

# Comments received on the East Meon Neighbourhood Development Plan

## Introduction

This document contains a summary of all comments received on the East Meon Neighbourhood Plan. The comments are categorised by:

- Statutory Bodies
- Developers
- Residents

The summary comments have been recorded in table form together with the response to the comments by the East Meon Neighbourhood Development Plan Group (EMNDPG). Comments that clearly identify the author in residents' comments have been redacted to remove the identity of the author (indicated by "*Identity redacted*" in the text).

Abbreviations used in this document have the same meaning as in the Neighbourhood Development Plan main document. EMNDP retains the full original forms of all comments received including the identity of the senders which will be made available to the 'Examiner'

## Contents

|   |    |
|---|----|
| Introduction .....                                      | 2  |
| Comments from Statutory Bodies .....                    | 3  |
| South Downs National Park Authority .....               | 3  |
| Hampshire County Council.....                           | 14 |
| Southern Water .....                                    | 16 |
| Council for the Protection of Rural England (CPRE)..... | 19 |
| Environment Agency.....                                 | 20 |
| Highways England .....                                  | 21 |
| Comments from Developers.....                           | 22 |
| Comments from Residents .....                           | 31 |

## Comments from Statutory Bodies

### South Downs National Park Authority

| Reference | Comment  | SDNPA recommendation   | EMNDPSG Response   |
|-----------|--|--|--------------------|
|           | Throughout the EMNP there is reference to the emerging South Downs National Park Local Plan, the correct name for this plan is South Downs Local Plan (SDLP), the words National Park should be removed  | Amend all references to the South Downs National Park Local Plan by removing National Park. The reference to National Park should also be removed from the acronym of South Downs National Park Local Plan, SDNPLP | Amend as suggested |
|           | Throughout the EMNP there are several references to South Downs Local Plan policy numbers. If the EMNP refers to SDLP policy numbers it should refer to the South Downs Local Plan: Preferred Options, as policy numbers may change in future versions of the plan.  | Where there are references to the SDLP policy numbers please ensure that the reference is to the South Downs Local Plan: Preferred Options   | Amend as suggested |
|           | The link to the East Meon Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan is incorrect as it currently links to a consultation version, the correct link is <a href="https://www.southdowns.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2015/04/East-Meon-CAAMP.pdf">https://www.southdowns.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2015/04/East-Meon-CAAMP.pdf</a> The correct title for the document (East Meon Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan) should also be used   | Correct link to be included in Neighbourhood Plan evidence base. Minor amendment to the title of the document.   | Amend as suggested |
|           | SDNPA can confirm that there are no safeguarded minerals or waste facilities within the Neighbourhood plan area. However, the plan should still be in general conformity with the adopted Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan 2013, which is part of the development plan for the area. A reference to this effect should be added to paragraph 1.3 of the Pre Submission Plan. Reference to this part of the development plan should also be included in the basic conditions statement which will be submitted | Minor amendment to ensure the EMNP identifies all relevant parts of the development plan with which it should be in general conformity   | Amend as suggested |

|  |                  |   |   |                    |
|--|------------------|---|---|--------------------|
|  |                  | with the submission version of the Neighbourhood Plan   |   |                    |
|  |                  | <p>1.17 The planning policy context paragraph states that the Local Planning Authority for East Meon is East Hampshire District Council, through the saved policies of the EHDC Local Plan 2006. This statement is incorrect. The South Downs National Park Authority are the Planning Authority for East Meon. The relevant planning documents for the determination of planning applications are; The National Planning Policy Framework; The East Hampshire Joint Core Strategy; The saved policies of the EHDC Local Plan 2006 and the emerging South Downs Local Plan</p> <p>Minor amendment</p> <p>1.17</p> <p>The current paragraph suggest that the East Meon Neighbourhood Plan will be adopted at a similar time to the SDLP. However, recent changes to the timetable for the SDLP indicate an adoption of the SDLP in 2018, which may not align with the 'making' of the EMNP. The point being made in the final two sentences of paragraph 1.17 is correct but the sentences may need to be revised given the change to timetable for SDLP</p> | Minor amendment to reflect changes to the SDLP timetable  | Amend as suggested |
|  | 2 Parish Profile | The EMNP group should be commended for the detailed description of landscape character area which East Meon falls within, and the reference to the South Downs Integrated Landscape Assessment. However, the SDNPA would also recommend that the EMNP makes specific reference to the SDLP Broad Spatial Diagram (page 41 of the SDLP) and in particular to the broad spatial area which East Meon is located (The Dip Slope).  | Additional text to reference the SDLP Broad Spatial Diagram, and in particular the Dip Slope and draft Policy SD4 | Amend as suggested |

