

Loxwood Neighbourhood Plan

Summary of representations submitted by Chichester District Council to the independent examiner pursuant to paragraph 9 of Schedule 4B to the 1990 Act

Name	Summary of Representation
Mr A Dixon Miss J Julian	More development in the village would make the quaint village heading towards a town. Impact on the facilities which would not be able to cope with this over development project i.e. sewage, shops and post office which is on the brink of closure. It is not a viable project.
Mrs A Holmes	<p>Chapter 5 – support the need for incremental change through limited and controlled growth on allocated sites within the proposed settlement boundary.</p> <p>Chapter 8 – support the view that the oldest part of the original village should be protected from further development.</p> <p>Chapter 17 – endorse the view that road and pedestrian safety needs improving, particularly along the B2133 where speed and constant lorry usage is a major hazard to the village.</p>
Mr & Mrs Ritchie	An enormous amount of hard work has been carried out to produce what is an eminently satisfactory and achievable neighbourhood plan for Loxwood.
Mr & Mrs Spencer	Support the Neighbourhood Plan. It represents my personal preferences for future development of my village and is a pragmatic and sensible approach. It should be approved and adopted as soon as possible.
Mrs A Smith	<p>6.3a & 17.2.3 & 17.5.4 – with the planned influx of new homes more school places will be required. Current school is outdated and overcrowded. Chichester District Council should take advantage of introducing plans to alleviate this shortage of places. The nursery site could be an ideal site for a new school. This could in turn free up land for community development and windfall development.</p> <p>6.9 & 12.10 – with additional 60 new homes and lack of public transport careful consideration needs to be given to car parking – many homes have 2 spaces with children staying at home longer there is a greater need for parking spaces.</p>
A Loader	Support
Mrs B Barrow	Strongly support all aspects of the proposed neighbourhood plan. It is needed to stop the village being open to unplanned development.
B Smith	<p>6.3a – support the Plan, well presented, well thought through but before we start building we must pay attention to the school needs. Beyond that policy 17 is important and could Chichester not only achieve traffic calming but also answer the narrow pavement problem?</p> <p>Support the Plan it answers most of the questions</p>
C Agar	Fully support the Plan and wish to see it implemented as soon as

Name	Summary of Representation
	possible.
C Chapman	<p>Support the plan which retains Loxwood's semi-rural character, with ambitions to secure its future with a mix of age groups housed in appropriate, affordable and sustainable dwellings. If this means new developments, there must be flood risk assessments including storm drain and sewerage capacity.</p> <p>The neighbourhood Plan recognises that the B2133 is a rat run, but fails to address adequately (beyond the mention of 'traffic calming measures') the daily incidence of feral speeding usually by motorbikes. Mix this in with 44 tonne lorries meandering through the village and we have a toxic mix of traffic quite inappropriate to the area, particularly along the northern and southern approaches to the village high street. This is an ideal time to make plans to tackle the problem. Only recently was such a lorry holding up the traffic whilst trying to back into Oakhurst Lane!</p> <p>The relevant part of the B2133 runs from the A272 at Newbridge to the A281 at Alfold Crossways. The signage at the junction with the A272 includes 'Guildford'. Traffic moving north from the coast, Worthing or Shoreham, should be using the A27 or A29, not the B2133. 'Guildford' should be removed from the signage and added to signage at the roundabout west of Billingshurst on the A29 to encourage (heavy) traffic to continue to Guildford north via the A29 and left at the A281. It is recognised that satnavs will override anything, but at least with this suggestion there could be a marginal improvement.</p> <p>When the 40 mph limit was introduced to the north of the village, the scheme failed to take into account Oakhurst Lane and Pigbush Lane. Both lanes are now scarred with de-restriction signs implying the national speed limit in what amount to farm lanes, and disfigured by out-of-scale roundels flagging the 40 mph limit on the B2133. Repeated pleas to WSCC to sort the nonsensical consequence of the new speed restriction out have been met with polite responses but no action.</p> <p>Finally on page 40 para 18.3 Appendix 3 mention is made of the special status of Sheaves Farmhouse. As the original 'historic farmhouse from the 17th century' was summarily demolished (except for the main chimney) and rebuilt about five years ago, without comment or objection from the planners at CDC, we have lost an important building quite unnecessarily. The house is still there but its bricks are in a different order!</p>
C Hoare	Support
C Kershaw	Support
Mrs E Agar	Fully support the Plan and wish to see it implemented as soon as possible.
E Lancaster	Support
Mrs F Gibbons	The steering group have fully consulted the residents of the village on a number of occasions and this draft plan represents their views. It provides for 60 new homes in accordance with the

