

Developers			SPC DECISION The recommendations have been approved by SPCNHP and the Parish Council. The Submission Plan is subject to the agreement of the Parish Council at the next convenient meeting TBC
Ref No.	Comment	Recommendation	
53	Representation on behalf of Warren Cottage Fields, Handcross.	Comments noted.	
	HLM support the general approach. However have some reservations regarding the sustainability and deliverability of the proposed sites at St Martin's Close East and West and are disappointed that the NP does not address the long-term sustainability and suitability of the existing village hall.	No changes required.	
	We also wish to question the approach taken to testing the two proposed allocations as well as whether the issues raised in the previously examined Slaugham NP have been successfully dealt with.	The Neighbourhood Plan is supported by a robust evidence base. This includes:	
	We support that further allocations should be made in the pre-submission NP as the Pease Pottage allocation is not proposed to meet local need, and as such will not serve the needs of the local Parish in its entirety.	- The Parish Housing Land Availability Assessment (PHLAA) which sets out an environmental and policy based assessment all sites received. This considered Warren Fields was unsuitable for development given the constraints of the site.	
	Policies 11 and 12: St Martin's Close (E & W) Concerned that the allocations at St Martin's Close (E & W) are more detached from the village compared to alternatives, including Warren Cottage Fields. Draw attention to the errors made in the conclusions regarding alternative sites within the evidence base which wrongly leads to the conclusion that the St Martin's Close sites are the most suitable for allocation within the Plan. Alternatives sites like the one at Warren Cottage Fields would be shown to have higher sustainability credentials and less highway and landscape impact.	The accompanying Sustainability Appraisal includes an appraisal of the sites against the sustainability objectives of the Plan.	
	Have undertaken an initial landscape assessment of our site which found that our sites wooded and residential boundaries mean that it is not visible from the wider area, and that it is separated from the wider AONB by mature woodland and the A23. This contrasts with the proposed allocations at St Martin's Close (E & W).	The NPWG have also undertaken public consultation to gain feedback on local residents preferred sites. Warren Fields was not identified as a preferred site by residents.	
	Concerns over the potentially greater impact of developing both the access and the site on the wider AONB, and on Coos Lane itself.		
	Concerns regarding road capacity.		
	Pre-Submission NP SA and Housing Site Assessments (2017) document (published one month apart) contain the same objectives but have drawn different conclusions about the performance of sites against those objectives.		
	The SA tests different housing delivery options. It does not test any other specific sites and so does not make a full assessment of any comparable sites against all of the policies, objectives and aims of the Pre-submission NP.		
54	Site has been identified in the PHLAA but not tested in the wider evidence base including the SA. Instead the SA jumps straight to the preferred option, so it is not assessing comparative impacts. Appears to have made sweeping assumptions, with no technical evidence base to support it, against matters such as access and landscape. It also appears to have prioritised ownership and control over sustainability.		
	Wider benefits and opportunities presented by other sites have not properly been explored as part of the evidence base. The plan makes no consideration towards the provision of community facilities, and in particular the village hall, which was a recognised issue by the Examiner for the previous NP.		
	Current Pre-submission NP has lost previous community facilities. Instead there is very little discussion or evidence about the approach to future infrastructure provision for each of the settlements in the Parish.		
	The plan does not explore how sites, particularly alternatives sites, can unlock the potential to provide new community facilities.		
	There is no monitoring mechanism within the plan to allow for alternative sites to come forward in a manage way.		
	Although the Plan indicates that reserve site (St Martin's Close West) is proposed, it is unclear how it is triggered.		
54	Batcheller Monkhouse request that the allocation strategy is reconsidered to include their clients land at Coos Lane to assist significantly in meeting the local housing requirements.	Comments noted.	
	In regards to the site representations confirm:	No changes required.	
	- There are no barriers to delivery in relation to site ownership.		
	- It is sited in a better location in terms of access to services and facilities than the St Martins sites.	The Neighbourhood Plan is supported by a robust evidence base. This includes:	
	- It is not restricted by any known archaeological issues, it is well screened by trees along its southern, eastern and western boundary.		
	- The site has been found suitable for development in the former SHLAA, which stated the site could accommodate circa 6 units.	-The Parish Housing Land Availability Assessment (PHLAA) which sets out an environmental and policy based assessment all sites received;	
		-The accompanying Sustainability Appraisal which includes an appraisal of the sites against the sustainability objectives of the Plan; and	
		The NPWG have also undertaken public consultation to gain feedback on local residents preferred sites.	
		In light of the above, the NPWG consider St. Martins Close (east and west)offers the most sustainable locations in the Parish to provide additional housing.	

