

Review & analysis of responses to pre-submission draft

EVENTS TODATE

The pre-submission consultation report of the neighbourhood development plan was published in March 2016, and widely promulgated (see elsewhere in this web site). Responses by a deadline of April 26th were invited from residents, statutory undertakers and other interested organisations. This was later extended to May 31st to accept a number of late responses. All responses were summarised and uploaded onto the web site on May 31st.

THIS REPORT

The project management group (PMG) then continued to work on the analysis of those results, taking further advice from the principal planning authority, the South Downs National Parks Authority (SDNPA) and other authorities who had submitted comments, notably East Sussex CC. The report that follows overleaf is a distillation of all that advice, (first published in June), that now also includes the PMG's proposed actions and SDNPA's rulings in response.

FUTURE ACTIVITIES

Many of the points made by respondents were dealt with by textual changes and refinements, and will be incorporated by the five focus groups into a revised version of the consultation document. However, the SDNPA advised the PMG to prepare more refined proposals in two areas: housing development and green spaces, and then to consult once more on the outcome for these two areas. Work is therefore continuing on these topics, and once it is complete there will be a second limited 6 week consultation period for residents, triggered by a mail drop to all homes.

This has caused a delay to our programme for which we apologise, but it is planned to have the work ready for public consultation by early autumn. At that point, we will submit the revised submission document to the planning authorities for onward transmission by them to the Independent Examiner for formal scrutiny. We cannot anticipate the timing or content of the Examiner's response, but it is unlikely to be before Easter 2017.

In the continuing and unfortunate absence of our Chair Tom Dufty, whose recovery from critical illness thankfully continues, please direct any comments to either Mike or Edwina. We should like to thank all of you who have supported the team through this difficult period.

The next meeting of the PMG will be in the Friends Meeting House (Quakers) as usual, at 7.30pm on Wednesday 27th July.

Mike Burr 01273 842133, mustburr@gmail.com

Edwina Rowling, 01273 845131, edwina.rowling@gmail.com

4th July 2016

Review & analysis of responses to pre-submission draft

(Points are recorded herein mostly in summary form: for further details see original response tables on web site)

Org'n/REF	Description of critique	Response	Action
SDNPA (using their ref nos)	South Downs National Park Authority		
1	GENERAL COMMENTS		
1.2	Several national & local planning policies repeated	Agree	Review all policies & remove duplication
1.4	Include list of links & evidence docs	Agree	
1.5	Put aspirational policies into appendix	Agree	Position land use policies in main body & aspirational in appendix at end
1.6	Insert paragraph numbers	Agree	
1.7	Avoid confusing abbreviations	Agree	Will replace 'neighbourhood plan' with 'neighbourhood development plan/NDP' or 'DSWNP'
1.8	Add supporting text below each policy	Agree	To be based on focus group reports
1.9	Loose use of affordable housing term	Agree	Will rephrase to reflect precise meaning of term in planning sense
1.10	Coordinate separate policies for interconnections	Agree	Review relevant policies and write higher level strategies
1.11	Improve front cover map	Agree	Re-plot with correct boundaries and better symbols
1.12	(Contents): Make all docs, maps and appendices openly available	Agree	Already mostly done (see website), but will review
2	SECTION 1: INTRODUCTION		
2.1	(What is a neighbourhood plan): See 1.7 above		
2.2	(How was plan drawn up): Joint NDP in neighbouring parishes <u>not</u> unusual	Noted	Re-phrase opening paragraph
3	SECTION 2: CHARACTERISTICS		
3.1	(History): 'cay' for 'clay'	Agree	Correct typo
3.2	(Settlement): listing is prerogative of Historic England	Agree	Amend 'that are worthy of listing' to 'that may be worthy of listing'. Aspirational policy to be included to promote buildings for listing.
3.4	(Environment) para 3 confuses traffic impact with countryside gaps	Agree	Rephrase and add examples
3.5	(Society): replace justification of boundary extension approval with Sec of State's own recommendation	Agree	Re-word with suggested insertion