Name	Summary of Representation
	Chichester District Council Draft Local Plan.
Genesis Town Planning on behalf of Landlinx Estates	<p>Support the proposed allocation in Policy 5 but minor modifications to the site boundary is requested. The site capacity should be expressed as a minimum to introduce more flexibility to the Plan. Phasing should be confirmed for the first 5 years of the Plan period.</p> <p>Policy 8 could be expressed as a preference subject to highway safety.</p> <p>Policy 18 should also be expressed as a preference as meeting the CS14 standard will be subject to overall development viability.</p>
G McGuinness-Smith	Support chapter 17 and all 19 policy paragraphs
Mrs G Seymour	Support the Loxwood Neighbourhood Plan
G Woodage	It appears to be the best alternative for conserving the village while accepting that limited planned and phased development will be necessary, resulting in conservation and improvement over the medium term.
G Moore	Fully support all areas of the Neighbourhood Plan
Mrs H Baker	A lot of local people have spent a lot of time sorting out a plan which is the best vision for our lovely village and it has my full support.
Mrs H McGuinness-Smith	Support chapter 17 and all 19 policy paragraphs
Mr and Mrs Kersey	Support the Neighbourhood Plan except for part of the settlement boundary which as proposed is inconsistent and illogical in respect to land to the west of, and abutting, the B2133 in the centre of the village. This anomaly occurs in the respect of land between Hall Hurst Close to the south and the Nursery Site to the north in that by being drawn as outside the settlement boundary it is classified as rural with restrictions as laid out in para 17.2.2 and therefore subject to Policy 13. This is incorrect as for example, Woolspinners has been developed and occupies as modern housing and as a domestic residential plot since the early 1970s. the positioning of this site outside the Settlement Boundary is even more irrelevant following recent expansion of the Settlement Boundary to include development at Hall Hurst Close from rural land to intensive residential development.
I Barnard	I support the Plan in its entirety I believe it is a realistic approach to the village's future
I Lancaster	Support
I Latimer	<p>I support plan with modifications. I am concerned that the infrastructure including sewers, surface water, roads, parking, traffic, clinic, Schools, etc. will not cope with too many extra houses. I hope that something is done about traffic calming before someone is seriously injured or killed as very few motorists keep to the speed limit including some locals.</p> <p>If and when houses are built on the old nursery site which is called Loxwood House that the houses are built a distance back from the Guildford Road for aesthetic and noise related reasons.</p>
J Dore	Support all aspects of the plan which will ensure a secure future for all inhabitants of Loxwood Parish
Mrs J Spira	Support

Name	Summary of Representation
J Baker	Provides a cohesive plan for the future development and protection of the village
J Butler	Support
J Brown King	Support
Mrs J King	Support
K Nichols	The Loxwood Neighbourhood Plan was professionally put together with full consideration of the village
Mr and Mrs Bacon	Fully support all the policies in section 17 of the document.
L Milsom	This is well thought out plan which when ratified will give a firm basis for planning the development of the village for the next 15 years and beyond. It is important not to let the plan be destroyed by allowing last minute development applications just prior to the referendum.
Mrs L Colling	Fully support the 19 policies of the Loxwood Neighbourhood Plan.
Chichester District Council	<p>The District Council is supportive of the proposals set out in the Loxwood Neighbourhood Plan and is pleased to see the levels of support received for the Plan from Loxwood Residents reflecting the work and public engagement that took place in carrying out the Plan.</p> <p>General Comments: The Loxwood Neighbourhood Plan is a clearly laid out and structured document. It may be worth highlighting further the start of the policies section for ease of use.</p> <p>Specific Comments:</p> <p>Policy 2 - The modifications to the Settlement Policy Boundary set out in Figure 6 relating to the sites at Farm Close and the Nursery are justified through policies 4 and 5 of the Neighbourhood Plan; however the change to the Policy Boundary adjacent to North Hall does not have a corresponding policy. The rationale for this change is justified in the supporting text for policy 2 as windfall development. The CDC policy of windfall developments classifies them as 5 dwellings or less.</p> <p>Policy 4 - Para a: Is there evidence to support the requirement for Bungalows for the elderly? There could potentially be an impact upon site viability from this requirement.</p> <p>Policy 5 - Para a: The mix and needs for affordable housing will change throughout the plan period. Although the specified mix reflects the current District Council housing mix requirement, the Neighbourhood Plan would be better rewording the policy to reflect the fact that that mix will change over the plan period. The following wording could potentially be used: 'The mix of affordable dwellings provided should be in accordance with the current Chichester District Council requirements.'</p> <p>Policy 6 / para 17.6.3 - References to appendix 4 should read figure 7.</p> <p>Policy 7 - This policy is looking to repeat / add to the District</p>