|  |      |   |  |   |
|--|------|---|--|---|
|  | 3.5  | The neighbourhood plan objective relating to Natural Landscape makes reference to the importance of watercourses, it would be helpful if the specific water courses were referenced and shown on a map to ensure there is no confusion  | Make specific reference to the important water courses referred to in the natural landscape objective                | Amend as suggested  |
|  | 3.5  | In the objective to retain and enhance the villages existing services and facilities there is reference to the Green Spaces valued by the local community at the end of the first sentence. Capital letters are not required.   | Amend text as follows....Green Spaces  | Amend as suggested  |
|  | 4.3  | Reference should be made to the National Park's Purposes and Duty   | Include reference to the 'Duty' as well as the two purposes of the South Downs National Park Authority               | Amend as suggested  |
|  | 4.6  | To properly reflect the status of the South Downs Local Plan, the term preferred options should be included   | Minor amendment as follows.... Core Policy SD1 of the South Downs Local Plan Preferred Option                        | Amend as suggested  |
|  | EM1  | The policy currently refers to Policy SD23 of the SDNPA Local Plan, text should be amended as proposed in recommendation  | .....on the sites defined as A3, B2, B3/4 and B9 to meet the draft housing policy SD23 of the SDNPALP                | Amend as suggested  |
|  | EM1  | The table describing the site allocations for housing development should include a total to demonstrate that the EMNP meets the housing requirement set by the draft SDLP   | Minor amendment  | Amend as suggested  |
|  | 4.11 | This sentence is not required. Neighbourhood Planning regulations allow communities to allocate sites for development through the Neighbourhood Planning Regulations, specific reference to SDNPA allowing sites of 6 is not necessary.   | Delete para 4.11   | Amend as suggested  |
|  | EM2  | The title of this policy requires attention as the policy refers to development both in and outside the settlement policy boundary  | Amend policy title to read 'Settlement Policy Boundary'  | Amend as suggested  |
|  |      | The Policy should clearly state that development outside the Settlement Policy Boundary will NOT normally be permitted. The policy could be more explicit about development outside the settlement policy boundary, in open countryside. The group should consider whether specific reference is made to the circumstances when development is appropriate. | Minor amendment to make clear that development outside the Settlement Policy Boundary will not normally be permitted | Amend as follows:<br>Development outside the Settlement Boundary will not be permitted apart from on the proposed sites allocated in this Plan or in exceptional circumstances in accordance with |

|  |                    |   |   |  |
|--|--------------------|---|---|--|
|  |                    |   |   | policy SD22 of the SDNPA Local Plan.   |
|  | EM3                | Reference to 'the overall mix of unit sizes in East Meon will be measured by the Annual Monitoring report' should be removed as the Authority Monitoring report will not monitor overall unit sizes for individual parishes   | Remove reference to the Annual Monitoring report monitoring unit sizes in East Meon | Amend as suggested   |
|  | Affordable Housing | Consider a footnote with thresholds   | Consider a footnote with thresholds   | Agreed - in addition reference NPPG advice which is fluid -see comment below covered by alteration suggested by 4.18 |
|  | 4.18               | Make specific reference to the National Planning Policy Framework and National Planning Practice Guidance in supporting text for affordable housing. Proposed text as follows....In order to comply with the national and local policy affordable housing will be provided on all development sites that meet the requirements set out in the National Planning Policy Framework and National Planning Practice Guidance and be consistent with affordable housing policy in the East Hampshire Joint Core Strategy and emerging South Downs Local Plan | Amend text  | Amend as suggested   |
|  | 4.2                | The EMNP group should be commended for their attempt to direct some market housing to meet the needs of local people. The EMNP group could consider including the following text in the supporting text at 4.20... 'The Parish Council will seek to liaise with possible developers for the sites to promote this idea'   | Amend text  | Amend as suggested   |
|  | 4.23               | Include reference to townscape and village character in the supporting text for policy EM5 at paragraph 4.23, as follows....Policy EM5 therefore requires that the Landscape impact (including townscape) of all new development is carefully assessed and mandates that development must contribute positively to the villages setting and character within the National Park, protecting the important views  | Amend text  | Amend as suggested   |

|  |      |   |   |   |
|--|------|---|---|---|
|  | 4.24 | The SDNPA understands that the EMNP group were keen to identify important views to be protected within the EMNP but have resisted this approach to avoid suggesting some views are more important than others. However, SDNPA would draw the group's attention to the SDNPA Viewshed study and the East Meon Settlement Context Study, both of which identify important views in and around East Meon. Specific reference to these two documents, and the views identified through public consultation should be included in the supporting text, or with specific reference in policy EM5. Please note that the settlement context study will not be published until autumn 2016 | Include specific reference to the SDNPA Viewshed study and Settlement context study in supporting text for Policy EM5 | This can only be referenced if the plan is published after the SDNPA Viewshed study. Note other NDP have had local views supported through examination. Could caveat that all views are important given National Park but those identified by locals clearly have local significance. |
|  | EM5  | Add the word assessing to the end of the final sentence in Policy EM5 introduction text, as follows.... 'Except where views are entirely localised, all development proposals must be accompanied by a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment and must demonstrate low or negligible impact on landscape views, in particular assessing:  | Amend text  | Amend as suggested  |

|  |     |   |   |   |
|--|-----|---|---|---|
|  | EM6 | <p>Policy EM6 is titled Layout and Form but it does not appear to deal with matters relating to layout and form. The current policy focuses on individual buildings and aspects of them. Consideration should be given to other matters relating to layout and form, including: distance from neighbouring properties, position on plot (which should be consistent with surrounding character), chimneys etc. Whilst the current policy deals with some matters of form and layout there appears to be no reference to the public realm or the spaces created between buildings.</p> | <p>Consider additional points to be included in EM6: Layout and Form.</p> | <p>Amend as follows:<br/> Policy EM6: Layout and Form All new buildings will be located in the established settlement pattern of the grid or within clusters. All new buildings must conform to the following design parameters for form: · New buildings shall not exceed two storeys, with a pitched roof of between 37 and 45 degrees. · Accommodation in the roof of new buildings will only be permissible when it does not involve a dormer or mansard roof form to create the accommodation. Windows in gables are preferred and only small dormers that provide light, not floor space, will be permitted. Chimneys should be included on dwellings where they reflect the character of the street scene · The scale of any new building must take into account the scale of the existing buildings in the immediate area. The layout of the building should follow established building lines. Separation distances between buildings should reflect the street scene and should be similar to neighbours.</p> |
|  | Em9 | <p>Remove the word refer from the final sentence of Policy EM9 as follows.... Applications which refer or reflect the Pattern Book will be supported.</p>   | <p>Amend text</p>   | <p>Amend as suggested</p>   |



