

Chailey Neighbourhood Development Plan

Shaping Chailey

CONSULTATION STATEMENT

2019-2034

November 2019

Published by Chailey Parish Council for Submission Consultation
Under the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012
and in accordance with EU Directive 2001/42

OUR VISION

“Chailey will continue to be a thriving community which protects and retains its quiet, rural character and enhances its built and natural heritage. Sustainable development that respects its countryside setting will be supported and infrastructure improvements will be encouraged. The most highly valued countryside areas in the Parish will be recognised and conserved. Job opportunities within the village will be actively encouraged to provide improved prospects for local people. The sense of community spirit and cohesion will be fostered and increased.”

CONTENTS

Introduction and Background	[2]
Section 1: Objectives of the communication and engagement strategy	[3]
Section 2: Consultation timeline	[5]
Section 3: Regulation 14 consultation responses	[7]
Section 4: Conclusion	[55]
Section 5: Appendices	[56]

Introduction and Background

This Consultation Statement has been prepared to fulfil the legal obligations of the Neighbourhood Planning Regulations 2012. Section 15(2). Part 5 of the Regulations sets out what a Consultation Statement should contain:

- (a) contains details of the persons and bodies who were consulted about the proposed neighbourhood development plan;
- (b) explains how they were consulted;
- (c) summarises the main issues and concerns raised by the persons consulted;
- (d) describes how these issues and concerns have been considered and, where relevant, addressed in the proposed neighbourhood development plan.

This statement has been prepared by Chailey Steering Group on behalf of Chailey Parish Council to accompany its submission to Lewes District Council of the Chailey Neighbourhood Development Plan (CNDP) under section 15 of the Neighbourhood Planning Regulations 2012. As part of the formal submission of the CNDP for Examination, there is a requirement for the Parish Council, as the 'qualifying body' to illustrate that they have consulted with the community and relevant bodies.

Section 1: Objectives of the communication and engagement strategy

- 1.1 The aim of the CNDP communication strategy was to have a clear framework which showed how the Steering Group would involve as much of the community as possible throughout all consultation stages of Plan development so that the Plan was informed by the views of local people and stakeholders from the start of the Neighbourhood Planning process.
- A communication strategy was established to:
1. promote a high degree of awareness of the project;
 2. invite residents to join the team advising the Parish Council;
 3. encourage everyone to contribute to the development of the Plan;
 4. promote consultation events;
 5. provide regular updates on the status of the Plan and its development.
- 1.2 The objectives of the Communication and Engagement Strategy are to:
- ◆ To achieve better communication, leading to better feedback and decision-making.
 - ◆ Ensure that the implications of the development and adoption of the Neighbourhood Plan are understood by all stakeholders.
 - ◆ Allow residents and other relevant stakeholders the opportunity to take part in defining the Chailey Neighbourhood Development Plan.
 - ◆ Ensure that all stakeholders are aware of the Neighbourhood Development Plan process to include:
 - the roles and responsibilities of the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group;
 - the process of creation of the Neighbourhood Development Plan;
 - the governance, approval, and acceptance of the Neighbourhood Development Plan;
 - the schedule for the Neighbourhood Development Plan.
 - ◆ Ensure appropriate consultation with and communication to all stakeholders and residents, ensuring that:
 - Input into the development and approval of the Neighbourhood Development Plan has been included;
 - the current status of the Neighbourhood Development Plan is understood at all times;
 - appropriate approval is gained from key stakeholders;
 - ◆ Ensure acceptance by Lewes District Council by continuous engagement throughout the process and providing, amongst other things, a Consultation Statement setting out how consultation is carried out.

1.3 The community can be divided into different stakeholder groups to ensure each area are effectively engaged with. Such groups might include:

- Residents
- Community Groups, clubs and societies
- Businesses
- Landowners
- Schools
- Service Providers

along with outside organisations such as:

- Lewes District Council
- South Downs National Park
- The Highways Agency
- Neighbouring Parishes

1.4 The Steering Group will ensure the process remains inclusive of all residents, community groups and businesses within Chailey Parish through various methods like the website (chailey.org), social media, community events, community workshops, the annual parish meetings, press releases, Chailey News, posters, banners, noticeboards, face-to-face discussions, letters to businesses, face-to-face meetings with businesses, meetings with schools and students, questionnaires, surveys and leaflet and summary documents.

1.5 The full communication and engagement strategy document can be viewed online at <http://chailey.org/media/18725/chailey-neighbourhood-plan-community-engagement-strategy.pdf>

Section 2: Consultation timeline

2.1 The timeline below outlines the key points of community engagement and consultation which has shaped the production of the CNDP.

- ◆ Initial consultation with villagers on the proposed creation of the Chailey Neighbourhood Plan
- ◆ Steering Group formed 2015
- ◆ April 2015 – “What is a Neighbourhood Plan?” Document
- ◆ Shaping Chailey Questionnaire 14/11/2015
- ◆ Vision Statement written
- ◆ Formation of the Task Groups
- ◆ Housing Design Survey & Report (Dennis Matthews)
- ◆ Village Meeting 2015, 16, 17 updating on the plan progress and inviting comment
- ◆ Updated 2016 “What is a Neighbourhood Plan?” Document
- ◆ Regular articles in Chailey News, the parish magazine for Chailey which is received by all households on a monthly basis
- ◆ Letters distributed to all local businesses inviting comment on the Neighbourhood Plan
- ◆ Meeting with Chailey Heritage 20th July 2016
- ◆ Meeting with Chailey Brickworks 27th July 2016
- ◆ Chailey School Student Council were invited to comment
- ◆ Horticulture Society Questionnaire July 2016 - What is the most significant advantage of living in Chailey? What is the most significant disadvantage of living in Chailey?
- ◆ Village Neighbourhood Plan Meeting April 2016 – Forming the Task Groups
- ◆ Parish Meeting – presentation
- ◆ Village Day 2016 – discussion and distribution of the draft Vision statement (also published in Chailey News, Website and Facebook and open for comment)
- ◆ Publication of the draft vision statement and policies (every household received a copy of this)
- ◆ Task Group Workshops Feb - March 2017

Consultation Statement

- ◆ Objectives and Policies Clarification Survey (St George's Day Fete 22nd April 2017)
- ◆ Character Assessment Produced
- ◆ Housing Needs Survey February 2018
- ◆ The Parish Website has a full list of meetings, agendas, meeting minutes and documents produced for the Chailey Neighbourhood Plan, available for the public to view

2.2 For more detailed information of engagement literature and resources used, refer to the **CNDP Consultation Statement** online at <http://chailey.org/media/18725/chailey-neighbourhood-plan-community-engagement-strategy.pdf>
It is important to note that minutes of steering group meetings have been published throughout the process, and key documents published including results from the call for sites process.