Review & analysis of responses to pre-submission draft

4	SECTION 3 PLANNING POLICY CONTEXT		
4.1	<i>(Introduction)</i> : clarify LDC and SDNP responsibilities	Agree	Re-word with suggested insertion (see original submission)
4.2	<i>(What documents are used)</i> : re-word for clarity	Agree	Ditto
4.3	<i>(What guidance is provided by development plan on sites)</i> : Change wording in para 3 re dwellings from 'provide sites' to 'allocate sites'	Agree	Ditto
4.4	<i>(What guidance is contained in emerging plans)</i> : factual amendments	Agree	Ditto
5	VISION, OBJECTIVES AND KEY ISSUES		
5.1	<i>(Housing)</i> : Consider meaning of affordable housing	Agree	Review wording to clarify whether 'affordable housing for rent or purchase' is meant here.
5.2	<i>(Ditto)</i> : change 'eco-efficient'	Agree	Rephrase to 'uses resources efficiently'
5.3	<i>(Ditto)</i> : reword 4 th bullet point	Agree	Change to: 'has <u>adequate</u> provision for off-street residents' parking'
5.4	<i>(Traffic & transport)</i> : Re-word 1 st bullet point	Agree	Replace 'force' with 'encourage', and add to the end 'whilst respecting the historic setting of the village'.
5.5	<i>(Local economy)</i> : unclear how off-street parking for residents contributes to use of community facilities	Agree	Resident parking topic will be moved to a different section.
5.6	<i>(overall)</i> See 1.10: opportunity for synergy between aims	Agree	Will consider cumulative effect of objectives and potential to strengthen connections between them.

Review & analysis of responses to pre-submission draft

6	HOUSING POLICIES		
6.1 Intro	4 th para: expand acceptable dwelling types	Agree	Expand to include replacement dwellings, building conversions in certain circumstances, and agricultural workers' dwellings.
6.2 HSG1	<i>(Apply acceptable site density & layout rules)</i> : 2 nd bullet point: see 1.8: affordable housing will not be for purchase	Agree	Re-word
6.3 HSG2	Delete unclear phrase 'return the maximum housing stock (units) into the SDNP/LDC area'	Agree	Will delete phrase
6.4 HSG3	<i>(Restrict development to within settlement boundary)</i> : Policy worded too liberally & in conflict with CONS2	Agree	Will clarify that policy only applies to residential development acceptable under CONS 2. Consider extending boundary (ref SDNPA meeting 2/6)
6.5 HSG4	<i>(Critically review proposals to subdivide existing housing stock)</i> : Clarification needed: policy to apply to existing buildings, not plot sub division, and to avoid adverse impacts on character, safety or amenity of roads.	Agree	Replace 'housing stock' with 'dwellings' Add that development should avoid adverse impact on character, safety or amenity of local road network
6.6 HSG7	<i>(Prepare village design statement)</i> : Could serve as basis for a land use policy, or within policy CONS3, requiring development to accord with the principles of a VDS, which should include a section on typical boundary treatments & entrance designs within the villages & design advice on new features, & include a section on 'designing in traffic calming'.	Agree	Will add as suggested in implementation phase (Section 8: BVIT)

<p>6.7 HSG8</p>	<p><i>(Allocate development sites):</i> Refer to point 1.8. re affordable houses. The difficulties of identifying suitable & appropriate development sites within Ditchling are noted and acknowledged. Two of proposed allocations are problematic in landscape terms. Recommendation: Remove allocation at Nye Lane, & re-consider allocation at Park Barn Farm in light of comments below</p> <p>Comments on Land to the west of Nye Lane:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Although there is development in the vicinity, it's a portion of a larger field in a prominent location south of the village, a sizeable component of the undeveloped land to the south. The site forms part of a consistent tract of undeveloped fieldscapes (early enclosures – ref Sussex HLC) which contribute to the settlement setting, reducing its depth and scale in views. Development of part of a field changes the scale and pattern of the viewed landscape & affects the whole field, not only that proposed for development; • The site is prominent in views from the footpath crossing the adjacent field & connects into the wider PROW network between Ditchling & the scarp slope to the south. Views from the footpath which runs along New Lane would be affected by development including likely loss of existing trees which line the western edge of the track; • The described layout of housing fronting onto New Lane would result in rear gardens being exposed to views from the surrounding PROW network. Any alternative layout of fronting onto the countryside would appear overly assertive compared with surrounding settlement edge treatments, Therefore the number and types of houses proposed and their design and layout is problematic; • Site access restricted and any requirement for highway improvements may lead to urbanising impacts including those on the adjacent Conservation area. Associated loss of existing trees alters the existing rural backdrop to the village in this location and affects the rural character of the PROW; • Views to the Scarp slope are open and it is assumed that there would be visibility of the site from the scarp, and although this would be against the back drop of the settlement it is considered that the site would be prominent in views if developed; (continued) 	<p>Agree</p> <p>Agree</p>	<p>Will re-word</p> <p>Nye Lane allocation removed</p>
---------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------

