	Noted and text will be changed	<b>Y</b>

Organisation or Individual Name	All boxes 'Support no change' unless detailed	Page No	Policy or Proposal	Policy or Proposal Number	Support with Modifications	Oppose	Comment Received	Birdham Parish Council (BPC) - Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group (NPSG) response	NP Amended Y/N
<b>GENERAL COMMENTS</b>									
Natural England			<b>General</b>				Generally the plan seems to work effectively with the evolving Local Plan, and it is for Chichester District Council to indicate if the two plans interlace effectively, particularly in respect of the interim and evolving policies for the designated sites at Chichester and Pagham Harbours	Noted	<b>N</b>
Natural England			<b>General</b>				Due to the current pressure of consultations on land-use plans, I have not been able to spend the time I would have wished reviewing and commenting on your Neighbourhood Plan. Nevertheless, I hope you find these comments helpful	Thank you yes.	<b>N</b>
Natural England			<b>General</b>				It appears that housing need can be met on the basis of recent planning consents and the two sites brought into the settlement policy area boundary.	Agree.	<b>N</b>
Natural England		17	<b>General</b>				We welcome the reference (page 17) to the "main potential effect is recreational disturbance, which is covered by the Interim Solent Scheme and conformity with Policy 50 of the CDC Local Plan"	Noted with thanks	<b>N</b>
Chichester Harbour Conservancy			<b>General</b>				Précis - Conservancy supports Submission draft, well thought out, logically structured, supported by SWOT, good evidence base, strong vision, key text has been highlighted in bold blue letters for ease of reading.	Noted with thanks	<b>N</b>
Chichester Harbour Conservancy			<b>General</b>				The structure of the policies may lead one to conclude that the Parish's and community's priority is for preservation, rather than sustainable growth, which is the thrust of the NPPF. If this has been informed by public responses, that is fine, but some further commentary on the order that the policies appear in may be useful. This is alluded to in the 1st paragraph on page 20, but an overview at the start of the policies or beginning of the objectives would be useful too.	We are happy with the order of policies as agreed.	<b>N</b>
Chichester Harbour Conservancy			<b>General</b>				Half of the Plan area is outside of the AONB, but the Conservancy would be pleased to see the recognition of issues of recreational disturbance from new development within 5.6km of the AONB/SPA boundary and how this is to be mitigated mentioned in the Plan, especially the Solent Disturbance Mitigation Project.	This is felt to be a local plan issue	<b>N</b>
Chichester Harbour Conservancy			<b>General</b>				In a couple of instances policies begin with the wording "Any development will be permitted only...". It is probably better to alter the wording to "Development will only be permitted", because there are many forms of development that, for example, in the case of Policy 21, do not generate wastewater disposal issues – e.g. someone applying for a new boundary wall. Perhaps better to say "Residential or commercial development which results in a net increase of residents or employees and thus will increase the rate of wastewater generated...", is more specific and an applicant can immediately tell if the policy relates to their proposals.	This wording has normally been altered in line with comments from CDC	<b>Y</b>

Organisation or Individual Name	All boxes 'Support no change' unless detailed	Page No	Policy or Proposal	Policy or Proposal Number	Support with Modifications	Oppose	Comment Received	Birdham Parish Council (BPC) - Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group (NPSG) response	NP Amended Y/N
<b>GENERAL COMMENTS</b>									
Chichester Harbour Conservancy			<b>General</b>				I have recently attended a meeting of the West Itchenor Parish NP Steering Group. They no doubt have made their own comments. In particular, their Village Design Statement refers to a 'zone of influence', which it may be worth including as an Appendix to your NP, as that Parish are particularly keen on maintaining what they see as a 'local strategic gap' between Birdham and Itchenor.	We have altered policy 1 to promote settlement separation.	<b>Y</b>
Chichester Harbour Conservancy		<b>2</b>	<b>General</b>				Also useful to refer to NPPG in 1st line of 2nd paragraph.	Reference Added	<b>Y</b>
Chichester Harbour Conservancy		<b>2</b>	<b>General</b>				8th paragraph, 3rd line: what is meant by the phrase "integrate well". If you want developers to achieve this, better to guide them as to what the community is looking for.	happy with guidance as it is.	<b>N</b>