Section 3: Regulation 14 consultation responses

- 3.1 The Neighbourhood Planning Regulation requires that the pre-submission Plan is taken to consultation by the Parish Council at Regulation 14. This is a formal statutory consultation period of 6 weeks with the statutory bodies, stakeholders, the Local Planning Authority and the community. It then requires the Parish Council to consider those representations received and whether any further changes may be required because of these. The Reg.14 Pre-submission consultation and publicity was held from 9:00am on 17th May 2019 to 5:00pm on 28th June 2019. There were drop in consultation events at the Chailey Parish Hall Friday 31st May 2019, between 2.00 pm and 4.30 pm; Saturday 15th June 2019, between noon and 3.00 pm; and Friday 21st June 2019, between 6.00 pm and 8.30 pm. In addition to being emailed to the relevant people, the plan was also made available on the CNDP website <http://chailey.org/chailey-neighbourhood-plan-main-page/> or by visiting the Parish Council.
- 3.2 Table 1 outlines the key points of representation made at Regulation 14 community engagement and consultation which has shaped the changes to the CNDP at Regulation 14 stage to refine the Submission Plan (Regulation 15)

Table 1: Reg.14 representations

Details of the persons and bodies consulted	Consultation method	Objective or Policy	Summary of main issues and concerns	CNDP Response
E Berry	Response Form	Housing Objectives General feedback on the plan	3b – Uncertain of how NP can ensure developments are “sustainably constructed” Could comment on lowering speed limits in relation to footpaths and cycle-ways 1.4.39 – need to reflect the Kings Head actual change of use	See Lewes comments We can’t lower speed limits – not a land use issue Update the draft of the NP

		HO1-4	1.4.48 – New Heritage has a board of directors managing the development, not a lobby group	Update the draft NP
		HO5	Need to mention Ribbon Development in the policy	There is insufficient evidence to include this in a policy at this point.
		HO6	SP - Contributes needs to be contribute	We can't lower speed limits – not a land use issue.
		HO7	Tie policy in with belief A road speed limit should be lowered Not clear what this policy means	Reducing traffic speed limits has been identified as a community aspiration in section 3.2
B Rider	Response Form	Objective 3a	No mention of social housing – provision for villagers who can't afford to purchase a property	There is insufficient evidence to include this in a policy at this point.
		HO3	Housing mix criteria assume all properties will be purchased – should be social housing available for young people and families	There is insufficient evidence to include this in a policy at this point.
		HO10	Affordable is beyond the reach of nurses, teachers and welfare workers	Noted but not a planning issue
		TRA3		
		Background	Connections between North Chailey and Chailey Green are non-existent	This has been identified as a community aspiration in section 3.2

			<p>for pedestrians – no footpath to Church and School.</p> <p>Background section has more ‘past’ than ‘present’ (1.1.4)</p>	<p>Amendments made to this section.</p>
M Berry	Response Form	<p>Housing Objectives</p> <p>Omissions</p> <p>COM1</p>	<p>Objectives relate specifically to new housing – should there be objectives about refurbishments / extensions etc.</p> <p>No mention of the Alms-house provision in South Chailey – this is an important housing resource in the parish.</p> <p>Comment relating to existing S106/CIL monies held by PC – how much is it?</p>	<p>Refurbishments not normally planning matter unless listed etc – separate rules. Extensions will be subject to the NP.</p> <p>Grantham Close is included in the Character appraisal.</p> <p>Not applicable to the Plan – this will vary across the 15 year period.</p>
R Massey	Response Form	<p>TRA4</p>	<p>Is in Agreement</p> <p>Planners please take note!</p>	<p>No action required</p> <p>ditto</p>
D Caughley	Response Form	<p>Housing Objectives</p> <p>Environmental Objectives</p> <p>Economy & Transport Objectives</p> <p>General Comment</p>	<p>H06 – Cycle and Pedestrian links are important</p> <p>ENV2 – particularly good / important</p> <p>TRA1 & TRA3 – particularly good</p>	<p>Beyond the scope of the NP but can be a CA</p> <p>No action required</p> <p>No action required</p>

		HO6 ENV2, COM1, TRA1, TRA3	Concerned that the maps in the appendix are missing Very Good – like a lot Very Good	Currently preparing / accessing these and these will be in the final draft No action required ditto
M Morton-George	Response Form	The Vision Housing Objective 1 Objective 3a Environmental / Economy Objectives HO8 HO10 ENV3 ENV4 TRA2	Not clear where ‘Highly Valued countryside areas’ are located ‘Enhance’ may be optimistic Does this refer to all development Query use of word ‘enhance’ Assuming this refers to existing conservation areas not possible new ones? Right to emphasise local connections May be worth making it clear that this applies to temporary development as well as permanent Could protection of public footpaths be mentioned here?	Green spaces document makes this clear however we will also describe the specific locations in the NP document itself. Plan needs to be positive. Policies need to be positively framed. The review of conservation areas. Is undertaken by the District Council. This comes out strongly within the plan. The policy clearly starts by saying ‘All development ... Already protected under separate regulations.

		ECO1 ECO3 ECO6	<p>Definition of traffic calming is not made clear</p> <p>Explain what is meant by 'existing village centre'</p> <p>3a wide open – should be subject to existing appearances being largely retained and neighbours comments noted</p> <p>Could answer comments under EC03</p>	<p>Lewes / ESSC advise on this – change to Road Safety.</p> <p>Edit NP and drop word centre to read 'existing village'</p>
C. Peskett	Response Form	General Comment	Agrees with everything – Overall states “A huge amount of work has gone into producing this excellent document – thank you.”	No action required
J Griffin	Response Form		Agrees with the plan – no comments	No action required
S Griffin	Response Form		Agrees with the plan – no comments	No action required
R Thomas	Response Form	ENV7	<p>Dark Skies – ‘Security and other outside lighting on private and public premises will be restricted or regulated’ – how is this to be monitored and / or enforced? This section seems out of character and ambiguous.</p>	Existing planning constraints – permission required for flood lighting in many instances.

		HO1	No planning restriction on lighting or requirement to seek consideration for the installation of new lighting – cannot be monitored or enforced. – Brickworks recently installed new lighting –no longer in keeping with the quality of the dark skies - no planning permission was required. Residents can add lighting at a later date in developments.	
		HO3	Need maps of the development boundary	In Progress – LP Pt1 & 2
		HO6	1 bedroom properties required and omitted in regard to elderly and disabled	This is based on the results of the Housing Needs Survey and Shaping Chailey – we have to base our policies on this research.
		HO9	Especially making proper provision for those with mobility impairment – at present these are severely lacking	Required under building regulations
		ENV3, ENV4 & ECO3		
		ECO2	Can any protection be put on the Horns Lodge to prevent development of the site?	List as a Community Asset – put under HL paragraph
			No maps so cannot comment	In Progress – these will be added to the final draft

			Without causing retention issues for existing residents	This has been added to the policy for clarity
M Lethem	Response Form	General Statement COM2, COM3, ECO4	<p>Greater emphasis and clarity could be included on community amenities and facilities that are currently or likely to come under threat. Pubs a particular concern – argument also applies to shop, post office etc. COM3 – where the PC will oppose the loss of Assets of Community Value, but same strong support should be included in COM2.</p> <p>COM2 – should include a statement making it clear the PC will strongly oppose all proposals that involve the loss of a community amenity e.g. pubs unless it can be definitively demonstrated that there is no realistic prospect that the amenity will be viable in the future. Make the point that leaving an amenity closed for an extended period of time without any attempt to revive it or realistically market it will not necessarily be regarded as evidence of non-viability – stronger than ECO4? – COM3 & ECO4 – any</p>	<p>The plan addresses this as far as possible, the parish council /community aspirations needs to progress this.</p> <p>Assets of Community value protection has a process and the parish council applies to the district council</p>