Name	Summary of Representation
	<p>Council's affordable housing allocation policy. As such it is not a land use policy and should be removed. Reference to policy 7 in policy 4 should be removed.</p> <p>Policy 9 - This could potentially include an extra element added to allow for a package treatment works solution (i.e. independent of connecting to the sewerage system).</p> <p>Policy 12 - The first sentence in criterion is unclear. It states that the policy should avoid boats lining the edge of the canal and then goes onto state support will be given to canal moorings. This reads as a contradiction in advice and should be reworded for clarification.</p> <p>Policy 17 - End of first paragraph – developer contributions will be sought by either CIL or S106 so most probably don't need to be separated out. The trigger for greater than one house should be retained.</p> <p>Policy 19 - Second paragraph will be difficult to comply with for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • States any new development – this would relate to all development which is not appropriate – dormer windows, first floor extensions etc. Should be rewritten to refer to development which adds increased footprint, new buildings/dwellings etc. • It refers to development 'outside a flood risk area' – every area is designated even that without risk (e.g. flood risk 1) this should be written to say 'development outside of flood risk zones 2 and 3' if this is what is meant. • In relation to the bullet above this statement is very onerous and goes beyond what we could normally require.
Mrs E Carr	Fully support the 19 policies of the Loxwood Neighbourhood Plan.
M Stevens	Fully support the Plan and contents
M & I Moorhead	Support
A & M Joules	Support
Mr & Mrs King	<p>We would like to support the proposals for the Loxwood Plan however, we do have reservations that the LP will just be a paper exercise and not taken seriously by Chichester District Council. Local people have taken a great deal of time and effort in producing the detailed plan in an effort to make a contribution to meeting housing needs. It is important that these efforts and views are recognised and respected by CDC. There needs to be proper consultation with the community at large with regard to any future developments which fall outside the Parish Boundary but which will have a considerable impact on Loxwood Village and its amenities.</p>
Mr & Mrs Pelling	Fully support the Plan and contents
Mr & Mrs Walker	Fully support the Plan and contents
Mr & Mrs Turner	We fully support the Loxwood Neighbourhood Plan

Name	Summary of Representation
Natural England	<p>We welcome the recognition of the importance of ancient woodland (section 7 and figure 4). The plan should make reference to National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) Para 118 which indicates that "... planning permission should be refused for development resulting in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats, including ancient woodland and the loss of aged or veteran trees found outside ancient woodland, unless the need for, and benefits of, the development in that location clearly outweigh the loss".</p> <p>The themes relating to sustainable development (set out in para 14.2) make very limited reference to the environment and none to the natural environment. The NPPF includes a number of statements which help to define a range of sustainable objectives.</p>
Dr N Jones	<p>Whilst supporting the general outline of the existing neighbourhood plan and accepting the need for further housing within the parish boundary, my wife and I have serious concerns about Policy 9 of the plan.</p> <p>Along with 14 other houses close to Loxwood stream, ours was recently subjected to flooding by a mixture of water from the Loxwood stream and sewerage from an inadequate system of disposal. This is the 4th such flooding in 38 years, the time we have lived in our home, but it is the first where sewerage has been a very significant part of the problem.</p> <p>I have copies of several surveys completed over the years which show that the culvert under Station Road is of inadequate size to cope with the flow of water in the stream during periods of heavy rain. Sewerage leakage has been a problem for many years to the extent that our neighbours have been obliged to weld shut manhole covers on their land to prevent the sewerage backup from lifting the covers and fouling their gardens.</p> <p>Any development of the Nursery site in Loxwood will certainly increase water run off into the Loxwood stream and efforts to mitigate this with a holding system will still put more water into the stream swiftly after a storm and will only do that until the tanks are full.</p> <p>Sewerage is already a very significant problem and additional houses feeding into the system can only make things worse causing distress to householders downstream and with the possibility of adverse effects upon public health.</p> <p>In view of the above considerations I wish to make a strong plea that the capacity of the Loxwood stream culverts and general clearance of the stream to improve flow be undertaken before any development is allowed. I would further strongly support the policy 9 statement to improve sewer provision before building takes place.</p>

