

Appendix 1 – Statement of Consultation – May 2016

Organisation / Name of respondent	Summary of Comments	Proposed Action / Response
Southern Water	Confirm that Southern Water have no comments to make at this time.	Noted. No Action required
Environment Agency	Thank you for providing us with the opportunity to comment on the draft Nuthurst Parish Design Statement. The only comment that we wish to make is that we support the use of Sustainable Urban Drainage systems (Guidance 3 (j) page 31).	Noted. No action required
Natural England	<p>Natural England welcome this opportunity to give our views, the topic this Supplementary Planning Document covers is unlikely to have major effects on the natural environment. No specific comments on the document are recommended, but suggest that the following issues are considered:</p> <p>Green Infrastructure This SPD could consider making provision for Green Infrastructure (GI) within development. This should be in line with any GI strategy covering your area. A number of mechanisms to achieve this were suggested, including aspects such as new tree planting or altering the management of land to enhance biodiversity.</p> <p>Biodiversity enhancement This SPD could consider incorporating features which are beneficial to wildlife within development, in line with paragraph 118 of the National Planning Policy Framework, which for example advises the provision of features such as nest boxes in residential units.</p> <p>Landscape enhancement The SPD may provide opportunities to enhance the character and</p>	<p>Having given consideration to these comments it is not considered that any specific amendments to the SPD are required. Aspects of the SPD will contribute to the provision of green infrastructure, and in particular section three which makes specific provision for verges, ponds, ditches and fields. Maintenance of these features will also help enhance biodiversity. This document will however be used in relation to planning matters, and does not have any control over land management issues.</p> <p>Other suggestions made in this response are addressed in the HDPF which has specific landscape policies and makes reference to the need to consider landscape character assessment documents which have been produced by the Council.</p> <p>With regard to lighting, the SPD indicates that developments should not automatically have street lighting – it should only be considered when needed on safety/security grounds</p>

Organisation / Name of respondent	Summary of Comments	Proposed Action / Response
	<p>local distinctiveness of the surrounding natural and built environment; use natural resources more sustainably; and bring benefits for the local community, for example through green infrastructure provision and access to and contact with nature. Landscape characterisation and townscape assessments, and associated sensitivity and capacity assessments provide tools for planners and developers to consider how new development might make a positive contribution to the character and functions of the landscape through sensitive siting and good design and avoid unacceptable impacts.</p> <p>Other design considerations The NPPF includes a number of design principles which could be considered, including the impacts of lighting on landscape and biodiversity (para 125).</p> <p>Strategic Environmental Assessment/Habitats Regulations Assessment A SPD requires a Strategic Environmental Assessment only in exceptional circumstances as set out in the Planning Practice Guidance here. While SPDs are unlikely to give rise to likely significant effects on European Sites, they should be considered as a plan under the Habitats Regulations in the same way as any other plan or project. If your SPD requires a Strategic Environmental Assessment or Habitats Regulation Assessment, you are required to consult us at certain stages as set out in the Planning Practice Guidance.</p> <p>Should the plan be amended in a way which significantly affects its impact on the natural environment, then, please consult Natural England again.</p>	<p>Given that the document either addresses the points suggested by Natural England, or that issues are covered elsewhere (eg in the HDPF, it was considered that no change to the SPD is required)</p> <p>Comments in relation to the SEA are noted – it is noted that the response recognises that significant adverse impacts on the environment are unlikely. This supports the Council’s screening opinion that an SEA for this document is not required.</p>