Review & analysis of responses to pre-submission draft

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • While screening planting could be used along the western boundary this would not reduce the impact on views from higher ground owing to their elevated nature, & also the incongruent nature of screening planting itself being viewed as part of a development rather than an intrinsic landscape element; • The proposal for 5 small houses would be inconsistent with surrounding densities which are much lower, properties being largely detached in large plots. The incongruous impact of this would be exacerbated by the site's location at the settlement edge. <p>Comments on Park Barn Farm site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is queried whether the proposed site can take 13 houses given the existing trees, stream, layout and curtilage requirements; • The site is located south of the village, an extension of the settlement in this sensitive location between the edge of the village & the transitional landscape leading to the scarp slope & the South Downs ridge beyond. Whilst this in itself may not make the site undesirable to develop, what is problematic is the access to the site. No indication of site access is given in the plan. Any access off Beacon Road would result in unacceptable impact on existing landscape framework –trees, hedgerows, topography and field pattern (see further info below); • An alternative access may be possible through Long Park Corner by negotiation: there is an area of garage courts to the north of the site which could be included within a development & could be beneficial to the townscape in design terms; • The development (properties, access and domestic curtilage arrangements) would be visible from the Sussex Border Path (SBP) immediately west of the site. This route is important for access to the scarp slope & Ditchling; • Beacon Rd is lined with dense vegetation. The verge side planting has some depth & appears to be consistent in age with the Ancient woodland opposite. • HLC assessment identifies field patterns to the west of Beacon Road as 'early enclosures dating from 1500-1599AD, representative of significant time depth in the landscape - this includes boundary features (these defining the layout). 	<p>Redesign allocation layout and density at Park Barn Farm in the light of the comments, in particular the need to avoid access from Beacon Road and potential capacity constraints, and the need to avoid negative impact on the amenity of an important footpath.</p>
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Review & analysis of responses to pre-submission draft

7	TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORT POLICIES		
7.1 TRANSI	<i>(Public parking provision):</i> Proposals accepted in principle provided they achieve overriding traffic management or recreation management benefits, they are part of a strategic traffic management scheme which gives precedence to sustainable transport, and the site is close to and easily accessible from main roads by appropriate routes.	Agree	Will provide additional supporting evidence and detail on the allocation to address the issues raised.
7.2	<i>(Aspirational traffic and transport policies)</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local community initiatives welcomed where they contribute towards SDNP purposes Build on TP3 as a basis Base proposals on evidence that support LATS, with reference to ‘Roads in the South Downs’ Some technologies & infrastructure proposals unlikely to respect status/setting of highway as historic routes 	Noted	Policies to be reviewed after further discussions with SDNPA and ESCC. TP3 makes no reference to the three Beacon parishes; LATS principles still valid
7.3	<i>(Footpath and cycle routes:)</i> SDNPA welcomes this policy, particularly E-W routes. Add Equestrian paths. Promote provision of safe crossing places. Safeguard routes with specific land use policy.	Agree	Policy wording to be revised
9	CONSERVATION POLICIES		
9.1 INTRO	Para3: Confirmed that Joint Core Strategy (JCS) will apply to totality of the three parishes	Agree	Paragraph to be removed after explanatory note
9.2 CONS2	<i>(Limit development in the countryside):</i> Bullet point 2: supporting text helpful eg, on interpreting terms such as ‘existing dwelling’ and ‘materially larger’; or refer to SD45	Agree	Supporting text to be inserted, or detailed reference to SD45
9.4 CONS3	<i>(Set standards for design of new development):</i> Duplicates SD5, SD6. Hence question inclusion of this policy	Review	Policy to be reviewed in light of emerging Local Plan policy
9.5 CONS6	<i>(Protect assets of archaeological importance):</i> Policy overlaps with SD41. Either redraft or remove	Review	Policy to be reconsidered and deleted or redrafted