Name	Summary of Representation
N Gibbons	It has been a thoroughly efficient and well researched piece of work. Hence my support.
A Holmes	Fully support the Plan particularly 17.3, Policies 9, 17 and 19
Mrs P Breakell	Support the Plan
Ms P Line	Support the Plan
P Cole	<p>I fully support the Neighbourhood Plan, save for one of the options proposed for the "Nursery Site". Loxwood does not need any more retail opportunities! In fact two business properties currently lie vacant in the village at the time of writing this.</p> <p>What the village does need is a proper village green. Somewhere that can be called the heart of the village and build a real community spirit as opposed to Loxwood being just a series of roads and little enclaves. I do not agree that the whole of the site cannot be used. If more of the back of the nursery site needs to be used to realise a village green and 43 new homes then this should be adopted.</p> <p>Other than that the plan is a very well considered document. Written with help from the village and for the village.</p>
P Hughes	Support the Plan
Mr P Hyem	Support the Plan
P Barrow	The Plan should be adopted and approved
Mr and Mrs R d'Aubyn Hirsch	Fully support the Plan
R Newman	<p>Para 1.2 Comment- I rather hope the policies will not replace those in the CDC Plan</p> <p>Para 5.1 Comment - What is the definition of a semi -rural Parish, surely Loxwood is rural.</p> <p>Para 5.2 j Oppose - It is not appropriate to specify fibre optic connectivity; there may be better options in the future.</p> <p>Para 6.2 Comment - The history section should be in the appendix, it is not pertinent to the Plan.</p> <p>Para 8.2 Comment - The term vernacular is most often used to describe language and dialect not buildings. Character is a better word.</p> <p>Para 10.8 Comment - The Wey Arun Trust must also commit to concentrate on keeping towpaths clear.</p> <p>Para 13.9 Support with modifications - Should also commit to providing bungalows for older folk who would like to downsize and stay in the Parish thus releasing their larger houses.</p> <p>Para 16.3 Comment - There should be guidelines for when it is deemed necessary and appropriate to complete Equality Impact assessments.</p>

Name	Summary of Representation
	<p>Policy 1 Support with Modification - Why state a precise number of 60. It would be better to say at least 60 thereby making it possible to help CDC in their quest for more houses to meet their quota.</p> <p>Para 17.2.4 Support with Modification - Should state 6 or less to be consistent.</p> <p>Para 17.4.2 Support -Excellent quoting bungalows.</p> <p>Para 17.4.3 Support with Modification - S106 funding and the size of it is yet to be agreed and so to state will be is incorrect. Also statement re traffic calming cannot be guaranteed.</p> <p>Policy 4 b Comment - Donation of land yet to be agreed.</p> <p>Para 17.5 3 Comment - I am not sure if the Parish Council did hold detailed discussions.</p> <p>Para 17.5.4 Oppose - The lack of funding for growing the size and modernisation of the school is not acceptable given the desire for more houses and therefore more children in the Parish. It is full and the buildings are past there sell by date.</p> <p>Para 17 5.5 and Policy 5 a Support with Modification -Why limit this site to 43 dwellings, surely better to fit the number in the site that would be most beneficial. Don't want multiple phases of building on the same site. Do not need the 2.3 hectares excluded. More houses would help the CDC quota.</p> <p>Para 17.5.7 Comment -We should be encouraging some self-build where appropriate which can in turn contribute work to the local businesses.</p> <p>Para 17.5.8 Comment- Is this really appropriate for S106 contribution.</p> <p>Para 17.6.3 Support with Modifications - Extension of the playground is subject to grants being available.</p> <p>Para 17.6.3 d Comment - Land has not yet been donated, subject to agreement of funding. Maintenance funding not yet agreed.</p> <p>Para Policy 9 Comment - Surely Southern Water through their strategic planning are responsible for providing the infrastructure for future housing in conjunction with the Councils concerned.</p> <p>Para Policy 11 a Oppose - Too restrictive, depends on the site.</p> <p>Para Policy 11 e Oppose - Why, dormer windows can provide valuable extra space and are common in the Parish.</p>