		<p>HO4</p> <p>COM1</p>	<p>marketing campaign must be able to demonstrate that it was marketed seriously and at normal market rates. COM3 could extend the opposition to any plans which do not involve the loss of an amenity but which would threaten the future viability of that amenity – e.g. Kings Head where the development proposal was to keep the pub but the development meant that being able to do so was unlikely.</p> <p>Inclusion of a statement about the sustainability of materials used – see objective 3b.</p> <p>Inclusion of a statement about managing and improving safe access around the village. E.g. pedestrian crossings etc.</p>	<p>This is referenced in HO4</p> <p>These are not land use issues however these points can be and are included under NSCA.</p>
S George		<p>Housing Objectives</p> <p>Omissions with the plan</p> <p>ECO3</p>	<p>(3b) to use local contractors/subcontractors where possible</p> <p>Unsure. I can find no strong comments on discouraging development on greenfield sites. (I also realise there are few brownfield sites in the parish.)</p>	<p>Not allowed to specify local – but use the word small house builders</p> <p>No change needed</p>

			I fail to see how (c) is possible if provision (1) is considered.	
A Harrison		Vision	Communication could be improved. Email, and Parish Council Letters. Engaging people is difficult and more proactive information might help. Relying on chailey.net sadly does not work and not many people will go and look at a physical noticeboard.	Not really within the remit of the NP, but something for the Parish Council to look into.
		Housing Objectives	(3b) to use local contractors/subcontractors where possible (also relating to economy policies) Additionally, regardless of LCD parking allocation this must be addressed more realistically. Young adults stay at home longer now which often means even more cars. Adequate realistic parking MUST be part of any development.	No change needed Parking is referred to in the NP
		Omissions	Greenfield sites and woodland should strongly be argued against development and although there are less brownfield sites than in a town these should be located and examined first. Utilising already used land must take precedent.	Green Spaces document aims to protect these areas.

		HO2	There should be more environmental consideration / reusable energy included in the design. Solar panels etc.	Is referenced in HO4
		ENV2	No woodland area should be destroyed.	Discussed in Green Spaces
		ECO3	I fail to see how (c) is possible if provision (1) is considered.	Yes proviso 1 contradicts C) – proviso 1 needs to be amended.
Mr & Mrs Royston	Email Response	Maps	It was with much interest that we came into Chailey Village hall today to learn about the neighbourhood development plan, I would be very interested to see the H01 map when finalised as was unable to find it on the following link http://www.chailey.org/chailey-neighbourhood-plan-main-page/	Relevant maps emailed 18/06/19
C Page	Email Response	Environmental Policies	I am concerned with the amount of air pollution given off from the brick works. Can a survey be taken to review levels and look into any associated health side effects or consequences of production? Also to review the use of filters that could limit the pollution.	Not within the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan
F Nation-Dixon	Email Response	Maps	However hard I try I cannot find amongst what has been posted	Relevant maps emailed 18/06/19

			online the plan of the “Development Boundary”, described in the summary as to be found at Annex 1 Map 1.	
E Shelford	Email Response	Maps	On page 5 of the executive summary it notes that there is a Annex 1 with a proposed new development boundary map. I could not find this document - please could you let me know where it is? Or send it to me?	Relevant maps emailed 18/06/19
J & P Rea	Response form and accompanying letter	General Comment	Emphasise the arboriculture heritage of the Parish – e.g. inclusion of distinguishable trees on the front cover, next to the heritage and windmill?	Include a map of trees with a TPO within the NP appendices – currently being sourced
		Vision	Vision Statement “most highly valued countryside areas will be recognised and conserved” – all of Chailey (like Ashdown Forest and South Downs) have to be protected in their integrity. Natural tourism will be growth economic areas of the future.	Tourism and its importance is emphasised in the plan.
		Chailey Past and Present	Roman Road omission – suggested wording – See attached suggested wording	No action needed
		Non Statutory Community Aspirations	Footpath linking North and South Chailey – connecting all parts of Chailey and suitable for all types of	Footpath included under NSCA within the plan, however policies cannot directly state this.

		General Comments	<p>movement including new version of e-bikes and usable in all seasons.</p> <p>Map of Chailey on P47 is illegible</p>	Better map will be sourced and included within the final draft
D Matthews	Written Response	<p>General Comments</p> <p>HO1</p>	<p>Emphasis that Chailey must be treated as a whole and not as three separate entities. There is an over-emphasis on the concerns of North Chailey in terms of text and photos.</p> <p>The Plan is very heavy on environment and landscaped setting, but much of it is protected separately, is not under heavy threat and the power of the Plan to influence it is limited. Consultations show that residents' concerns relate to their daily lives (jobs, traffic, schools, leisure, public transport, community facilities, affordable housing etc) and I think these areas are a bit light. There is also some duplication in the descriptive paragraphs, for example paras 1.4.18 and 1.4.30, as well as paras 1.4.27 and 1.4.54.</p>	<p>Look to include further photos of South Chailey within the text. The text aims to cover the Parish as a whole and is based on extensive research.</p> <p>All of these areas are covered and much of the research also emphasised the importance the villagers placed on the environment.</p>

			<p>Include explanatory text linked to each policy, rather than referencing back to documents. This would make the policies more understandable, but there may be a reason why the current approach has been adopted. There is considerable variation in the amount of supporting text for each policy group.</p>	<p>Perhaps this could form part of the introductory text, explaining the design characteristics of Chailey.</p>
		HO2	<p>Inclusion of a separate “Design” chapter.</p>	<p>Policy HO2 amended to reflect support for modern design</p>
		HO3	<p>2.3.1 3a and 3b are policies, rather than objectives. Modern designs should be accepted where they are of sufficient quality and make a contribution to their setting and a policy should cover that.</p>	<p>Policies need to be positively framed</p>
		HO4	<p>The policy should be in the negative; “...and therefore will not be permitted unless ...”. If the development boundary is not going to be extended to include the allocated sites (in the Local Plan), the policy needs a concluding phrase “....or on allocated sites.”</p> <p>“Inclusive” is meaningless in this context. There is a danger of</p>	<p>Policy HO2 amended to reflect support for modern design</p> <p>This is based on the results of the Shaping Chailey Questionnaire and Housing needs</p>

			<p>excluding good, modern design and, perhaps the Plan should explain where such design is appropriate.</p> <p>I would not include three bedrooms. The corollary should be that larger houses will not be supported until the current imbalance is corrected.</p> <p>The policy seems to concentrate on bricks, to the exclusion of other details, such as windows and tiles. Also, to expect handmade bricks is excessive. What is wrong with a new Chailey stock brick?</p> <p>Building materials are only one aspect of design and this is not a substitute for a separate Design chapter, bringing in the elements which are currently mentioned fleetingly in other policies eg landscaping, use of spaces, car parking, fencing, roof form etc. At present the Plan only gives guidance to residential buildings and does not include, for example, commercial or farm buildings.</p> <p>One point that was made during public comment sessions was the opposition to “ribbon”</p>	<p>survey, so 3 bedrooms will have to be included.</p> <p>Handmade bricks is only listed as a preference, however Chailey Stock should be added to this policy, as the local brick type. Perhaps windows etc. could be added into the policy? – see comment below</p> <p>The separate design report in the appendices covers a lot of these details.</p>
		HO5		
		HO10		