Chichester Harbour Conservancy		<b>2</b>	<b>General</b>				9th paragraph: how are you expecting 'extended bus service times' to be delivered? Unless you are contemplating major development, I doubt very much whether developers will contribute to little else other than improved bus shelters and kessel (raised) kerbing at bus stops, through the Community Infrastructure Levy, once CDC have adopted their currently draft charging schedule.	This is a proposal not a policy.	<b>N</b>
Chichester Harbour Conservancy		<b>2</b>	<b>General</b>				10th paragraph: the evidence the Conservancy prepared for the Church Lane public inquiry into 46 houses, could usefully be followed up. How many of the permissions identified have been built out? The notional 50 dwellings to meet parish needs 2014-2029 represents the minimum to be provided: this figure does not represent a maxima	Agree policy is not a maxima. Amended in agreement with CDC	<b>Y</b>
Chichester Harbour Conservancy		<b>4</b>	<b>General</b>				1st paragraph: suggest delete "It is a uniquely situated harbour-side village" and replace with – "Birdham Parish has an extensive shoreline to Chichester Harbour and village life and activity is closely associated with the harbour", because the defined settlement boundary is clearly removed from the shoreline – a point that was made in the recent Church Lane Public Inquiry.	The vision statement has been agreed and any changes would need to be made at a future review of the plan when everyone can consider them.	<b>N</b>
Chichester Harbour Conservancy		<b>14</b>	<b>General</b>				Table, 'Weaknesses' cell, bottom line: What would be interesting to know is what proportion of the resident population is economically active and how many (pre-dominantly) work within the parish boundary. Last and third paragraph up on page 26 do offer commentary on travelling to work, but this is not the same as saying they are commuting out of the parish.	Noted, but happy with plan as it is.	<b>N</b>
Chichester Harbour Conservancy		<b>17</b>	<b>General</b>				2nd paragraph, 3rd line: it is suggested that the word "restricting" is deleted and replaced by the words "safeguarding the tranquillity and scenic beauty of the AONB, whilst allowing for recreation and sustainable" and insert after "development" the words " , where consistent with the former aims".	The vision statement has been agreed and any changes would need to be made at a future review of the plan when everyone can consider them.	<b>N</b>

Organisation or Individual Name	All boxes 'Support no change' unless detailed	Page No	Policy or Proposal	Policy or Proposal Number	Support with Modifications	Oppose	Comment Received	Birdham Parish Council (BPC) - Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group (NPSG) response	NP Amended Y/N
<b>GENERAL COMMENTS</b>									
Chichester Harbour Conservancy		17	General				After the 4th paragraph you may also wish to refer to the NPPG, published 6 March 2014. The following text is suggested:- "The NPPG contains important, practical information and advice for any user of the planning system. Both the NPPF and NPPG can be read by going to – <a href="http://planningguidance.planningportal.gov.uk/">http://planningguidance.planningportal.gov.uk/</a>	Noted but the plan is not a general guide to the planning system.	N
Chichester Harbour Conservancy			General				it may be useful to have a weblink for Appendix 7.1, so people or potential developers can read English Heritage's List descriptions, so that they are crystal clear on what are the distinctive features of the heritage asset, when framing and creating design solutions for the development they wish to carry out, where such proposals need planning permission /conservation area consent/listed building consent/scheduled ancient monument consent. The current link is – <a href="http://www.english-heritage.org.uk/professional/protection/process/national-heritage-list-for-england/">http://www.english-heritage.org.uk/professional/protection/process/national-heritage-list-for-england/</a> - which seems to be different to the link you have listed for Appendix 7.1.	Link updated	Y
Chichester Harbour Conservancy		7	General				Small typing errata: Page 7, bottom line, should "...Ffollets..." instead read - "...Follets..."??	Ffollets is correct spelling	N
Chichester Harbour Conservancy		8	General				Small typing errata: Page 8, Section 3.2, 2nd line: suggest "shaded" reads "hatched", as shade implies solid colouring.	Agreed	Y
Haines Boatyard			General				The board of George Haines (Itchenor) support Birdham Parish Council's aspiration to produce a neighbourhood plan.	Noted with thanks	N