|  |      |  |   |   |
|--|------|--|---|---|
|  | EM10 | The final four sentences of Policy EM10 are not necessary. It would be adequate for the policy to read as follows...<br>The Local Green Spaces shown on the 'Map of Local Green Spaces' (figure 3 below) and in the table below will be protected for the benefit of the community. These have been found to be demonstrably special to the community through consultation. These Local Green Spaces will be protected in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework.  | Amend text  | The wording makes it clear what is appropriate no need to alter text  |
|  | EM10 | Policy EM10 sets out the proposals for Local Green Space designations in East Meon. The SDNPA supports the Parish in the identification and designation of important Local Green Spaces to ensure their protection in the long term. However, experience from previous Neighbourhood Planning examinations has highlighted the importance of providing comprehensive justification for Local Green Space designations. Currently the table set out in support of Policy EM10 is likely to be inadequate for the purposes of designating Local Green Spaces. The EMNP group should refer to the specific requirements as set out in Paragraph 77 of the National Planning Policy Framework and provide justification against each criteria for each of the sites. | Provide further justification to support the designation of Local Green Spaces in Policy EM10 | Can the evidence be bolstered?<br>There is strong consultation evidence that supports these sites.  |
|  | EM11 | Policy EM11, part C refers to development being permitted if it is for an alternative community facility, which could include affordable housing. Whilst the SDNPA commend the community for encouraging the delivery of affordable housing the Authority is highlighting this point to ensure the Parish Council and wider community are content with community facilities being replaced by Affordable Housing. It is worth noting that some affordable housing models may not remain affordable housing in perpetuity, so consideration should be given to whether replacement with affordable housing is appropriate.  | Consider whether affordable housing is an appropriate alternative to community facilities.    | AH is better than private open market if all other alternatives have been exhausted. Given the issue with affordability this seems appropriate. |

|  |      |   |   |   |
|--|------|---|---|---|
|  | 4.37 | Reference should be made in the supporting text to the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan 2013, specifically reference should be made to Policy 31 'Liquid waste and waste water management' to ensure that developers are aware of the relevant criteria for expansion of sewerage systems  | Minor amendment   | Amend as suggested  |
|  | 4.43 | Paragraph 4.43 sets out the landscape analysis which has been used to inform the site selection process. However, the SDNPA would recommend that additional text is included in the introduction to the site specific policies which requires development to protect and enhance the intrinsic character of the village and its setting, as set out in the studies which are named in this paragraph. It would also be helpful to make specific reference to the South Downs Integrated Landscape Character Assessment here. This is important so that development is not just screened to mask any problems. Character is a key issue whether you can see it or not. Development has many other influences on character through movement, human activity, noise, vehicular traffic, highway engineering, loss of local features etc.             | Additional text to reinforce the importance of protecting and enhancing the intrinsic character of the village and its setting in the South Downs National Park. Including specific reference to studies which have identified the importance of landscape character locally. | Not convinced this is required- just a repeat of SDNPA Plan. The studies are part of the evidence base no need to repeat here. The NDP needs its local dimension to remain an NDP not just a copy of SDNPA Local Plan   |
|  | EM14 | Bullet point 8 requires permitted development rights to be removed to ensure that dwellings remain appropriate to their location. This approach is generally supported by SDNPA. There is, however, potential that Classes other than those quoted (which include matters such as porches, hard surfaces, chimneys, fencing, antenna) may adversely impact on the character of an area and that some of the Classes quoted may not be specifically relevant to every case. The removal of permitted development rights by way of planning condition needs careful consideration in order to ensure that the condition meets the tests set out in national guidance. The clause could state: "During the planning application process, consideration will be given to the removal of relevant permitted development rights as contained within the | Consider rewording the policy clause relating to permitted development rights.  | The removal of permitted development (PD) rights is to prevent the impact from the main changes normally allowable that would destroy the policy intention of each site and the deliberate careful planned solutions for the allocations, the policy needs force. Other minor PD rights to not go to the heart of the intention of the planned allocations. No change required. |

|      |  |  |   |   |
|------|--|--|---|---|
|      |  | Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015, as amended to ensure that development is appropriate to the site and character of the locality.”   |   |   |
| EM15 |  | Bullet point one to be reworded as follows....Development will accord with the indicative layout shown above in a cluster formation. It is suggested that the clause should allow for some flexibility in the layout to allow for landscape and design issues which may be identified in more detailed analysis of the site.         | Minor amendment   | Amend as suggested  |
|      |  | Bullet point 7 requires the developer of site B2 to alleviate current drainage problems in Coombe road adjacent to the site. This is not appropriate, the policy could require the development to not exacerbate the drainage situation in adjacent sites but the policy cannot require this development to resolve existing issues. | Consider rewording the policy clause requiring the developer to alleviate existing drainage problems. | Disagree with SDNPA rationale. It is appropriate for development to deal with existing problems in the environment through development solutions where the opportunity arises. There is limited scope to deal with it otherwise. The development would not be acceptable without it. Highlighted by many locals as an issue through consultation. No change required. |
| EM15 |  | Bullet Point 8 to be amended as follows....A bespoke landscape and visual impact assessment appraisal will be required...  | Minor amendment   | Amend as suggested  |