Review & analysis of responses to pre-submission draft

9.6 CONS7	<i>(Protect character of conservation areas)</i> : Reference to the Ditchling Historic Character Assessment welcomed but it covers more than just the conservation area of Ditchling. Suggest including a comment about boundary treatments for new properties to be in keeping with surrounding properties and public realm treatments. Suggest reference to the Sussex historic landscape character assessment. Recommend separating out second part of policy into new policy for Ditchling village as a whole, rather than just Conservation Area	Agree	Will re-word and add policy
10	COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE POLICIES		
10.1 COMI	<i>(Increase and protect our community assets)</i> : Para 1 not consistent with SD29	Agree	Policy will be revised to be consistent with SD29
10.2 COMI	Para 2 too vague. Exact marketing requirements should be set down. See Petersfield Plan	Agree	Detailed plan will be prepared



Review & analysis of responses to pre-submission draft

	Lewes District Council		
P35	Windfall sites are defined in the JCS Glossary as usually “small sites for a small number of homes” – not necessarily individual homes	Agree	Re-word
HSG3	<i>(Site density)</i> : Support the general intent of the policy, but it may be overly restrictive in restricting housing development in the countryside and question whether, the policy as worded is in conformity with NPPF.	Review	Consider re-wording after review (see full text from submission)
HSG8	<i>(Allocate development sites)</i> : Support Park Barn Farm development up to 13 dwellings (drainage issues) More accurate site maps needed for application determination	Accept	Add caveat and maps
BIZ1	<i>(Parishes have differing needs)</i> : Aspirational, and words missing	Agree	Re-word and position in aspirational appendix
BIZ4	<i>(planning policies for retention of local shops)</i> : potentially a land use policy and thus used to determine planning applications in the parishes.	Agree	Review wording
CONS3	<i>(Set standards for new development)</i> : Policy in 6 th bullet should be referred to: CONS 10	Agree	Will add
CONS 8	<i>(Protect & enhance ecology..)</i> : Also refer to parts in LDC outside SDNP	Not needed?	Will take SDNP advice as to correct wording
CONS 12	<i>(Protect local green spaces)</i> re-word to “permitted in very special circumstances, such as....essential utilities, infrastructure...”	Agree	Re-word
CONS 13	<i>(Protect important gaps between settlements)</i> : add map	Agree	Map to be added
CONS 16	<i>(Enhance ecological network)</i> : error in drafting?	Agree	Will be re-worded

Review & analysis of responses to pre-submission draft

	West Sussex County Council		
TRANS 10	<i>(Provide for pedestrians, horse riders and cyclists):</i> E-W route proposal could be extended into West Sussex & link up through Hassocks/Keymer	Agree	Add WSCC proposal