Haines Boatyard		13	General				3.7 Marine facilities are spread throughout the parish . They are not just limited to Birdham Pool. The parish council , due to the irregular nature of some of its boundaries , should make reference to uses on adjacent areas of land as this might better inform the parish with regard to what is appropriate within its boundaries .- the wording might better provide for development remote from a heritage asset and therefore not capable of improving its setting	Policy in the plan is felt to be flexible enough to accommodate this point.	N
Premier Marina CBRE Ltd on behalf of	✓		General				<i>Cover letter</i> 1st para gives general information about Premier Marinas at Chichester, 2nd para grateful for opportunity to comment on the Plan.	Noted with thanks	N
Premier Marina CBRE Ltd on behalf of	✓		General				Cover Letter 3rd para briefly describes the recent development that has happened at Chichester providing jobs and services for local people and enhances environment and value of marina.	noted.	N
Premier Marina CBRE Ltd on behalf of	✓	11	General				Under 3.5, The Planning Approval should refer to Chichester Marina, instead of Birdham Marina.	Corrected	Y
Premier Marina CBRE Ltd on behalf of	✓	13	General				Under 3.7, Chichester Marina should read 1,100 berths instead of 900.	Corrected	Y

Organisation or Individual Name	All boxes 'Support no change' unless detailed	Page No	Policy or Proposal	Policy or Proposal Number	Support with Modifications	Oppose	Comment Received	Birdham Parish Council (BPC) - Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group (NPSG) response	NP Amended Y/N
<b>GENERAL COMMENTS</b>									
Premier Marina CBRE Ltd on behalf of	✓	14	General				It is proposed that the furthering of marine businesses should be included in the 'Opportunities' section, in line with the business policies proposed.	Noted	N
Premier Marina CBRE Ltd on behalf of	✓		General				Premier Marinas, as a major investor and provider of jobs and services in the area, welcomes the opportunity to submit representations to the Draft Birdham Neighbourhood Plan. The vision of the Plan is supported by Premier Marinas, as a stakeholder for both the local economy and environment. Whilst there is broad support for the overarching objectives of the Plan, there are concerns regarding specific policies with regard to compliance with the NPPF.	Noted	N
Premier Marina CBRE Ltd on behalf of	✓		General				Specifically, Premier Marinas is concerned about the restrictions placed on development in the Plan area, and the lack of conformity with the pro-growth and sustainability agenda of the NPPF. Policies 12, 13, 14, 15 and 22 seek to restrict growth of both economic and residential development, by virtue of the current planning consents and current economy. There should be recognition that circumstances may change over the Plan period and as such, the policies should contain added flexibility to future-proof the economic and social vitality of Birdham.	see response above.	N
Premier Marina CBRE Ltd on behalf of	✓		General				We look forward to hearing from you regarding further consultations and engagement.	It is proposed the plan will be submitted to the LPA who will undertake a further 6 week consultation under reg16 of the Neighbourhood Planning regulations.	N
Russells Garden Centre			General				<i>Summary of response</i> : our main industry sectors agriculture, horticulture, marine and tourism are all related but all under threat from both bigger players and/or housing developers	Noted	N
Russells Garden Centre			General				welcomes our support of these small local businesses but fears they are at a tipping point and we should be working harder to protect them. Suggests that support should be given to local businesses to diversify as long as it doesn't harm the environment on which the tourism and horticulture sector depend.	This would not be ruled out by the plan and its policies.	N
Russells Garden Centre			General				need to encourage start up business opportunities for young local entrepreneurs. Small specialist companies who can offer apprentice type opportunities must be created. Development sites need to be found for this.	the plan has not considered any site allocations, but is generally supportive of business suitable to a rural location.	N
Russells Garden Centre			General				fearful of a large sub-village developing between Birdham and Somerley with no 'heart' or facilities and that Birdham will splurge/merge into Somerley	See additional protection from settlements merging in policy 1 revision.	Y