|  |      |   |   |   |
|--|------|---|---|---|
|  |      | The SDNPA is concerned with the explicit use / requirement for screen planting to mitigate visual impact. This approach suggests several things; that the development is in the wrong place, - That poor design and inappropriate development can be made acceptable if you can't see it; and The SDNPA would suggest a preference for structure planning which is consistent with local landscape character. The following amendments to this policy are suggested....A bespoke landscape and visual impact assessment appraisal will be required and should inform the design and layout of the sites proposals and must show how the screen plating will mitigate the wider visual impact incorporate a scheme of structure planting which is consistent with the local landscape character in order to integrate the development appropriately within its landscape setting | Minor amendment and additional text to ensure appropriate planting in new development   | Amend as suggested  |
|  | EM15 | Bullet Point 9 to include the following text.....The Proposal must be accompanied by a desk based Archaeological Investigation with more comprehensive investigation should this be necessary.  | Minor amendment   | Amend as suggested  |
|  | EM16 | Changes as above in line 38, 40 and 42  | Minor amendment   | Amend as suggested  |
|  | EM17 | There is a concern from the SDNPA that this site has the potential (if badly designed) to be a prominent mistake (in planning and design terms) particularly given its elevated position and wooded nature. The SDNPA recommend that further thought is given to green infrastructure planning for this site and how green infrastructure could link with site B2. It is worth noting that green infrastructure is not public open space, it should be a planned network of connected routes, networks and functions. The consideration of green infrastructure on B9 and B2 could propose an additional public right of way or permissive path along the southern side of the village to provide a connection for residents and visitors to access the new developments along the southern edge. This public right of way, if correctly implemented could also provide a       | Recommend that further consideration is given to green infrastructure proposals for site B9 and potential links to green infrastructure on site B2. It would also be a good opportunity to create new footpaths for residents and visitors to connect the southern edge of the settlement to other existing public rights of way. | Approach land owner and seek to extend the green infrastructure around B2 and B9 as suggested by SDNPA. Change policy if the offer is made, and revise plans. |

|  |      |   |  |   |
|--|------|---|--|---|
|  |      | biodiversity corridor, connecting pockets of natural space and public open space on the southern edge of the settlement. This would involve discussion with the landowners but the opportunity exists to provide important biodiversity connections and a new route for residents and visitors to access new developments and other facilities in the village.  |  |   |
|  | EM17 | Changes as above in line 38, 40 and 42  |  | Amend as suggested  |
|  | EM17 | Bullet Point 14 requires further clarification. Currently the policy suggests that land ownership for the whole site is to be transferred to a public body to secure its provision as green infrastructure. Surely a part of the site is to be used for residential development, is the intention of this clause to ensure the remaining land, other than that developed for residential is transferred to a public body to ensure its provision as Green Infrastructure. | Consider rewording of policy clause (bullet point 14)  | Reword as follows:<br>The implementation of the Scheme (the scheme being the supporting green infrastructure works) in full by the development; |
|  |      | Consideration should also be given to the opportunities for Green Infrastructure planning on site B9 and B2. There is a real opportunity for the EMNP to provide a new route to connect the southern edge of the settlement (including the allocated sites) to existing public right of way network and other facilities in the village.  | Consider opportunities to further develop Green Infrastructure proposals for site B2 and site B9 | Discuss with landowner  |

Hampshire County Council

|  | Reference       | Comment   | EMNDPSG Response  |
|--|-----------------|---|---|
|  | Design Policies | <p>Hampshire County Council has a long history of working to increase energy efficiency, reduce carbon emissions, build climate resilience and promote sustainability. Work in this area is encouraged and supported through its Energy Strategy. With reference to the East Meon Neighbourhood Development Plan, the County Council would like to see a consideration of these elements to encourage and support communities to reduce their carbon emissions through adopting energy efficiency and renewables.</p> <p>Although there is a mention of sustainability as a concept within the document, there is no mention of climate change or energy reduction/renewables. We would suggest the inclusion of wording to ensure that paragraphs 93 to 98 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) are addressed. This wording could be added to one of the policies, or be a bespoke policy, in the design section of the Plan (Chapter 4) along the following lines:</p> <p>'New developments and improvements to existing properties will be planned in a way that reduces greenhouse gas emissions and utilises energy efficiency measures. The use of renewable, decentralised and/or low carbon energy generation technology will be encouraged.'</p> | <p>Additional text could be included, however, with new national standards it has no force.</p> |

|  |   |   |   |
|--|---|---|---|
|  | <p>Surface Water Management - Policy EM13</p> | <p>Hampshire County Council is the Lead Local Flood Authority for East Meon Parish and is responsible for the management of surface water flood risk as set out in the Flood &amp; Water Management Act 2010 (FWMA). Both the FWMA and the NPPF emphasise the importance of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) as a way of managing surface water flood risk. The Neighbourhood Plan refers to the requirement to provide SuDS in a number of the site specific allocation policies, but not all. There is no mention of SuDS in the overarching surface water management Policy (EM13).</p> <p>Policy EM2 of the Plan makes provision for land within the settlement boundary to be developed provided it accords with other policies of the Plan, the NPPF etc. On that basis, small scale development may come forward in the parish in addition to those sites currently allocated. It would be helpful, therefore, if the requirement to consider the provision of SuDS was referred to in the overarching surface water management policy (EM13) rather than just the site specific allocation policies. Policy EM13 could helpfully be amended as follows:</p> <p>'Any planning permission for new development will be subject to a condition requiring that full details of the proposed surface water drainage scheme has been submitted (including details of its route, design and specification, how consideration has been given to the use of SuDS and details of its management and maintenance) and have been approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority'</p> | <p>Agreed additional text helpful. Include.</p> |
|--|---|---|---|