Review & analysis of responses to pre-submission draft

	East Sussex County Council (again using their ref nos)		
	TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORT		
2.2	(p27:Objective to reduce traffic volume and speed): No currently identified schemes to achieve this policy, so its inclusion should be re-considered	Noted	Advice from SDNPA is that while aspirational policies are not part of statutory plan, they may be included in the report Appendix
2.3	SUGGESTED ADDITIONS REINFORCING A NUMBER OF OBJECTIVES (see original submission) (p27: cycle friendly facilities):	Agree	Replace with new wording
2.4	(p27: public transport)	Agree	Ditto
2.4	(p27/8: local economy):	Agree	
2.5	(P28:promote provision of community services):	Agree	Ditto
2.6	Rename chapter title as 'Transport' rather than 'Traffic and Transport'	Agree	Change
2.7	(reference to resurrecting LATS): No plans to do this therefore Neighbourhood Plan should refer to the relevant sections of TP3 and its Implementation Plan. 'Strongly advise' that reference to the resurrection of the LATS study is not included in the plan as a policy and within the appendix.	Noted	Advice from SDNPA is that while aspirational policies are not part of statutory plan, they may be included in the report Appendix
2.8	(p39: traffic policies are aspirational): state that parishes are willing to work in partnership with ESCC to deliver transport policies	Agree	Will add
2.9 TRANS2	(special zoning & recognition): ESCC not aware of special zoning scheme, so exclude it	Noted	Propose to have joint open discussions with with ESCC and SDNPA to implement scheme using principles of 'Roads in the South Downs', and in recognition of the ESCC proposal in their para 2.8 above.
2.10 TRANS 3	(Resurrect LATS): see 2.7 above	Noted	LATS may be used as an evidence source
2.11 TRANS 4	(prepare traffic plan): Clarify that parish councils will pay for detailed design, cost and implementation.	Agree	Add clarification, noting that each parish will agree individual contributions
2.12 TRANS 5	(Discourage through traffic): change 'will' to 'should'. Added commentary noted (see original ESCC response).	Agree	Change and add ESCC commentary to text
2.13 TRANS6	Reduce speed & improve ped'n safety): replace 'enforced' and 'set & enforced' with 'sought'; add ref to need for Sussex Police consultation	Agree	Amend and consult

Review & analysis of responses to pre-submission draft

2.14 TRANS 7	(Protect countryside from traffic: introduce quiet lanes): Remove as not supported by ESCC	Noted	See again their paras 2.8 and 2.9 and our comments under 2.2
2.15 TRANS 8	(Improve pedestrian environment in High Street): replace 'will' with 'could'	Agree	Re-word
2.16 TRANS10	(Provide for pedestrians, horse riders and cyclists): Change 'will' for 'could'. Add that work will be at parish expense. Get rights of way put onto definitive ESCC map	Agree	Re word, and add. Also note that while ESCC does not currently plan to contribute, we would expect to negotiate since this may change over the plan period
	ACHIEVING SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT	Agree	
2.17	(P59 Community welfare): replace 'in reducing the need to travel outside the area' with 'through the provision of a range of accessible transport choices'	Agree	Re-word
2.18	(p60 Conservation bullet point 3): add phrase (national park) 'that is accessible through the provision of a range of transport choices, which..' (will bring)	Agree	Re-word.
2.19	(p61 Traffic): Reword para 1 as : 'Our transport policies will lead to safer and more accessible transport choices from which residents, visitors and businesses will benefit' (bullet point 1): Remove reference to LATS as per para 2.7 (bullet point 3): Remove reference to cordon sanitaire (bullet point 5): Reword as: 'affordable and reliable transport choices to enable people to walk, cycle and use public transport for short local journeys or as part of longer journeys'.	Agree	Re-word Re-word See again para 2.9. Re-word
	LANDSCAPE		
3.1	(Statement of local landscape character)	No change	
3.2	(Countryside development)	No change	
3.3	(new development to conserve & enhance landscape character)	No change	
3.4	(Housing developments): ensure compliance with SDNPA policies	No change	
3.5	(Park Barn Farm hsng): access to be through estate	No change	as SDNPA comments
3.6	(Nye Lane hsng): comments overrrtaken by SDNPA decision	None	

Review & analysis of responses to pre-submission draft

3.7	(Strategic gap preservation): supported	No change	
3.8	(Local green spaces): supported	No change	
3.9	(Keymer Rd car park): supported. Ensure well screened & surface design	No change	
HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT AND ARCHAEOLOGY			
4.1	(No reference to HER record base):	Agree	Insert reference
4.2-4-5	(Note County Archaeologist’s rapid reviews of Nye Lane (overtaken) Park Barn Farm (noted), East End Lane (noted), and further steps needed	Agree	Insert recommendations
4.6	Keymer Rd car park reservations noted.	Agree	Insert recommendations
5 ECOLOGY			
5.1	Support for plan	No change	
6 ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT			
6.1	(Superfast broadband). No ESCC support, so rely on BT’s own programme	Noted	