Russells Garden Centre			General				The school is already at capacity it will have to be extended. New people moving in are sending children to schools out of the area. This automatically removes them from the community	School planning is not an issue for neighbourhood plans but the education authority.	N

Organisation or Individual Name	All boxes 'Support no change' unless detailed	Page No	Policy or Proposal	Policy or Proposal Number	Support with Modifications	Oppose	Comment Received	Birdham Parish Council (BPC) - Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group (NPSG) response	NP Amended Y/N
<b>GENERAL COMMENTS</b>									
Stephen Crossley							<p>We would like to propose one new separate dwelling at Birdham Fruit Farm as part of a future site allocation. Drawing and illustrative picture of proposed design attached.</p> <p>We are advised to make clear that the bungalow already exists on site, and my family lived in it from 2000 until 2009. It had been granted permission and occupied since 1959. In 2009 the bungalow was granted permission to be used as multi purpose/agricultural store, ancillary to our new separate family home, which was constructed in 2009.</p> <p>We are nearing retirement and would like to down-size from our existing property. Also like the option to re-locate elderly relatives to live nearby.</p>	The plan has not made any site allocations or undertaken the assessment and selection exercise needed to support any such allocation.	<b>N</b>
Genesis Town Planning Trustees of Farquhar-Thompson Trust	Only Policies 7,9,11 ticked support no change						<p>The sketch layout shows a modest <b>housing proposal of 5 detached dwellings on land adjacent to Martins Cottage.</b></p> <p>There are no access constraints to this scale of development from Martins Lane and <b>we therefore propose the site is included as a housing allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan.</b></p>	see above	<b>N</b>
Genesis Town Planning Trustees of Farquhar-Thompson Trust	Only Policies 7,9,11 ticked support no change						<p>Planning Policy Context</p> <p>The Land concerned was identified as potential housing allocation in the May 2014 SHLAA.</p> <p>Landscape assessment for the Local Plan considered the site located within the AONB has capacity for some limited development.</p> <p>Local Plan defines Birdham as a 'Service Village' and provision should be made for 'small scale housing developments consistent with the indicative housing numbers set out in Policy '</p> <p>Policy 5 of Local Plan provides for 50 dwellings, This figure cannot be relied on until the Local Plan examiner has concluded that it meets housing need. We would suggest that the Birdham Neighbourhood Plan takes a more flexible approach to its housing policies perhaps with the inclusion of additional housing sites as future contingencies to allow for higher levels of growth if the Local Plan Examination Inspector requires it.</p>	The SHLAA does not allocate sites, it details sites that landowners have suggested and offered for development.	<b>N</b>



Organisation or Individual Name	All boxes 'Support no change' unless detailed	Page No	Policy or Proposal	Policy or Proposal Number	Support with Modifications	Oppose	Comment Received	Birdham Parish Council (BPC) - Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group (NPSG) response	NP Amended Y/N
<b>GENERAL COMMENTS</b>									
Genesis Town Planning Trustees of Farquhar-Thompson Trust	Only Policies 7,9,11 ticked support no change						For all these reasons we believe the land adjacent to Martins Cottage should be included as a housing allocation in Policy 12 of the next Submission Version of the Birdham Neighbourhood Plan. As indicated above this could be a 'contingency' allocation to come forward in the event additional housing is required at Birdham as a result of the Local Plan Examination If the development were limited to five dwellings this would be in keeping with the scale of neighbouring development and allow the provision of affordable housing with a financial commuted sum for off-site provision in accordance with the District Council's emerging Local Plan Policy 34.	see above	<b>N</b>
Wanda Hudson			<b>General</b>				I am concerned that the proposed housing developments in Bell Lane and also in the recent and continuing developments in Bracklesham and East Wittering will vastly increase the already busy traffic in Bell Lane . Bell Lane, originally a quiet country Lane, is relatively narrow with an even narrower footpath, making it making it impossible in some places to walk side by side with a child. There is an almost continuous row of homes and businesses to the south west side of the Lane and we therefore consider that a 30 mph speed restriction should be imposed for the whole of Bell Lane, from the roundabout at the junction with Birdham Road until after the second tight bend at the southern end of Bell Lane where it becomes Bracklesham Lane. Since I have lived in Bell Lane (thirty years), I have witnessed four accidents - all coursed by speed, and all involving injury. There have been countless others over this period, including life changing injury and deaths. I do hope you are able to act on this proposal, and that Bell Lane will become a safer place for residents and road users.	Highway issue not a planning policy concern.	<b>N</b>