## Southern Water

| 3  | Southern Water | Comment   | EMNDPSG Response |
|----|----------------|---|------------------|
| 3a | Policy EM2     | <p>Southern Water understands East Meon Parish Council's intention to protect countryside outside the built up area. However, we cannot support the current wording of policy EM2.</p> <p>This is because it could create barriers to statutory utility providers, such as Southern Water, delivering essential infrastructure required to serve existing and planned development allocated in the District Plan or the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) identifies that there are very special circumstances' in which development would be permitted in such locations. Paragraph 76 of the NPPF sets out that neighbourhood plans can identify green areas of particular importance with the intention of ruling out new development other than in very special circumstances'.</p> <p>Paragraph 88 of the NPPF explains that special circumstances exist if the potential harm of a development proposal is clearly outweighed by other considerations.</p> <p>Southern Water considers that should the need arise, special circumstances exist in relation to the provision of essential wastewater or sewerage infrastructure (e.g a new pumping station) required to serve new and existing customers. This is because there are limited options available with regard to location, as the infrastructure would need to connect into existing networks. The draft National Planning Practice Guidance recognises this scenario and states that 'it will be important to recognise that water and wastewater infrastructure sometimes has needs particular to the location (and often consists of engineering works rather than new buildings) which mean otherwise protected areas may exceptionally have to be considered'.</p> <p>Proposed amendment</p> <p>Accordingly, we propose the following additional text to Policy EM2 (new text underlined):</p> <p>[...] <u>Development of outside the Settlement Boundary will only be permitted on the proposed sites allocated in this Plan or in other exceptional circumstances in accordance with policy SD22 of the SDNPA Local Plan, including essential utility infrastructure, where the benefit outweighs any harm or loss and it can be demonstrated there are no reasonable alternative sites available.</u></p> |                  |



|                  |   |   |   |
|------------------|---|---|---|
| <p><b>3b</b></p> | <p>Policy EM10 - Local Green Spaces</p> | <p>Southern Water understands East Meon Parish Council's desire to protect Local Green Spaces. However, we cannot support the current wording of this policy as it could create a barrier to statutory utility providers, such as Southern Water, delivering essential infrastructure required to serve existing and planned development.</p> <p>Southern Water may in future have to provide additional wastewater infrastructure to serve new and existing customers or meet stricter environmental standards. It is likely that there would be limited options with regard to location, as the infrastructure would need to connect into existing networks. The National Planning Practice Guidance recognises this scenario and states that 'it will be important to recognise that water and wastewater infrastructure sometimes has locational needs (and often consists of engineering works rather than new buildings) which mean otherwise protected areas may exceptionally have to be considered' (our highlight). Therefore, utility infrastructure is considered to constitute the 'very special circumstances' envisaged by paragraph 76 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). This approach has been supported by the Examiner of the Hurstpierpoint and Sayers Common Neighbourhood Plan (p21).</p> <p>Proposed amendment</p> <p>To ensure consistency with the NPPF and other government guidance and to facilitate sustainable development, we propose the following additional wording (underlined) to be included at the end of Policy EM10:</p> <p>[...] <u>Development will be not permitted on Local Green Spaces except in very special circumstances, for example where it is essential to meet specific necessary utility infrastructure needs and no feasible alternative site is available.</u> [...]</p> | <p>Include additional wording but remove the 'for example' which appears to suggest there are a number of exceptions.</p> |
|------------------|---|---|---|

|    |                                    |   |   |
|----|------------------------------------|---|---|
| 3c | Policy EM12: Sewerage and Drainage | <p>Southern Water recognises that flooding events have occurred in the catchment in the past and the catchment may be adversely affected by surface water and/or groundwater inundation. Accordingly, Southern Water supports East Meon Parish Council's desire to limit the risk of flooding by ensuring that new development does not make the existing situation worse. Southern Water agrees that new development should not be permitted unless the required infrastructure is either available or can be provided in time to serve it. As identified in the above policy, the mechanism to achieve this is making a connection at the nearest point of adequate capacity. Paragraph 020 of the National Planning Practice Guidance states that 'when drawing up wastewater treatment proposals for any development, the first presumption is to provide a system of foul drainage discharging into a public sewer to be treated at a public sewage treatment works' and that where this is not feasible, a 'package sewage treatment works' could be installed. Such works however 'require a source of power as well as regular maintenance. They also accumulate solid matter (sludge) that is settled out from the sewage, and require de-sludging.' We feel that it should be made clearer within the policy that option a) should be the required course of action, unless it can be demonstrated that this is not feasible.</p> <p>Proposed amendment</p> <p>For the sake of clarity, we propose the following amendments to Paragraph 4.38:</p> <p>East Meon has a combined surface water and foul sewerage system which in the past and in recent extreme weather events in 2014, 2015 and 2016 demonstrates is not able to cope experienced inundation of surface water and/or groundwater.</p> <p>To ensure consistency with government guidance and to facilitate sustainable development, we propose the following additional wording (underlined) to be included at the end of Policy EM12:</p> <p>Where capacity is insufficient in the local combined drainage and sewerage system, the development will need to either a) provide improvements to the sewer infrastructure to enable a connection to the nearest point of adequate capacity as advised by Southern Water, or b) Where this is demonstrated to not be feasible (in terms of cost and/or practicality), the development may provide a private site-specific solution to manage drainage and sewerage which meets relevant planning regulations.</p> | Additional wording adds clarity, include. |
|----|------------------------------------|---|---|