			<p>development. This is a legitimate concern but is not covered in the Plan.</p> <p>I strongly disagree with this. Whilst it is the case that taller buildings need more care, there is no need for such a blanket opposition. They can be appropriate or beneficial in the right place and may make a better use of land.</p> <p>I cannot find a definition of “affordable” housing, but it should specifically include Local Authority housing; a number of Councils are now putting money into Council housing, as the only real answer to rural exclusion (cf Cornwall).</p> <p>The Plan is silent on the impact of development, including extensions, on neighbours, ie amenity issues such as overlooking, loss of light, overbearing, means of enclosure, security etc. I am not clear whether this will be included in the Lewes Local Plan, but a policy should be included as these are important issues to residents and have been raised in consultation and discussion. It should not relate solely</p>	<p>The omission of tall buildings was included as the surveys showed the parish wished new builds to respect the existing architectural styles of the parish, to which tall buildings are fairly non-existent.</p> <p>There is insufficient evidence to support a policy on affordable housing which goes beyond the Lewes requirement.</p> <p>There is insufficient evidence to support a policy on affordable housing which goes beyond the Lewes requirement.</p>
--	--	--	--	--

			to housing development.(see my DES 6-10)	
		ENV3	I find this policy rather confusing; could the first paragraph be read as supporting ribbon development?	Minor modification for clarity.
		COM3	I support this proposal strongly but should the Plan list the desired ACV's?	This has been included in 3.2
		TRA3	I realise that there are arguments against, but I still believe that there should be specific policy support for a pedestrian path on the A275, south from the A272, to the Primary School. This has been so strongly supported by residents. The relevant landowners might be amenable if they see it in an adopted Plan.	This has been included as a Community Aspiration.
		ECO1	I am not sure what the purpose of this policy is. Do we have a “retail core”?	Policy amended
		ECO3	Para 'c' contradicts the first proviso to the policy.	Yes it does – proviso 1 amended.
		General Point	Generally, is there a case to name our big employers (schools, Heritage, brickyard, Bluebell) and	Expand on this in the background sections to the Neighbourhood Plan, to emphasise their importance.

			explain how vital and appreciated they are?	
Environment Agency M Oxley	Email	General Statement	We have read your plan with interest and are pleased to see the wording below included within the document. To enhance the context of these policies, it may be useful to add some information in the introductory sections regarding the geographical context of the River Ouse and its' tributaries that fall within your neighbourhood plan area.	Agreed – additional geographical information can be included within the plan on the River Ouse, which forms the northern most boundary of the Parish. 'Chailey Through the Centuries' has a very good section on the geography and streams within Chailey.
		ENV3	Policy ENV3: Countryside Protection and the village setting. '.....1. take opportunities to restore the natural function of any watercourses to improve water quality, to prevent flooding and enhance wetland habitats;'	No action required
		ENV5	Policy ENV5: Conservation of the environment, ecosystems and biodiversity 'Development will be expected to retain well-established features of the environment, ecosystem and biodiversity, including mature trees, species-rich hedgerows, watercourses and other ecological networks together with	No action required

			<p>the habitats alongside them including ponds.’</p> <p>As you are not allocating sites for development, we do not have any further detailed comments to make. However, we attach a copy of a Neighbourhood Plan checklist that we have recently developed to help provide Environment Agency advice at the earlier stages of Neighbourhood Plan preparation.</p>	<p>No action required, however consult the checklist to ensure we cover the relevant points.</p>
<p>Southern Water C Mayall</p>	<p>Email</p>		<p>Thank you for your email inviting Southern Water to comment on the Pre Submission Chailey Neighbourhood Plan. Southern Water is the statutory wastewater undertaker for the Parish of Chailey, as such, we have reviewed the Plan and confirm that we have no comments to make on this occasion.</p>	<p>No action necessary</p>
<p>Newick Parish Council S & E Reece</p>	<p>Email</p>	<p>General Comment</p>	<p>We have only one suggestion to make which concerns the desire to conserve the number of Green Spaces within the Parish as outlined in your document on this topic, your vision statement and policy ENV3; ‘All development will be considered with regard to the need to protect the landscape character of the</p>	<p>Agreed – specific areas should be added and this policy made clearer, perhaps with the use of a map.</p>

			<p>countryside. Proposals which preserve and enhance the open character of the important gaps between settlements and which are not detrimental to the Green Infrastructure Network (as identified by the Local Planning Authority) will be supported. 'From our own experience we have learned that actually naming the specific areas strengthens the policy. Therefore, we would respectfully suggest adding to this policy, for example, that the green gap between Newick and North Chailey to the east of the village should be respected to prevent coalescence of the two villages.</p>	
<p>East Sussex County Council C Flavin</p>	<p>email</p>	<p>Objective 8 (Economy and Transport Objective)</p>	<p>We welcome the inclusion of Objective 8 on Page 24 'To enhance and promote community, recreational, tourism and transport infrastructure in Chailey'. Recommended changes to the text of Policies TRA 1, TRA2 and TRA3 We strongly recommend making some slight changes to the wording of the proposed Policies on page 38 to 39. The bold, underlined, blue text indicates the recommended</p>	<p>The changes recommended by ESCC have been accepted. Policy TRA1: <u>Sustainable Access – provision for public transport/cycling & walking</u> Non-car provision/ footpath/ public transport provision The Neighbourhood Plan will, encourage proposals for new housing development to: 1. <u>Which enable</u> promote walking, cycling and the use of public transport, <u>integrating inclusive design</u> including</p>

			<p>insertions, whilst the strikethrough text indicates deletions.</p>	<p>making proper provision for those with mobility impairment; and</p> <p>2. improve, protect, maintain and extend the local footpath, cycle and bridle path and public transport network</p> <p>Policy TRA2: Traffic calming Road Safety Proposals for new housing development will be expected to demonstrate how the adverse consequence of increased traffic movements will be mitigated to eliminate or substantially reduce any identified impacts on their adverse consequences for road safety and the environment.</p> <p>Policy TRA3: Pedestrian safety Supporting Connectivity – Cycling & Walking We will support highways or other transport improvements which facilitate connectivity safe access for pedestrians and cyclists through and between all parts of the village, and the linkages between other settlements. All new housing developments should show how safe pedestrian/cycle access can be ensured to connect link up with existing, or proposed, wider footpath networks, ensuring that residents can walk safely to public transport services, schools and other key facilities. Proposals that encourage the construction of a</p>
--	--	--	---	---

				<p>pedestrian crossing near the junction of the A275 and Mill Lane will be supported.</p>
		<p>Landscape</p>	<p>The plan is supported by well researched and thorough background studies with regard to landscape/ townscape character, local green space and visual appraisal. These have been used to inform the environmental policies in the document.</p> <p>Appendix C contains a list of maps which will be produced to support the plan. This does not include a map of green infrastructure (GI) or open spaces/ proposed Local Green Space. This would be useful as GI is a very important feature of the parish –we therefore recommend the inclusion of a map in the next version of the NP.</p>	<p>The changes recommended by ESCC have been accepted</p> <p>Policy ENV1: Landscape</p> <p>Policy ENV1 could be more succinct as there is some repetition. We would recommend that ENV 1 is reworded as set out below. See Appendix 1 for a version of the recommended policy which doesn't show the deletions etc.).</p> <p>ENV1: Landscape Integration Integration of landscaping</p> <p>The design of new landscape features will happen at an early stage in the design process to ensure they are well integrated into new developments.</p> <p>New development will be informed by early site assessment and master planning to ensure that existing landscape features are retained and integrated.</p> <p>New development proposals will have considered and correctly sensitively interpreted the landscape character of their the location. so as to produce the most appropriate design solution for the development. Landscape schemes should therefore:</p> <p>Landscape masterplans for proposed development will:</p>