Name	Summary of Representation
	<p>Para Policy 13 e Oppose - So barn conversion are not allowed, surely not.</p> <p>Para Policy 14 b Oppose - Size of extension/rebuild should be dependent on the size of the plot.</p> <p>Para Policy 14 c Oppose - Para not needed, down to CDC guidelines at the time.</p> <p>Para Policy 16 Oppose - Second guessing the future direction of Telecommunications should not be the business of this Plan.</p> <p>General Comment -The plan could be stated more simply and with less jargon.</p>
Mrs R Barnard	Fully support the Plan – it is a realistic approach to the villages future
S Bates	<p>I fully support both the need to have a neighbourhood plan and the plan itself. Furthermore, I wish to take this opportunity to thank the people who have worked so hard to assemble this plan for our community. I feel the plan is especially necessary due to our distance from Chichester and the fact that there is a designated National Park in between the Parish of Loxwood and out seat of governance.</p> <p>I fully support and endorse the policies set out in section 17 with particular attention paid to the points below: Broadly, the current infrastructure works OK, but we are at capacity for many important services, particularly sewerage and drainage (as the recent flood showed), so any new housing developments will need to be planned very carefully with these in mind (17 policy 9). Additionally, I am not opposed to affordable housing, but feel that we must exercise caution in the building of an excess of these as Loxwood cannot sustain employment or transport for people on lower incomes. (see 6.1g & 12 & 17.15)</p> <p>Recent developments have not been sympathetic to the local style and have suited the needs of a developer to make a quick buck rather than the desires of the village community. 17 Policy 10 is vital to retain the character of the village.</p> <p>Additionally, the preservation of ancient woodland (See section 7) is vital to the retention of the character of the village.</p>
S Holmes	<p>Strongly support paras 17.3 reflecting full site assessment on respect of future building sites and conclusion</p> <p>Support Policy 9 when considering heavy rainfall this winter. Support Policy 17 reflecting heavy, fast traffic using B2133 and Station Road</p>
Mrs S Hyem	Fully support the Plan. It addresses the need for housing development whilst retaining the character of the area.
T Russell	Object to the proposed development to the land south of Loxwood Farm Place.

Name	Summary of Representation
T Colling	Fully support all of the 19 policies in the Loxwood Neighbourhood Plan
West Sussex County Council	<p>Given that the Submission Neighbourhood Plan for Loxwood includes the proposed allocation of small scale housing sites, it should be noted that this will be subject to the resolution of any highway safety and access issues at the planning application stage or as part of a consultation on a Community Right to Build Order. The County Council provided general Development Management guidance in response to the Pre-Submission consultation.</p> <p>Policy 17 identifies infrastructure investment priorities as potential for receiving contributions from the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). It should be noted that no mechanism currently exists for prioritising infrastructure needs across different public services and allocating funds to priority projects. The County Council is working with Chichester District Council and other Local Planning Authorities to develop a robust mechanism and establish appropriate governance arrangements to oversee the prioritisation of infrastructure across different services. This will be important to secure delivery of priority projects and the County Council would welcome the Council's support for establishing appropriate decision-making arrangements.</p>
Mrs Y Holmes	<p>Fully support the objectives put forward to define the Plan policies. Support strongly the intention of seeking to protect the heritage established over a period of 400 years, in particular those located within the village itself.</p> <p>Support the concern that all future developments of housing within the parish should take account of the transport needs particularly as the majority of working people in the parish must travel outside the parish to work. This links closely chapters 12 & 17 with concerns stated in Policy 17.</p> <p>Support the Plan which seeks to aspire to or meet those statements listed in para 14.2</p> <p>Strongly agree with the determination to ensure the preservation of indigenous wildlife and the conservation of their habitats – chapter 15</p> <p>Strongly support the 60 houses for Loxwood Parish are built in the areas the Plan allocated in sites that have been very thoroughly researched by this plan on land within the proposed settlement boundary not in land that is deemed rural</p>