|    |   |   |   |
|----|---|---|---|
| 3d | Additional policy supporting the provision of water and wastewater infrastructure | <p>We could find no policies to provide for new or improved infrastructure to support development. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) outlines the importance of achieving sustainable development and paragraph 177 states that it is equally important to ensure that there is a reasonable prospect that planned infrastructure is delivered in a timely fashion. For this reason, infrastructure and development policies should be planned at the same time. Also the National Planning Practice Guidance states that Adequate water and wastewater infrastructure is needed to support sustainable development.</p> <p>Although the Parish Council is not the planning authority to wastewater development proposals, support for essential infrastructure is required at all levels of the planning system.</p> <p>On this basis, we propose the following policy provision:<br/>Proposals for new and improved utility infrastructure will be encouraged and supported in order to meet the identified needs of the community.</p> | Policy not required. The NPPF and NPPG allows for essential infrastructure. |
|----|---|---|---|

### Council for the Protection of Rural England (CPRE)

| Comment   | EMNDPSG Response |
|---|------------------|
| <p>Overall, the plan is good. It seems to have been well thought through, and on the whole is clear and well drafted. It has the strong support of CPRE Hampshire. We particularly like the protection of views, in and out, which are such an important aspect of the village. The views from the high ground towards the church and the village are of the highest quality and iconic of the national park. It is essential these are fully recognised and protected within the Plan</p>  | Noted            |
| <p>The Plan refers to the whole parish, but says little about protection of the countryside outside the built up area of the village, which the plan quite properly focuses on. In common with other NPs it would be good to make it expressly clear that outside the SPB the policies for the countryside in the East Hampshire JCS will apply along with, as a material consideration, the emerging policies in the South Downs National Park Local Plan until such time as the latter is adopted to replace the East Hants JCS. This will include the SDNPA Local Plan policies on landscape, ecosystem services, tranquillity, dark night skies, wildlife etc, as well as policies covering development in the countryside.</p> | Noted            |
| <p>We support the new SPB calculated according to the SDNPA methodology, accepting that it will need to be altered to bring in the allocated sites outside the SPB.</p>   | Noted            |

|   |   |
|---|---|
| We have no issue with the housing site allocations or the Local Green Space allocations.  | Noted   |
| We would prefer the Plan to call for "high quality" design of any development.  | Plan is very specific on design and has Pattern Book to support it. No change required. |
| As to Local Green Space allocations, I would be inclined to leave it to the expression "very special circumstances" (per NPPF), rather than try and cover the circumstances where development will not be allowed.  | Wording is consistent with NPPF. No change required.                                    |
| I find the first sentence of Policy EM5 quite hard going, even as a lawyer. Some redrafting might help. Also, the words "unacceptable loss" can lead to question as to what is "unacceptable ". In fact, "unacceptable loss" is quite permissive and gives quite a lot of scope to developers to argue on appeal. We made the same point in the consultation on the SDNPLP consultation, and I think it has been accepted. CPRE prefers "an adverse impact" or "no harm". The EHDC JCS uses "cause harm". | Agree to change term to "an adverse impact"   |

## Environment Agency

| Environment Agency   | Comment   | EMNDPSG Response   |
|--|---|--|
|  | We are pleased to see that the proposed housing allocations have been directed to the areas at the lowest probability of flooding and that they are all located within Flood Zone 1.  | Noted  |
| Policy EM12<br>Sewerage and Drainage and<br>Policy EM13<br>Surface Water<br>Drainage | The 4 sites allocated for housing fall within a Groundwater Source Protection Zone 3 which is a sensitive groundwater area. The groundwater is a resource for drinking water and provides base flow to its rivers and supports habitats. We need developers to understand and consider the pollution risks associated with their sites and for them to demonstrate that groundwater can and will be protected from pollution. This may mean that additional controls are needed to enable development to proceed. | Add text to all site policies to advise on sensitive groundwater area and the need to demonstrate that the proposals do not give rise to groundwater pollution issues. |

|  | <b>Comment</b>  | <b>EMNDPSG Response</b> |
|--|---|-------------------------|
|  | <p>Ideally, the sites would be connected to the mains foul sewer and we suggest that the feasibility of this is discussed with Southern Water. Generally, we will only agree to developments involving sewage effluent, trade effluent or other contaminated discharges to ground or surface waters if we are satisfied that it is not reasonable to make a connection to the public foul sewer. Full justification would be required as to why the development cannot connect to the sewer. An Environmental Permit may be required for the discharge of treated effluent to ground or surface water. This position will not normally apply to surface water run-off via sustainable drainage systems and discharges from sewage treatment works operated and permitted by sewage undertakings with appropriate treatment and discharge controls. Developers may however be asked to look at alternative methods of surface water management to avoid making discharges into the ground or to re-consider foundation design in order to mitigate risk.</p> | <p>Noted</p>            |