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Integrate new development sympathetically with its surroundings • Enhance the setting of new buildings • Sympathetically integrate the development with the surroundings • Provide a landscape setting for proposed buildings • Create a high quality environment in which to live and work • Promote quality landscape schemes which are sensitive to the locality and provide local distinctiveness <p>Developers will be required to submit a landscape scheme to accompany all major development proposals and for smaller developments in sensitive locations as outlined in the character appraisal.</p> <p>Major developments and those in sensitive locations will be informed by landscape and visual impact assessment* and supported by a landscape masterplan. The definition of major development is in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 and its amendments.</p> <p>*In accordance with Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Assessment Third Edition (LI and IEMA 2103)</p>
--	--	--	--	--

		<p>County Ecologist Policy ENV2 Wildlife Protection.</p>	<p>Policy ENV2 Wildlife Protection. The policy states that it is for wildlife protection, but only refers to trees and hedgerows of arboricultural or amenity value. Reference should also be made to the protection of habitats, not just trees and hedgerows, of wildlife value, in their own right and/or for the natural communities they support. Whilst the policy to retain or provide wildlife corridors and stepping stones is welcomed, this should be supported by a map of green infrastructure. Any loss of trees, hedgerows, or other important habitats, should be replaced on a like-for-like basis, and developments should seek to achieve a net gain for biodiversity, as required by the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006, NPPF, the 25 Year Environment Plan, and the forthcoming Environment Bill.</p>	<p>Agreed and amended accordingly</p>
		<p>Policy ENV5 Conservation of the environment, ecosystems and biodiversity</p>	<p>This policy would benefit with some more detail, and makes no reference to protection or enhancement, or to species. All development should be informed by an Ecological Impact Assessment, and should consider the existing</p>	<p>Agreed and amended accordingly</p>

			nature conservation resource of the site, identify impacts and assess the need for avoidance, compensation and new benefits for biodiversity, including the potential to create and/or strengthen connectivity between existing habitats.	
		Policy ENV8 Chailey Common buffer zone	Policy ENV8 states that developments with adverse impacts on the SSSI will be resisted. This statement should be strengthened. Local planning authorities have a statutory duty under Section 28G of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981, as amended, to avoid damage to SSSIs and to further their conservation and enhancements. Planning permission is unlikely to be granted for a development that would damage a SSSI.	Agreed and amended accordingly
		Policy COM1 Developer contributions	This policy should include the need for creating and improving green infrastructure.	Agreed and amended accordingly
		Local Green Spaces and Green Infrastructure	The appendices refer to a Green Spaces assessment but no reference to Local Green Spaces is made in the document. A data search from the Sussex Biodiversity Record Centre should be included in the evidence base, as should a map of ecological networks and/or green infrastructure.	Agreed and amended accordingly

		<p>Policy ENV4: Historic Environment</p>	<p>Policy ENV4 reiterates the NPPF heritage policy, however it should make more reference to assessment of development sites well in advance of designs being drawn up, in order to assess the potential impact on archaeological remains as well as the financial risk to a development in relation to archaeological mitigation costs. The NP could consider a local listing survey to identify non-designated buildings that developers/planners should be aware of e.g. the ruins of Chailey windmill.</p>	<p>Agreed and amended accordingly</p>
		<p>Flood Risk Management Policy ENV3: Countryside Protection and the village setting</p>	<p>We note point 1 of the policy and are generally supportive of the approach. However, we are of the view that the wording “to prevent flooding” should be changed to “to reduce the risk of flooding and ensure that the development in question is not placed at an unacceptable risk of flooding”. Such a change will ensure conformity with national and local strategic policy, as well as the County Council’s Local Flood Risk Management Strategy.</p> <p>With regards to this policy, we also suggest that you have regard to the</p>	<p>Noted and amended accordingly</p>

			<p>County Council’s Local Flood Risk Management Strategy and that this is added to the key evidence base that is referenced at the end of the policy. This Strategy can be viewed at: https://www.eastsussex.gov.uk/environment/flooding/localfloodriskmanagementstrategy/ We would also suggest contacting the Flood Risk Management team should you wish to obtain data that we hold on local flood risk matters in the parish. To contact the team, go to: https://apps.eastsussex.gov.uk/contactus/emailus/email.aspx?n=flood+risk+management+team&e=su.ds&d=eastsussex.gov.uk</p>	
<p>Highways England E Cleaver</p>	<p>Email</p>	<p>General Comment</p>	<p>We will be concerned with proposals that have the potential to impact the safe and efficient operation of the SRN, in this case the A23 and A27. Having reviewed the draft Chailey Neighbourhood Development Plan, we would normally have expected to see information regarding planned housing numbers. Having checked the Lewes Core Strategy, we note that it includes the</p>	<p>Add into the plan the number of allocated houses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • North Chailey – a minimum of 30 net additional units • South Chailey – a minimum of 10 net additional units <p>Text in para 1.3.6 is updated to include this</p>

			<p>following housing numbers for Chailey: North Chailey – a minimum of 30 net additional units South Chailey – a minimum of 10 net additional units Provided that the number of houses planned is not appreciably higher than this, we do not have any further comments. However, please continue to consult Highways England as the Chailey Neighbourhood Plan progresses.</p>	
<p>Plainview Planning Ltd on behalf of Greenplan Designer Homes Ltd.</p>	<p>Letter (emailed)</p>	<p>Vision (pg 23)</p>	<p>We wholly support the commitment to support sustainable development that respects its countryside setting. However, this vision is compromised/at odds with the housing objectives set out at page 24, and policy HO1 which limit development to within the identified tightly drawn settlement boundary. This does not reflect the above vision.</p>	<p>The vision is reflective of what the community wants. It is within the remit of the NDP to guide appropriate development in their area and the development boundary proposed has been done with this in mind.</p>
		<p>Housing Objectives (pg 24)</p>	<p>Objective 2: “To promote new residential development if within the revised development boundaries shown in the Plan and other allocated sites identified by Lewes District Council in the Local Plan.”</p>	<p>No changes needed. These objectives are positive and looks to encourage the right development in the right area.</p>

			<p>The above objective fails to recognise that sustainable development can come forward outside settlement boundaries.</p> <p>Objective 3a: “To ensure that new housing development in the Parish comprises dwellings with 1, 2 or 3 bedrooms, suitable for starter homes or for elderly residents downsizing from elsewhere in the village.”</p> <p>We fully support the provision of new homes through objective 3a. However, the objective does not reflect that housing need may change over time. The policy should allow a recognition of this and note that the housing type/size provided should reflect identified need at the time. Individual site characteristics are also relevant in establishing dwelling size to be provided.</p>	
		<p>Draft Policy HO1: Development Boundary</p>	<p>With such a tightly drawn settlement boundary in place and such specific and narrow policy provisions to be complied with for development proposed outside the boundaries, it is unrealistic to expect</p>	<p>We appreciate that Plainview Planning specialises in securing consents for sites outside of settlement boundaries, however settlement boundaries are a spatial planning tool used to guide development to the most sustainable</p>