Review & analysis of responses to pre-submission draft

	Hassocks Parish Council		
p51 CONSI3	<p><i>(Protect important gaps between settlements):</i> Propose that important gap policy be amended to match wording in Hassocks plan:- ‘Local Gaps have been defined and will be safeguarded between:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Keymer/Hassocks and Ditchling; and • Keymer/Hassocks and Hurstpierpoint, <p>as defined on the Proposals Map with the objectives of preventing coalescence and retaining the separate identity and amenity of settlements. Development will be supported within the Gap areas where;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is necessary for the purposes of agriculture, or some other use which has to be located in the countryside; • It makes a valuable contribution to the landscape and amenity of the Gap and enhances its value as open countryside; and • It would not compromise individually or cumulatively the objectives and fundamental integrity of the Ditchling Gap and Hurstpierpoint Gap.’ 	Noted	Discussion needed with Hassocks and SDNPA to clarify intent and wording

Review & analysis of responses to pre-submission draft

	Westmeston Parish Council		
p11	Delete non historical exaggeration of settlement size	Agree	Change
p11	'clay' not 'cay'	Agree	Change
p12	Delete Greensand Way in last para, and reference to self sufficiency	Agree	Change
p18	Insert picture caption 'Ditchling's submission for inclusion in the SDNP'	Agree	Change
p20/p23	All references to JCS to be updated following its approval	Agree	Change
p28	Add local groups in community service: 'Support local groups & bodies that carry out work to meet this aim, eg Ditchling Grounds Committee, Footpath Committee, Footpath Preservation Society, Westmeston Jubilee Pathway Trust & Monday Group'	Agree	Add
p39	Move heading "Land use policies" to immediately above land use policy TRANS 1	Agree	Change
p39	Add to Introduction: It is important to stress the essential coordination of the buffer zones and traffic gateways in the outlying parts of the three parishes (TRANS 6 and 7) with the improved pedestrian-friendly High Street and protection of Ditchling village centre (TRANS 8). Without this coordination, the policy implementation risks diverting traffic away from Ditchling village centre onto other roads or ceasing to be as effective in protecting both the centre and the periphery.	Agreed	
p41 TRANS 6	Add intention to progressively introduce slower speed limits from the periphery inwards	Agree	Will add
p42 TRANS10	Insert: 'extend the existing E-W Jubilee pathway from Westmeston, through Streat'.	Agree	Add
p53 CONS4	Correct impression that Westmeston has no conservation area by adding 'complete the appraisal of the proposed extensions to the current Westmeston conservation area	Agree	Will amend
CONS16	Insert comma after assets	Agree	Insert
p64	Under policies in action, add 'Within the resource and financial capacity of the smaller parishes'	Agree	Also add"(a)" be inserted before "to design and Implement..." and "(b)" inserted after "and" and before "to carry out improvements..".

Review & analysis of responses to pre-submission draft

	Streat meeting		
HSNG	There should not be an absolute bar on new housing if a need could be shown for low cost/ affordable housing for young people/ local workers.	Noted	SDNPA policy
CONS	No expansion of Plumpton College campus between its existing western boundary and Streat Lane.	Noted	SDNPA policy: this is to be tested under second stage consultation of CONS 12 (local green spaces)
TRANS	20mph not appropriate for parts of Streat Lane; no development along Streat Lane which increases traffic flow	Noted	ESCC policy
BIZ	The statement that Streat residents “rely heavily on Ditchling for shopping” is not correct.	Agreed	Remove
COM	No mention of church activities	Agreed	Add
	Southern Water		
P47 CONS2	<i>(Limit development in countryside):</i> not in conformity with NPPF Add bullet point: ‘ ● essential utility infrastructure’. Add to last sentence: ‘or meets the needs for essential utility infrastructure’	Agree	Add

Review & analysis of responses to pre-submission draft

HSNG	New policy for utility infrastructure: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• New and improved utility infrastructure will be encouraged and supported in order to meet the identified needs of the community• New residential and commercial infrastructure will be permitted only if sufficient infrastructure capacity is either available or can be provided in time to serve it.	Noted	Refer to SDNPA
------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------	----------------