## Comments from Developers

|           | Reference  | Comment  | EMNDPSG Response   |
|-----------|--|--|--|
| <b>1</b>  | <b>Ian Ellis,<br/>Southern<br/>Planning<br/>Ref.Sunley<br/>Homes Ltd</b> |  |  |
| <b>1a</b> | Various  | <p>General comments</p> <p>It is disappointing that the Neighbourhood Plan has not embraced the principle that it can do more for the community and its needs than the Development Plan does. The opportunity to be proactive and meet those needs is lost in the alignment with an early options plan that is very far from being a material planning consideration.</p> <p>East Meon is well placed to serve outlying smaller settlements with housing requirements. The Plan should have considered National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 55 and the principle that there are groups of smaller settlements, development in one village may support services in a village nearby.</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Plan fails to identify how it proposes to address the local demand for affordable housing (20 dwellings across bands 1 - 4 in the Housing Evidence Base report).</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Plan ignores one very important guiding principle in paragraph 3.2 namely Safe access to/from East Meon School. Indeed the silence about traffic and highway safety is deafening by its absence from the Plan bearing in mind the traffic associated with 15 new dwellings will have to go past</p> | <p>The results of the housing needs survey coupled with the constraints of being in a national park has confirmed that 15 units is a realistic number, The EH JCS is the development plan, Policy CP10 states that there will be a minimum of 100 dwellings at other villages in the South Downs National Park. The EH JCS also identified the other villages with settlement policy boundaries as Blackmoor, Binsted, Blendworth, Bucks Horn Oak, Buriton, Chawton, East Meon, East Worldham, Greatham, High Cross, Hill Brow, Liss Forest, Lower Farringdon, Selborne, Sheet, Steep, Stroud, Upper Farringdon, West Liss. If you cross reference those villages identified in the JCS with the housing requirements set out in the South Downs Local Plan you will see that the SD Local Plan allocated 107 dwellings to those villages (so this meets the minimum 100) therefore you could argue that the 15 for East Meon is appropriate because its contribution to the 100 at other dwellings meets the minimum of 100. Traffic generation from 15 dwellings is an insignificant amount of additional traffic on the network. In addition, over time the preference for catchment children at the school will reduce the amount of</p> |

|           |         |  |  |
|-----------|---------|--|--|
|           |         | <p>the school.</p> <p>There is a grave danger that the Neighbourhood Plan might be found unsound.</p> <p>Policies and Proposals chapter<br/>This chapter should start with the adopted plan and saved policies and not an emerging plan that has very little weight and that is some years away from adoption. The SDNPA Chief Executive advises that a Pre-submission consultation will not take place until September 2017 and the Plan might possibly be adopted in 2018. Given the slippage in the programme thus far adoption may well be three years away.</p> <p>The Development Plan is the Joint Core Strategy and saved policies of the Second Review Local Plan. Those are and should be the basis of the Neighbourhood Plan and they will remain so for at least 18 months. The reliance placed on the emerging National Park Local Plan is misplaced given the very significant number of representations it has generated but fundamentally because it does not have a sound approach to meeting the National Parks housing requirement. There are no arrangements in place with adjacent authorities to meet the deficit in the housing requirement. The absence of a sound approach to meeting the National Parks housing requirement rebounds on the Neighbourhood Plan which may find itself non-compliant with the park wide Local Plan in 2 or 3 years time.</p> | <p>incommuting parents and new populations can walk to school. This will occur even if new housing is occupied by downsizers as family homes are freed up.</p>   |
| <b>1b</b> | Various | <p>Spatial strategy<br/>Objective a. The National Park early options plan is not a sound basis on which to allocate development sites<br/>Objective b. In the light of the Secretary of States successful appeal to the Court of Appeal in the West Berkshire case small</p>   | <p>The housing survey has shown that the communities needs are for smaller housing. There is already a significant proportion of AH housing and site A3 will provide 2 units of full mobility standard as indicated in the HNS. The high court case is not</p> |

|  |  |   |
|--|--|---|
|  | <p>sites of less than 5 dwellings will not deliver any affordable housing to meet Objective a.</p> <p>Policy EM1 housing allocations<br/>This policy is flawed as policy SD23 is not a Development Plan policy. The Development Plan policy setting out the housing requirement is JCS policy CP10. By the same token the Neighbourhood Plan ignores the opportunities provided by policy CP14 to make a contribution to affordable housing for villagers.</p> <p>The policy would only provide for up to 6 affordable homes barely denting the affordable housing requirement of 20 homes, By focussing solely on small sites the opportunity afforded by say a larger site to deliver rather more affordable homes is lost.</p> <p>Sites B2 and B9 would have a major impact on the streetscene and character of the village and it is readily apparent that both sites would fail the requirements of policy EM5 as well as policy.</p> <p>Site B6 represented a golden opportunity to provide a phased development site for some 20 dwellings that would have made a major contribution to affordable housing provision and potentially provide a route to take traffic away from the village centre, Chapel Street and Coombe Road as well as reducing traffic past the village school. Site B6 is not in a flood plain and is also free of the flooding and drainage constraints whereas sites B2 and B6 are in areas where there are prevailing problems that will contribute to problems experienced in the centre of the village</p> <p>It is also a matter of great concern that when the SDNPA considered the site as a SHLAA, the authority misinformed itself about the proposal and rejected the site because development was not currently considered to be achievable. This, despite the fact that a sound route for traffic was submitted and the Park authority concluded that the site was acceptable in principle. The</p> | <p>at issue here as the small site preference of the village means the sites come below the threshold for design and assimilation reasons. Following development of 15 units AH still is much higher % than elsewhere in rural Hampshire. Very clear community steer for small sites only. B6 had very low support in community consultations, one of the least popular sites. No evidence to support contention that B6 is sequentially better? Disagree with the approach that allocated sites need to be included in the SPB. The SPB will be altered post development to reflect the built development on the ground and reflect purpose of the plan to control sites. This is especially important where the allocations include open space areas. The plan is sound in this regard. No change required.</p> |
|--|--|---|