			<p>sufficient development opportunities to come forward. We suggest that the policy should be positively rather than negatively worded to better reflect the 'Vision' (page 23) and to recognise that there are opportunities for development outside settlement boundaries where they can be shown to be sustainable and would not result in harm to the countryside - windfall, infill and backland development sites for example which reflect paragraph 78 of the NPPF.</p> <p>We consider that policy H01 fails Basic Conditions a and d, of Schedule 4B to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) due to conflict with paragraph 78 of the NPPF.</p>	<p>locations while protecting the character of the countryside and the parish.</p>
		<p>Draft Policy HO3: Housing Mix</p>	<p>We consider it unattainable for the LPA to promote a 'range' of house types and mix for housing development when the policy so heavily restricts the location of new dwellings to within such a tightly drawn settlement boundary. It is difficult to see where a site large</p>	<p>The boundary is not considered to be tight. It has been proposed to guide development to more sustainable locations, both in terms of accessibility of services and transport while protecting the countryside from encroachment of land uses more characteristic of built up areas. The policy provides guidance to landowners and developers on where development is acceptable in principle.</p>

			enough to provide more than 1 or 2 dwellings would be found so that this 'range' could be delivered.	This policy supports a plan led approach to development which is what the NPPF encourages.
Historic England Robert Lloyd-Sweet	Email Response	General Comment	<p>Historic England's remit is for the Historic Environment, including advising on the planning for the conservation and enjoyment of heritage assets and championing good design own historic places. As such our review of the plan has focused on these areas and silence on other matters should not be taken as consent.</p> <p>I am happy to confirm that we do not have any objections to raise with regard to any proposals within the plan. Moreover, we are pleased to see the use of the Chailey Character Assessment as a key document to underpin many of the plan's document.</p>	No action necessary
Lewes District Council	Report		*See separate table below	
Chailey Heritage Foundation M Nelhams	Email response	General Statement	We have reviewed the proposed neighbourhood development plan and support the objectives that have been set out. We would support any enhancement to the transport infrastructure that would improve	This is further emphasised under the Community Aspirations section of the plan?

			connections' with local towns and villages.	
Gladman Laura Tilston L.tilston@gladman.co.uk	Report	Policy HO1: Development Boundary	Gladman suggest that wording could be added to this policy that would increase the flexibility, setting out the circumstances where development adjacent to the development boundary would be acceptable, giving the CNP the ability to adapt to a change in circumstances. This would accord more closely with Paragraph 16 (b) of the NPPF (2019) as this would ensure that the CNP is positively prepared.	The policy has been amended.
		Policies HO2: Design, HO4: Building materials and Policy HO5: Building height	Gladman suggest that that these three policies are merged into one to provide a more general approach to design in the neighbourhood area. The Framework encourages the use of visual tools such as design guides and codes and for plans to set out a clear design vision and expectations. However, the level of detail and degree of prescription should be tailored to local circumstances in each place and should allow a suitable degree of variety where this would be justified.	Noted but it is felt that merging all 3 policies is not necessary.

		Policy HO3: Housing mix	Whilst noting the aspirations of this policy Gladman consider that it will need redrafting to ensure clarity in accordance with Paragraph 16(c) of the NPPF (2019). In seeking for starter homes to be contained within the housing mix, it must be noted that this tenure is now a form of affordable provision, as set out in the Glossary of the Framework. Reference could be made that starter homes are sought as part of the affordable housing mix, but this should not be a requirement as part of the market provision.	The policy has been amended.
		Policy HO9: Historic buildings and Policy ENV4: Historic Environment	Gladman suggest that both of these policies are modified slightly to be in greater accordance with requirements of the NPPF (2019), whilst being merged in to one policy to avoid unnecessary repetition within the CNP. Should these policies be retained within the CNP the term 'unacceptable impact' impact should be clarified as impacts could be subjective and this is likely to lead to inconsistencies in the development management process.	Noted
		Policy ENV3: Countryside Protection and the village setting	This policy seeks to protect the landscape character of the countryside through preserving and	The policy has been amended.

			<p>enhancing the open character of important gaps between settlements as well as conserving or enhancing the natural beauty of the character of the villages. This overall approach does not accord with the NPPF (2019), notably Paragraph 170, as this policy seeks to set out more restrictive requirements than national policy. Gladman suggest that the wording of this policy will need to be amended to better reflect the NPPF to meet basic condition (a).</p>	
		<p>Policy ENV6: Protection of open views</p>	<p>Gladman reiterate comments made to Policy ENV3 in relation to this policy. There is no ‘need to protect the open landscape character’, as national policy requires this to be recognised, not protected. Views should only be protected in line with national policy where they are a valued landscape.</p> <p>Gladman suggest that similar modifications are made to this policy as that to ENV3 to better reflect the requirements of the NPPF (2019).</p>	<p>The protection of these views are considered important to retain the landscape character of the village and is in keeping with the NPPF.</p>
			<p>Site Submission Land to the West of the A275, South Chailey</p>	<p>Noted but not the remit of the NDP</p>

Consultation Statement

			<p>As the Parish Council are aware, Gladman are promoting land within the neighbourhood plan area, land to the West of the A275, South Chailey. The site extends to 2.6 hectares, is well related to the existing built environment of South Chailey and presents a sustainable development opportunity capable of accommodating circa 55 dwellings.</p> <p>Gladman would be happy to work with the Parish Council and the local community to prepare a development framework that seeks to address key concerns, whilst contributing to the services and facilities of the village.</p>	
Natural England J Salt	Letter, via email	General Statement	Natural England does not have any specific comments on this draft neighbourhood plan.	No action required

Comments received from Lewes District Council

For ease of reference the policies have been colour coded to represent the following:

Green	The policy is considered acceptable against the criteria we have assessed it against.
Amber	Although the policy is generally considered acceptable, we do recommend certain changes in order to improve it, particularly when it comes to its usability by Development Management officers, Planning Committees, applicants, agents, consultees, etc.
Red	We advise against the inclusion of the policy in the NDP/the policy is not useable/the policy presents us with concerns that we can't offer solutions
Blue	Although acceptable, the policy achieves little/repeats policy in higher-level documents

Introduction

Policy	Regard to National Policy?	Does it undermine strategic policies?	Notes	CNDP Response
Foreword	-	-	<p><i>..'parishes are able to have a greater say over development in their local area and a Neighbourhood Development Plan forms the statutory planning document by which local development requirements can be outlined..'</i></p> <p>This will be more complete if substituted with the following: <i>'...the Neighbourhood Development Plan will form part of the statutory development plan for Lewes District, once it has been through a successful</i></p>	Noted