Ian Culley	✓		<b>General</b>				No further comments and excellent piece of work. Thank you	Noted with thanks	<b>N</b>
Elizabeth Campbell	✓		<b>General</b>				Beautifully presented document - wonderful photographs. Well done Thank you	Noted with thanks	<b>N</b>
Marion Barker	not marked	5	<b>General</b>				Key statistics Travel stats are in mils, Nearest facilities are in Kilometres. Should be consistent - suggest change Kilometres to miles.	Updated to miles	<b>Y</b>

Organisation or Individual Name	All boxes 'Support no change' unless detailed	Page No	Policy or Proposal	Policy or Proposal Number	Support with Modifications	Oppose	Comment Received	Birdham Parish Council (BPC) - Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group (NPSG) response	NP Amended Y/N
<b>GENERAL COMMENTS</b>									
Sallie Watson Drew	✓	26	Transport ?				Is there some way to ensure that large lorries + building equipment vehicles are charged with repair and replacement to village roads where verges + pot holes are so damaging that the road becomes unsafe? Example at moment is Westlands Lane between Crooked Lane and Greenacres, where there have been a number of building sites. The sides of the roads are severely damaged and in places it becomes necessary to use the road as a one lane only as it is unsafe to drive in both lanes. There are large pot holes which are not always obvious if it has rained and this is not only a threat to car suspensions but also to cyclists. Some provision for a contribution to road repairs seems called for, either by contacting contractors working for individual projects or the house-holders where the work is being carried out.	Agree there is a problem, but this is not a planning issue. Road tax is collected to assist with the cost of highway repairs.	N
Roger Tilbury	✓	6	General				Remove the work 'Lay' in the title of top line. I can only imagine this is a typo from someone reading 'Hundredsteddle lay in the centre of the main wood' elsewhere	Agreed deleted	Y
Roger Tilbury	✓	11	General				Suggest inserting after "Planning Approved" (subject to section 106 agreements)	Updated	Y
Dr Susan Monks	✓		General				(All boxes ticked Support no modifications)	Noted with thanks	N
Mr Rodney S de Chair	not marked		General				Note for steering group. The site referred to in the above two proposals will be found on file. PS Elsewhere reference is made to 'Open Views from ALANDALE ROAD. The Steering Group might wish to consider whether that particular road merits such reference - main roads in BIRDHAM would have no less of our 'open views'	Noted	N
Clive Barrington	✓		General				(All boxes ticked Support no modifications)	Noted with thanks	N
Mrs Gillian Barrington	✓		General				(All boxes ticked Support no modifications)	Noted with thanks	N
Graham Campbell	✓		General				(Précis) Congratulations to Steering Group & Parish Council. A lot of hard work, enormous effort, appreciate the difficulties of producing the plan, delivering the document and I consider plan to be reasonable. Form completed but limited opportunity to respond to plan due to prescriptive nature of form. Hence cover letter.	Noted with thanks	N
Graham Campbell	✓		General				(précis) The housing allocations have been decided without any input from NP	agree	N
Graham Campbell	✓		General				Surface water flooding requires a change in the law, or at least planning law, as a piecemeal mixture of rural ditches, mixed with a series of culverts with no easily enforceable maintenance system, is totally unsuitable for a village that is quite densely built up.	This issue is beyond the scope of the plan	N

Organisation or Individual Name	All boxes 'Support no change' unless detailed	Page No	Policy or Proposal	Policy or Proposal Number	Support with Modifications	Oppose	Comment Received	Birdham Parish Council (BPC) - Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group (NPSG) response	NP Amended Y/N
<b>GENERAL COMMENTS</b>									
Graham Campbell	✓		General				Roads are the responsibility of the Highways Agency, which sees roads only as a means of moving traffic on as quickly as possible, with no regard to the damage caused en route.	This issue is beyond the scope of the plan	N