55	<p>Representations confirm the site has been submitted in response to MSDC's Call for Sites. Representation confirm the site is available for development. Access is confirmed from the East through the adjoining Redrow development and from the south through the adjoining Denton Homes development.</p> <p>Representation suggest the removal of the requirement for the Strategic Gao to the north of Pease Pottage. Support the objective of the Gap however consider that the strategic purpose is fulfilled through the Crawley District Council land to the north which is occupied by the Scouts and the Little Trees Cemetery. Representation notes the number of planning permissions granted on land within the Gap. A natural gap is highlighted which lies to the north created by the scouts and the Little Trees Cemetery and the A264. Requests the removal of the Strategic Gap.</p>	<p>Comments noted re Strategic Gap.</p> <p>Policy 3: is to be included in the Submission Plan as an Aim.</p>
56	<p>DMH Stallard generally support the Plan and the allocation of St Martins Close for housing. Consider specific detail of policy 12 is unnecessarily restrictive.</p> <p>Support the Plans intention to plan positively and boost housing supply.</p> <p>Consider that the St Martins (west) site should be allocated as a development site rather than a reserve site, with no restriction on the time frame for development proposal to come forward.</p> <p>In addition consider that the allocation should not be restricted to only having access via St Martins Close. An access to the site from Coos Lanes would allow the provision of dwellings without the impact on traffic movements though the existing close. Outlines creation of a new access from Coos Lane would allow the site at St. Martins Close west to developed independently.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>No changes required.</p> <p>The Plan seeks to allocate St. Martins Close (west) as a reserve site to ensure the Plan can continue to facilitate the required housing need in the Parish over the lifetime of the Plan. Access to St. Martin Close west will be facilitated through/following the development of St. Martins Close east.</p>
57	<p>Policy 2: Protection of the Landscape, outlines opinions on landscape are highly subjective. The reference to exceptional circumstances is not the correct test to be applied. Does not apply to areas of open countryside.</p> <p>Policy 3: Preventing Coalescence: Pease Pottage Gap. It is not the role of the Neighbourhood Plan to implement a strategic policy which could preclude the delivery of sustainable development proposals. We question the justification behind the proposed behind the proposed gap. If the policy is to be retained then the wording should instead be altered to allow for a balancing exercise to be undertaken which assesses any harm to the visual and functional separation of settlements against the benefits of the proposal.</p> <p>Policy 4: Development outside of BUAB. Opposed to the use of defining built up area boundary (BUAB) if these would preclude the delivery of otherwise sustainable development from coming forward. Gladman believe this policy should therefore be amended which promotes a criteria based approach consistent with the requirements of national policy. The following wording is put forward for consideration:</p> <p>The Slaugham Neighbourhood Plan take a positive approach to development proposals which lead to the delivery of sustainable development. Applications that accord with the policies in the Development Plan and the SNP will be supported particularly where they:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - provide new homes including market and affordable housing; or - opportunities for new business facilities through new or expanded premises; or - infrastructure to ensure the continued vitality and viability of the neighbourhood area". <p>Policy 13: Residential Development within Settlement Boundaries This policy does not state what forms of development would be considered acceptable beyond the BUAB. As such, this policy is not in accordance with paragraph 154 of the framework as it does not provide a clear indication of how a decision maker should react to a development proposal.</p>	<p>Policy 3: is to be included in the Submission Plan as an Aim.</p> <p>No changes to be made to Policy 4. The policy is in line with the strategic policies of the District Plan and national planning policy guidance.</p> <p>Policy 13 is in line with national planning policy guidance and includes criteria to guide decision making.</p>
58	<p>Concerned Policy 4 conflicts with Policy DP6 of the MSDC but also imposes an additional constraint to housing delivery through retention of a ridged built up area boundary. Consider the policy could be modified to provide an element of flexibility to development. The policy should be amended to allow for housing development to meet identified local housing need over the entire plan period to come forward outside of BUABs.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>No changes to be made to Policy 4. The policy is in line with the strategic policies of the District Plan and national planning policy guidance.</p>
59	<p>Support the NDP however have some specific concerns. The Plan makes no reference to the presumption in favour of sustainable development which is a fundamental tenant of national planning policy.</p> <p>Support the vision in principle however: No reference is made to sustainable economic growth or economic well-being which is inconsistent with national policy.</p> <p>The language associated with the statement relating to the historic environment and its settings seem inconsistent with national policy. The use of the word conserve in S03. The wording should be changed so that instead of reading ...will be protected and enhanced... it reads... will be conserved and enhanced.</p> <p>The language of S01 needs to be changed. The phrase preserve, protect and enhance the countryside is inconsistent with national It should read 'conserve and enhance' rather than 'conserve ad protect'.</p> <p>Support Policy 1: Protecting the area of outstanding natural beauty</p> <p>Policy 2: Protection of the landscape. Objectives and wording are demonstrably inconsistent with national policy .