			<p><i>referendum. It will then be given equal weight to the Lewes Local Plan in determining planning applications in Chailey.'</i></p> <p>Please also bear in mind that if the LPP2 is adopted before the Chailey NP then the Chailey NP would have more weight where a conflict arose and vice versa.</p>	
Summary			p.g.4 – Omit (<i>adopted</i>) as this could be confusing	Agreed and amended accordingly
Introduction			<p>Para 1.1.2 '<i>Local Plan/JCS</i>'</p> <p>The strategic plan is the JCS, the LPP2 is non-strategic and depending upon which Plan is adopted first (likely to be LPP2) the more recently adopted would supersede certain policies in LPP2 - so the Chailey NP is likely to have more weight (once through referendum) for being the most recent plan.</p>	Agreed and amended accordingly
Summary of plan process			There is another stage of consultation after the plan is submitted to the LPA (point 4)	Agreed and amended accordingly
The Plan Process			<p>Para 1.2.4 '<i>.. it is then put to a parish referendum.'</i></p> <p>Please add: '<i>unless the Examiner decides to widen the voting area</i>'</p>	Agreed and amended accordingly
Local Planning Context			This is not quite accurate. The development plan for the area includes the Joint Core Strategy, the retained 'saved' policies of the LDLP 2003 and the East Sussex, South Downs	Agreed and amended accordingly

			and Brighton and Hove Waste and minerals Local Plan (2013) and Sites Plan (2017). We would suggest an up-to-date paragraph on the LPP2.	
Objectives			p.g. 23 Explain what is meant by <i>'other changes'</i>	Agreed and amended accordingly
Objective 8			<i>'Enhance and promote'</i> It may make more of an impact if another set of verbs are used in this section such as <i>'strengthen and sustain'</i> .	Agreed and amended accordingly
Housing policies			p.g.27 <i>'District Core Strategy Process'</i> amend to <i>' the site allocation process of Local Plan Part2'</i>	Agreed and amended accordingly

Housing

Policy	Regard to National Policy?	Does it undermine strategic policies?	Notes	
HO2 Design	Yes	No	We recommend that zero-carbon homes could form a part of this policy and also guidance regarding how new homes will be designed to cope with climate change. How will they be built to cope with heavier rain fall and drier summers? Criteria to steer this can be included here. This would be a good place to include renewable energy targets e.g. solar panel numbers or areas. Please note that these policy additions would need	Agreed and amended accordingly

			evidence of developer commitment to building sustainable, zero carbon homes through a viability study. We are happy to give further advice on this.	
HO2 Design	Yes	No	<p><i>'Applications proposing unsympathetic designs which fail to respect the connections between people and places...'</i></p> <p>This policy should be worded positively and be useful to a planning officer in determining applications.e.g. <i>'Applications which should sensitivity to the location and pay regard to existing densities...will be supported.'</i></p> <p>This may also need to be defined in the supporting text to ease the implementation of the policy.</p>	Agreed and amended accordingly
HO3 Housing mix	Yes	No	It is helpful to know that the policies have justifications but we would suggest adding supporting text again to ease the implementation and provide further information on the benefit this policy would have.	Agreed and amended accordingly
HO4 Building materials	Yes	No	Materials that are ethically and environmentally friendly could also form a part of this policy. The policy should support the use of materials which are certified to not involve human exploitation or cause pollution in their manufacture.	Agreed and amended accordingly

			<p><i>'The design of new buildings will be expected to have regard to vernacular character of buildings in the villages.'</i></p> <p>We would amend this to <i>'Building design will be supported when regard is given to the local vernacular character.'</i></p>	
			<p><i>'Building materials that age sympathetically will be supported.'</i></p> <p>We think this would be difficult to enforce or to make a planning decision with. If it is retained a list of appropriate materials could be given to aid planning decisions.</p>	Noted
			<p>To assist ageing/weathering, bricks should preferably be handmade rather than factory We advise that this is omitted. It is restrictive and unless there is evidence to support it, inclusion may make development unviable for developers due to the cost.</p>	Agreed and amended accordingly
H05 Building heights	Yes	No	<p><i>'Building heights have an important influence on the character and image of a place. They also have a direct impact on development density and the intensity of activity in an area. Therefore, building height needs to be carefully managed.'</i></p> <p>We recommend that this section should be moved to the 'objectives' section or used as supporting text.</p>	Agreed and amended accordingly
			<p><i>'Tall buildings (over 2 storeys) are likely to have a greater impact than other building</i></p>	Agreed and amended accordingly

			<p><i>types due to their massing and size and will not be supported.'</i></p> <p>We recommend that this line is omitted as it repeats the previous line, which is very clear, but in a negative manner.</p>	
HO6 Pedestrian connections	Yes	No	<p><i>'We will support highways or other transport improvements that facilitate safe access for pedestrians and cyclists through and between all parts of the village...'</i></p> <p>This is out of the scope of planning policy but could added as supporting text to a 'Community Aspiration' section. Projects could be identified here that will be funded or part-funded by CIL contributions.</p>	Amended in line with ESCC comments
			<p><i>'The Neighbourhood Plan will where appropriate require proposals to...'</i></p> <p>Amend this to: <i>'Development proposals will be required to:...'</i></p>	Agreed and amended accordingly
HO7 Development of residential gardens	Yes	No	<p><i>'The development of residential gardens within the Development Boundary, where such development would harm local character, will be resisted.'</i></p> <p>This would be more positively worded as follows: <i>'The Character Appraisal will be used to guide where development of residential gardens within the development boundary</i></p>	Agreed and amended accordingly

			<i>would be permitted and where it would be resisted due to harm to local character.'</i>	
HO8 Conservation Areas	Yes	No	This policy does not expand on the Local Plan, therefore is not necessary as it is currently worded. We recommend that the policy could be expanded to make it more specific to Chailey and its conservation areas.	Agreed and amended accordingly
Policy HO10 Housing considerations	Yes	No	<i>Change 'encouraged' to 'supported'</i>	Agreed and amended accordingly
			<i>'Sheltered housing on a very limited scale with preference for those with strong local connections will be viewed favourably.'</i> This needs further interpretation to clarify what is required here.	Agreed and amended accordingly

Environment

Policy	Regard to National Policy?	Does it undermine strategic policies?	Notes	
ENV1 Integration of Landscape	Yes	No	We recommend that the title is <i>'Landscape'</i> .	Agreed and amended accordingly
			We recommend amending the first lines of the policy:	Agreed and amended accordingly

			<p><i>'The design of new landscape features will happen at an early stage in the design process to ensure they are well integrated into new developments.'</i></p> <p>to</p> <p><i>'Landscaping should be considered during the initial design stages to ensure complete integration into new development schemes'</i></p>	
			<p>In the criteria of this policy state either 'and' or 'or' before the last criterion to clarify if you intend for all or one of the criteria to be addressed.</p>	Agreed and amended accordingly
ENV2 Wildlife Protection	Yes	No	<p>There scope here to introduce targets to make this policy more robust and reinforce the protection of wildlife e.g. Number of trees to be planted per hectare, length or required hedgerow, wildflower verges along proposed roads/bike paths. This would have to be with regard to existing local and national policy and evidence about local biodiversity to make specific requirements.</p>	Noted
			<p><i>'Development requiring planning permission...'</i></p> <p>This can be omitted. The NP will only be used to determine apps that require planning permission.</p>	Agreed and amended accordingly
			<p><i>'Arboricultural amenity value will not be supported unless the benefits of the proposed development outweigh the amenity value of the trees or hedgerows in question.'</i></p> <p>How will this be measured?</p>	Agreed and amended accordingly