Graham Campbell	✓		General				Our sewerage system, which is more like that of a third world country when it rains, shows absolutely no signs of getting the massive investment obviously needed (despite absolutely huge water bills).	This issue is beyond the scope of the plan	N
Graham Campbell	✓		General				Taken overall, the NP has highlighted to me just how important it is for the Parish Council to lobby the District & County Councils, and the Government, if we are to achieve any significant long term improvements to the infrastructure of our village. I think the Parish Council, when delivering this document, should highlight the above points, to ensure that what is essentially a good idea, actually comes to mean something in the future.	Noted	N
Mr KJ Wright	✓	1	General				Summary principal purpose of allocating possible development sites not met. Without this I cannot see the inspector passing the NP	A neighbourhood plan does not have to allocate sites.	N
Mr KJ Wright	✓	52	General				Foul Water Disposal. Instead of march 2013 perhaps the housing numbers could be updated at least to march 2014, this will show less headroom for the sewage plant at Sidlesham. Yet cast in stone in the draft CDC Local Plan	Not relevant for this plan, agree should happen with future planning permissions.	N
Mr KJ Wright	✓	20	General				Environmental Policies The importance of a linked open ditch system with regard to water voles could be emphasized. Water voles are making a comeback in this area and should be encouraged but they need a linked water ditch system.	Noted	N
Mr KJ Wright	✓	13	General				SPA Looks a little contrived on the map ? Should be Policy 13 not Page 13	Boundary has been considered and revised.	N
Mr KJ Wright	✓	52	General				Apart from these few comments the NP reads very well and looks good. Congratulations.	Noted with thanks	N
Ian Lockwood	✓		General				All boxes ticked Approve with no change. * On Policy 20 Note of congratulations on a comprehensive and well-constructed document	Noted with thanks	N
Sarah Backhouse	✓		General				Congratulations and many thanks to all those who contributed to this extremely comprehensive, well thought through and well presented document. They really have done an excellent job.	Noted with thanks	N
Mrs Patricia & Mr William Dreusicke	✓		General				(all boxes ticked support no change)	Noted with thanks	N

Organisation or Individual Name	All boxes 'Support no change' unless detailed	Page No	Policy or Proposal	Policy or Proposal Number	Support with Modifications	Oppose	Comment Received	Birdham Parish Council (BPC) - Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group (NPSG) response	NP Amended Y/N
<b>GENERAL COMMENTS</b>									
John F Dyer	✓		General				NB Holdnes Nursery are also a local business in Birdham. Cover letter précis. what a wonderful job, only criticism is that it is a little too gentle. As a family we have no trust in developers and planning. References to Old Common Close, Donnington. Rowan Nursery have had long standing problems in heavy rain. Comments attached in line with Family thoughts. We should get tough from bottom and ensure the other levels do - Parish, District, County. Well done and thanks for all hard work	noted with thanks. Policies are as robust as we feel reasonable in a planning sense.	N
Michael Karn	✓		General				Congratulations to Steering Group on producing a comprehensive and professional looking document.	Noted with thanks	N
Wendy & Michael Pitty	✓		General				(All boxes ticked support no changes)	Noted with thanks	N
Ron Green	✓	10	General				4 lines down <u>a</u> field	Corrected	Y
Ron Green	✓	21	General				3rd para 2nd line, "that that"	Corrected	Y
Ron Green	✓	25	General				3rd Para last sentence - understated ??	Noted	N
Ron Green	✓		General				List of Acronyms at end? - CIL ? Page 25 Proposal	CIL reference removed	Y
Ron Green	✓	37	General				Policies Para starts "72% respondents ...." 2nd line environmental delete al	Corrected	Y
Ron Green	✓	38	General				Policy 23 4th Para starts " Chichester Harbour Conservancy" 1st line --the tourism Delete the.	Corrected	Y
Ron Green	✓	46	General				Para 5 10th line "different to" should read "different from"	Corrected	Y
Susan & Derrick Pope	✓	7	General				Holt Place, although not a Listed Building, is a building of historic importance and should be included. The property is thought to have been a duck shooting lodge for the Goodwood Estate, which had extensive land interests in West Itchenor. It is shown in the OS Arundel 8 Map of 1805 when it was known as Godfrey's. By 1895, the property had been enlarged and was known as Holt Place, appearing on OS sheet 332 Bognor (Outline) and also in the OS six Inch England and Wales Map of 1896	Agree. Holt Place added.	Y