</p> <p>Policy 4: Development outside of built up area boundaries. Concerned that this policy does not reflect the reality of actual life in this and other rural settings.</p> <p>Policy 6: Green Infrastructure. Recommend deletion</p> <p>Policy 9: Community Facilities. Pleased to note the support for community facilities and open space set out in strategic objectives. However recommend that the position in Policy 9 in support of such facilities is extended beyond a position of protection and retention of existing facilities.</p> <p>Section 7: Economy and Employment. Support employment and business opportunities set out in strategic objectives SO10 and SO11.</p> <p>Recommend that either an additional policy is introduced or that specific reference is made to the objectives of national policy in supporting and enabling sustainable economic growth in rural areas.</p>	<p>Comments noted re sustainable development. The Plan is in line with the strategic policies of the District Plan and the NPPF and therefore does not need to repeat national planning policy guidance.</p> <p>Recommend Objectives is updated to read: Preserve, protect and enhance the countryside.</p> <p>No changes to be made to Policy 4. The policy is in line with the strategic policies of the District Plan and national planning policy guidance.</p> <p>Policy 6: No changes to be made.</p> <p>Recommend Policy 9 is updated to include support for new community facilities.</p> <p>An additional policy to support new employment/businesses uses in the Parish to be included in the Submission Plan to read:</p> <p>Economic Development Proposals which enable the development of businesses uses within the Parish will be supported where proposals are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - located in a suitable location; - in keeping with the character of the area;

60	<p>Rep is made on behalf of Crest Nicholson, who are currently developing Land at Hoadlands, Handcross.</p> <p>Representations confirm the site is within the Neighbourhood Plan boundary and on review of the proposed Proposals Map for the NP this appears to be out of date. The BUAB for the settlement of Handcross has been drawn excluding the Land at Hoadlands to the north.</p> <p>The impact of not including the Site within the BUAB results in the site being shown “countryside” within the AONB which is not an accurate reflection of the site and how it will evolve in the coming 6-12 months. It also results in some of the policies of the NP including Policy 4 directly contradicting the existing approved planning permissions.</p> <p>Therefore, request an amendment to the merging Proposals Map to ensure it is up to date and provides a clear tool for interpreting the NP.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>No changes required.</p> <p>The BUAB of the Parish will be updated in due course, once the Neighbourhood Plan is made by MSDC and forms part of the Districts Development Plan.</p>	
61	<p>Star Planning - Welbeck submit that the land to the west of London Road, Handcross is a more appropriate and sustainable housing allocation and should be preferred for the erection of about 60 dwellings. Promoters have undertaken an environmental and policy based assessment and SA appraisal.</p>	<p>The Parish Council have assessed the site, in the same manner as other sites received.</p> <p>An environmental and policy based assessment has been undertaken on the site.</p> <p>The Submission Sustainability Appraisal provides an appraisal of all sites received.</p>	
62	<p>Strutt and Parker promoting Land at Tilgate Forest Lodge for a sustainable, care use development on land which is considered suitable, available and achievable in the short term.</p> <p>Representations support Objectives.</p> <p>Consider Policy 4 is too inflexible, and flexibility should be incorporated to allow certain forms of development outside the BUAB to be considered on a case by case basis.</p>	<p>The Parish Council have considered the need for a residential care home in the Parish and do consider the Neighbourhood Plan should allocate land for a residential care home.</p> <p>No changes to be made to Policy 4. The policy is in line with the strategic policies of the District Plan and national planning policy guidance.</p>	
63	<p>Rep from Thakeham in relation to Land to the West of Old Brighton Road, South Pease Pottage.</p> <p>Request that site SL08 is reassessed in the PHLAA and Sustainability Appraisal to reconsidered the amended area of land.</p> <p>The red line boundary is now significantly different making the site assessment under SL08 now inaccurate, particularly in regards to its landscape assessment.</p> <p>The amended site is within an <u>area of change</u> in Pease Pottage.</p> <p>It should also be noted that the site is partly brownfield with residential properties and a livery it is therefore incorrectly described as 'Greenfield' under site context. Incorrect to state that the site is primarily agricultural land given the partly urban characteristics of the site and partly previously developed nature. The amended land parcel is now more physically and perpetually tied to the busy A23 as well as being in a 'area of change'. Therefore Objective 1: Conserve/ Enhance Rural Character should be suitably reappraised.</p> <p>In relation to Objective 2: Protect / Enhance Biodiversity and Objective 5: Reduce Impact on Climate Change more recognition is needed regarding the mitigation measures than can be put in place in conjunction with the development.</p> <p>Objective 9 should also be reconsidered given the improvements to public transport links such as a bus service loop, a separate road off the A23 and provision of pedestrian link ways.</p> <p>The nearby 619no. unit scheme will also bring about infrastructure improvements in the local vicinity.</p> <p>Thakeham also note that the draft SNP does not pay sufficient regard to the latest position with MSDC's housing needs, or Slaugham's place within the settlements hierarchy.</p>	<p>The Parish Council have assessed the revised site, in the same manner as other sites received.</p> <p>An environmental and policy based assessment has been undertaken on the revised site area.</p> <p>The Submission Sustainability Appraisal provides an appraisal of all sites received.</p>	