ENV3 Countryside protection and the village setting	Yes	No	<i>'In particular it will:'</i> We recommend changing this to <i>'Development should include the following criteria:'</i> Include <i>'and'</i> or <i>'or'</i> before the last criterion to clarify if all or one are to be considered.	Agreed and amended accordingly
ENV4 Historic Environment	Yes	No	The first paragraph does not expand on local or national policy and could be left out. It would be worth developing a policy that is specific to Chailey's heritage and built environment.	Agreed and amended accordingly
			<i>'...will be considered taking account of the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage assets.</i> We recommend changing this to: <i>'...will be determined with regard to scale of any harm or loss to the heritage asset.'</i>	Agreed and amended accordingly
			Criteria should be included here to assist the planner in deciding what public benefits should be considered.	Agreed and amended accordingly
Policy ENV5	Yes	No	We recommend this policy is either developed further or merged with ENV2. Targets could be included e.g. number of new trees to be planted. The Government has several white papers on natural capital, it would be worth having a look at these and deciding how the natural assets you mention can be valued and enhanced to really make the most of this policy.	Noted
Policy ENV6	Yes	No	<i>'All development will be...'</i> Change to <i>'should'</i> to be less restrictive.	Agreed and amended accordingly
			<i>'The Character Assessment will</i>	Agreed and amended accordingly

			<p><i>be used as a reference to assess the impact of all proposals.'</i></p> <p>This is fine as long as the Character Assessment clearly shows which views are to be protected.</p>	
ENV7 Dark Night Skies	Yes	No	<p><i>'New lighting will be required to conform to the highest standard of light pollution restrictions in force at the time. Security and other outside lighting on private and public premises will be restricted or regulated to be neighbourly in its use including floodlighting at equine establishments and on sports fields or sports grounds.'</i></p> <p>Is there evidence to support this part of the policy? Lighting alone will not require planning permission, so this would be tricky to enforce unless it is part of a wider development application. Local evidence is needed to implement a SDNP policy when not within the National Park.</p>	Agreed and amended accordingly
			<p>Information regarding national standards could be included here to aid the planning officer in making a decision.</p>	Agreed and amended accordingly
			<p><i>'Security and other outside lighting that will adversely affect the amenities of other occupiers or habitats or which cause unnecessary light pollution which reduces the quality of the dark night sky will be not be supported.'</i></p> <p>This sentence more or less repeats what has been said earlier in the policy.</p>	Agreed and amended accordingly

ENV8 Chailey Common Buffer Zone	Yes	No	This policy does not expand on national policy, therefore the protection mentioned is already covered by national legislation. I would include a map indicating the buffer zone to aid planning decisions.	Noted
---------------------------------	-----	----	--	-------

Community

COM1 Developer Contributions	Yes	No	<p>This is not policy material. We recommend having a governance in place to explain why you want to go this way or at the very least a section in the NP.</p> <p>We recommend COM1 & 2 should be merged with most of COM1 being omitted. An infrastructure projects list could be included (not in policy) to guide the boards in charge of the recommendation making and cabinet in charge of the decision making if projects come forward in the parish.</p> <p>If you intended to identify a site for allocation then this is likely to trigger the need for SA/SEA.</p>	Agreed and amended accordingly
------------------------------	-----	----	--	--------------------------------

Transport

Policy	Regard to National Policy?	Does it undermine strategic policies?	Notes	
TRA1 Non car provision	Yes	No	We support this policy however it repeats quite a lot of what has been says in earlier policies. Possibly another angle could be addressed with regard to transport e.g. air quality which would be a discernible benefit from non-car provision and could be measured against recognised national and local targets. Targets could also be used to make the policy more robust and distinguish it from earlier policies e.g. number of cycle racks for developments larger than a certain number of houses and a maximum distance from development to bus stops. This would all need to be evidenced as explained earlier.	Amended in line with ESCC comments
			Criteria: using 'and' here means there is an awful lot for a developer to take on board, which may make it unviable.	Amended in line with ESCC comments
TRA2 Traffic calming	Yes	No	This policy is out of the scope of planning policy, this is ESCC Highways territory. It could be added as a 'community aspiration'. It is not appropriate to expect this from small developments.	Amended in line with ESCC comments
TRA3 Pedestrian safety	Yes	No	This policy is more of an objective and should form part of that section. We recommend that you identify specific infrastructure projects as part of the NP.	Amended in line with ESCC comments

TRA4	Yes	No	This policy does not expand on what is already set out in ESCC Highways parking standards.	Amended in line with ESCC comments
------	-----	----	--	------------------------------------

Economy

Policy	Regard to National Policy?	Does it undermine strategic policies?	Notes	
EC01 Retail provision	No	Yes	<p><i>'Conversion of retail into residential within the retail core will be resisted.'</i></p> <p>Note that permitted development legislation currently allows a change of use from Retail (A2) to up to 150m2 of Dwellinghouse (C3) subject to Prior Approval.</p>	Agreed and amended accordingly
			<p><i>'Additional provision outside the existing retail core will be supported if it enhances the village centre retail offer, is compatible with the size and scale of the existing village centre, and does not have unacceptable impacts on the operation of the road network and the character of the Conservation Area'</i></p>	Agreed and amended accordingly

			We recommend that this paragraph is moved to the section on conservation.	
ECO2 Comms infrastructure	Yes	No	Change 'must to 'should'.	Agreed and amended accordingly
ECO3 Rural business	Yes	No	We think this policy may need more of an evidence base to demonstrate why some conversions are acceptable (and some not). It is restrictive as it stands.	Noted
			c) We think this criterion will be confusing for a planning officer and needs to be refined.	Noted
			Additional criterion could be 'non car accessible'	Agreed and amended accordingly
ECO4 Employment retention	Yes	Yes	Core Policy 4 of the LPP1 goes further than this in defining when sites will no longer be safeguarded, therefore this is potentially in conflict with local policy.	Agreed and amended accordingly
			<i>'Proposals for the use of land or buildings on sites of existing employment uses other than employment purposes will not be supported unless:'</i> We recommend that this is re-phrased to say <i>'Proposals for the use of land... will only be supported when:'</i>	Agreed and amended accordingly
ECO5 Sustainability	Yes	No	We are pleased to see that renewable energy provisions are supported however these do not need planning permission.	Agreed and amended accordingly

Section 4: Conclusion

- 4.1 Throughout the process, the intention of the Steering Group has been to get as many members of our community as possible involved, using a variety of consultation techniques to ensure that we get a true picture of what the issues are for our community. The various consultation events have all been widely attended and public participation has been very positive.
- 4.2 The summary of the key stages of the CNDP process so far include:
- Area Designation: 17th March 2015
 - Shaping Chailey Questionnaire: 14th November 2015
 - Parish wide consultation open day (St.George's Day Fete): 22nd April 2017
 - Housing Needs Survey: February 2018
 - Reg.14 pre-submission: Consultation 17th May 2019 to 28th June 2019
 - Building of the evidence base is continuous throughout the process
- 4.3 The public has been very supportive throughout the production of the Plan through various consultation events and these have impacted directly on the production of the plan.

Section 5: Annexes

The annexes contain additional information that would be helpful to the flow of the main text of this statement or provide further detail on consultation events held throughout the process. Due to the size of these documents they have been compiled as separate annexes and published on the NP website.

Annex 1: Shaping Chailey Questionnaire and summary results

Annex 2: Resources/literature from key consultation community events (links to section 2 consultation timeline including leaflets, notices, articles, Chailey news etc.)

Annex 3: Photographs of consultation events