Review & analysis of responses to pre-submission draft

	Watermen & Lightermen Charitable Trust		
HSNG	Repeated request for trust owned land at Cottage Homes to be re-assessed and included for housing	Noted	No change of circumstances: land lies well outside settlement boundary, so request declined
	Ditchling Society		
HSNG	Review Nye Lane development	Agree	SDNPA has directed to remove
	Beacon Road glass houses: if not for development, what is to be done with it	Noted	Refer to SDNPA
	Wick Farm wine centre strongly opposed by residents, and hence by society. How can Neighbourhood Plan afford protection?	Noted	Refer to SDNPA
BIZ4	<i>(Support Rural Enterprise Diversification)</i> : wording could be misinterpreted leading to danger of sanctioning a variety of inappropriate uses	Agree	Re-word

Review & analysis of responses to pre-submission draft

	HKD Transition in Hassocks		
HSNG	<p>Advice to developers could included a requirement to:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • meet high energy efficiency standards, including airtightness and insulation measures that exceed the minimum Building Regulations requirements • include measures to generate energy from renewable and low carbon sources such as solar panels, ground source or air source heat pumps • include water efficiency measures such as low-flow taps and toilet • reduce run-off into streams and groundwater through sustainable urban drainage (SUDS) measures like permeable paving for driveways and roads, water butts for downspouts 	Noted	Focus group to assess
TRANS4 & 10	<p><i>(Improve pedestrian environment in High Street):</i> traffic management measures should be designed to reduce the number of vehicles using shared space. Entry to be signed to indicate right of way priority to traffic leaving shared space. In particular, rights of way parking on village centre roads to be switched over to deter lock-up.</p>	Agree	Add to traffic section
TRANS8	<p><i>(Provide for pedestrians, horse riders and cyclists):</i> Hassocks and Keymer should be integrated into cycle network</p>	Agree	Ref WSCC similar point

Review & analysis of responses to pre-submission draft

<p>CONS</p>	<p>Neighbourhood plan should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Specify energy efficiency standards for new housing to minimise carbon emissions • Promote a positive strategy to promote energy from renewable and low carbon sources • Identify suitable areas for renewable and low carbon energy sources & support community-led initiatives for renewable & low carbon energy. • Incorporate water efficiency measures for new developments • Design measures for Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS) to manage surface water runoff from roads and other paved areas • Develop Green infrastructure plans including for footpaths, wildlife corridors and green spaces, and Blue infrastructure plans including for streams and floodplains, ponds and wetlands • 	<p>Agree</p>	<p>Review for inclusion into report</p>
	<p>South Downs Society</p>		
<p>HSNG</p>	<p>Park Barn Farm and Nye Lane are both greenfield sites on the southern edge of the village, outside the village boundary, and easily seen from the downs ridge. This appears contrary to the plan's own objective on page 27, to conserve greenfield sites, key views and vistas.</p>	<p>Noted</p>	
<p>HSNG</p>	<p>Should development be considered for areas to the south of the village every possible measure should be taken to lessen the impact on the village environment</p>	<p>Noted</p>	

Review & analysis of responses to pre-submission draft

	Individual comments		
	This is a summary of the many individual letters and e-mails received from residents.		
HSNG	Oppose housing at Nye Lane (106 objections)	Agree	SDNPA ruling to reject
	Oppose housing at Park Barn Farm (28 objections)	Noted	SDNPA conditional approval (see authority response above)
	Oppose housing in East End Lane (5 objections)	Agree	SDNPA ruling to reject
HSNG	Suggestions for other locations		
	Common Lane/Orchard Lane donkey field 3	Note:	Site to be evaluated
	Lewes Road garage 1	Note:	Planning approval already in place
	Site north of village pond 1	Note:	Site in Article 4 area within sensitive location
	Greenhouses site, Beacon Rd 14 (2 opposing)	Noted	SDNPA ruling to reject: outside settlement boundary & remote from it (& see Hsng focus gp report, p3)
	South View 1	Noted	SDNPA ruling to reject: outside settlement boundary & remote from it
	Perrets 1	Noted	Ditto
	Grimwood Farm 1	Noted	Ditto
	The Potteries 1	Noted	Ditto
TRANS	Oppose Keymer Road car park site (3)	Noted	Parish Council planning application in process
	Oppose share space in High Street (7)	Noted	Re-evaluate
	All other individual objections recorded are from either 1 or 2 objectors (see introduction in response review paper already on web site)		