Organisation / Name of respondent	Summary of Comments	Proposed Action / Response
Highways England	Thank you for inviting Highways England to comment on the Nuthurst Parish Design Statement. We do not have any comments on the Nuthurst Parish Design Statement.	Noted. No Action required
Southwater Parish Council	Advise that Southwater Parish Council have no comments.	Noted. No Action required
Mr Chris Beer	1b .Questions the reference to HDC guidance on open and play space as development which takes place in the Parish	1b) Reference to open and play space was suggested to the Parish by Horsham District Council as this is a useful consideration for developers when designing schemes of any scale. It is not considered that this reference should be removed.
	2(b) This could be expanded to provide more guidance by adding “Consideration should be given to using locally sourced multi-coloured stock bricks , clay tiles, Horsham stone and sandstone”	2 b) Clay tiles, Horsham Stone and sandstone are mentioned in the text in 2.1
	2c) Considers this section is too demanding and expensive for the builder and should be removed	2 c) The wording used is “encouraged” is used, not “must”. This document is to provide advice and guidance for developers and stakeholders but does not set planning policy. No change is therefore required.
	2e) As tile hung upper wall elevations in single colour orange (from Kemer) or brown small flat clay tiles are attractive and can be found all around Sussex and Surrey , the reference to two tile colours needs to be removed . May be worth adding that shaped lead flashing under windows is preferred to straight 2(i) As with 2(e) above , the use of two colours should be removed for roof tiles as they can be very unsightly	2 e) The wording used is “ideally” is used, not “must – again for the developer to decide. This document is to provide advice and guidance for developers and stakeholders but does not set planning policy. In addition, it is not considered appropriate to remove reference to two colours as this is a matter of personal preference. Not change is therefore required. It is considered that the lead flashing is too detailed a point for inclusion in this guidance document.

Organisation / Name of respondent	Summary of Comments	Proposed Action / Response
	2h) minimum roof pitch of 45 degrees can lead to a very top heavy structure and an expensive build , especially if small flat clay tiles are used, As previously mentioned to NPC, a figure of 35 degrees may be more sensible	The wording used is “preferably” is used, not “must” – This document is to provide advice and guidance for developers and stakeholders but does not set planning policy. No change required.
	2(j) This should be expanded to cover the use of bonnet style tiles for sloping ridges rather than half pipes , which are usually used on the horizontal ridges	This is considered to be a very detailed point, and a range of styles may be appropriate. The document would not meet SPD guidance if it were viewed as overly restrictive. No change required.
	2(v) This should be modified to say that the colour of the solar tiles should MATCH and NOT be of a different colour to the roof	It is unlikely that solar panels can be an exact match. The text therefore refers to solar panels “merging in” with roof tiles. No change required
	3(b) This should be expanded to say that boundary hedges should be planted sufficiently far from the boundary to prevent the hedge from ever trespassing on the adjacent highway . (This will help avoid what we have along Church Road)	The Parish Council has a system for dealing with overgrown hedges and this is not considered a necessary approach.
	3(U) This section seems superfluous and should be removed as all the sites in the current NNP are for under 10 homes. It may apply to the only remaining medium sized infill site of Saddlers when it is developed .	Some sites in the NP could have 10 or more homes and was suggested to the Parish by Horsham District Council as this is a useful consideration for developers when designing schemes of any scale. It is not considered that this reference should be removed.

Organisation / Name of respondent	Summary of Comments	Proposed Action / Response
Mr Chris Beer	<p>Final Comment- What's missing from the Guidance</p> <p>It is very disappointing that NPC have not used this opportunity to add a section on Heritage assets that asks readers to reference their list of Heritage assets (designated and un designated) that are within the Parish</p> <p>Several Residents asked for this when the NNP was being formed , but to date nothing seems to have been done</p> <p>Such a list would have prevented the damage that NPC could have caused when it passed the original application for 10 homes on the land opposite the Dun Horse , without taking into consideration the adjacent 'listed' building of Chumleigh or indeed the recommendations 1(a) and 1(b) of its own recently drafted Parish Design statement !</p>	<p>Heritage assets are listed in the "made" Nuthurst Neighbourhood Plan – no need to list them again in the SPD</p> <p>NPC does not "pass" applications, it merely comments on them for HDC to determine. The application mentioned has been superseded by an amended application for 8 houses. Planning applications are public documents and comments can be submitted to HDC at the appropriate time. These will be taken into account when determining the application.</p>

Other consultees which responses were not received from include:

- West Sussex County Council
- Mid Sussex District Council
- Crawley Borough Council
- Chichester District Council
- Arun District Council
- Adur & Worthing
- South Downs National Park Authority
- Network Rail
- National Health Service
- Historic England
- Mobile Operators Association
- Marine Management Organisation

- Surrey Council Council
- Brighton & Hove City Council
- Mole Valley District Council
- Waverley Borough Council
- Sports England
- Colgate Parish Council
- Forest Neighbourhood Council
- Lower Beeding Parish Council
- Cowfold Parish Council
- West Grinstead Parish Council
- Shipley Parish Council