|           |                            |  |   |
|-----------|----------------------------|--|---|
|           |                            | <p>site is also far less visually intrusive than sites B2 and B9. Both those sites were rejected by the SDNPA as unsuitable sites with adverse impacts on the character and appearance of the landscape.</p> <p>Site B6 should be included as a site allocation because it is sequentially better than sites B2 and B9 and it would meet the Objectives of the Plan.</p> <p>Development within the settlement policy boundary<br/>Any map produced to explain the changes to the settlement policy boundary should include those sites to be allocated for development. The map on page 18 (and figure 5 on page 33) fail in that regard and the plan is unsound.</p>  |   |
| <b>2</b>  | <b>Matthew Allsop, WYG</b> |  |   |
| <b>2a</b> | Policy EM15 (Site B2)      | <p>I am writing to you on behalf of my clients, the Tosdevine and Blackman families, in general support of the East Meon Neighbourhood Plan 2016 - 2032 Pre-Submission Draft. We believe that it provides a positive plan for the village which will create new homes, whilst protecting its character. We broadly support the principle of the policies set out however we believe that some require amendment.</p> <p>We support Policy EM1: East Meon Housing Allocation to 2032, which allocates the site 'B2 South of Coombe Road opposite Kews Cottages and Coombe Cottages' for 6 dwellings and the site 'B9 South-east of Coombe Road as it turns west from the village' for 5 dwellings. We believe that these two sites present good locations for the village to expand to meet the future housing need, as required by the South Downs National Park Policy SD23. Strategic Policy SD23: Housing allocates 15 houses to East Meon in the period from 2014 to 2032, therefore the 11 houses allocated on the sites B2 and B9 will provide a significant</p> | <p>Use the word 'indicative' as advised by SDNPA to describe layout. The archaeological requirement should remain as revised by SDNPA. The landscape buffer should also accord with SDNPA advice. FFL details needed as suggested. Meeting required with landowner. Landscape Appraisal should consider impacts and landscape buffer.</p> |

|  |  |   |  |
|--|--|---|--|
|  |  | <p>contribution to the total.</p> <p>We are also in general support of Policy EM15: Land at B2 (South of Coombe Road). However, we believe that this policy should be amended in the following ways:</p> <p>    ¢ Bullet point 1 states that the development will accord with the layout shown in the Neighbourhood Plan. The layout is conceptual and is only meant to provide a guide to the level and type of development that can be created on this site. A future developer may wish to change and improve the design of the dwellings or the layout; however the wording of the policy is currently too proscriptive to allow this. We suggest that the wording of the first bullet point of this policy is changed to as follows: 'Development will be in general accordance with the layout shown above'.</p> <p>Bullet point 4 of the policy states that there should be a 'landscaped tree and shrub planted belt to the south of the site of a minimum of 10 metres to the boundary'. The creation of a 10m wide landscape belt would look artificial and urban in such a location and would not be in keeping with the character of the South Downs National Park, 10 m wide landscape belts are more commonly used to screen industrial and commercial sites and not small scale residential schemes. Whatever landscaping is introduced will not prevent the site or indeed the whole village being visible as one walks down footpath 7b. Surely, the solution is to provide a traditional hedge to soften the impact but to combine this with a well designed and attractive development and not to implement an alien landscape feature to try and completely hide it? It would also be contrary to paragraph 4.54, which states the views should be protected from the south 'by mitigation planting using planting typical of the South Downs Character'. A more natural and in keeping solution would be to supplement the existing landscape to create a thickly planted hedge; similar to the hedgerow that sits between the village</p> |  |
|--|--|---|--|

|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
|  | <p>green and the tennis courts in East Meon, providing a significant visual barrier but remaining in keeping with the national park. We believe that this would be a more fitting solution to soften the impact of the proposed dwellings.</p> <p>As part of a planning application the local authority will determine which surveys and reports are necessary. Policy EM15 states that an Archaeological Investigation must be undertaken; however this may not be necessary for this particular site. Therefore we suggest that this bullet point should be removed from the policy; allowing the local authority to determine which surveys and reports are needed.</p> <p>Considering the above, we believe Policy EM15 should read as follows:</p> <p>Policy EM15: Land at B2 (South of Coombe Road) Land at B2 is allocated for a maximum of 6 dwellings for the period 2016-2025; the proposal will include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Development will be in general accordance with the layout shown above.</li> <li>- The mix of dwellings will comprise 3 x 3 bed and 3 x 2 bed.</li> <li>- Dwellings will be no more than two storeys, with no accommodation within the roof space beyond the first floor.</li> <li>- A detailed landscape scheme will be submitted showing how the development is assimilated into the landscape.</li> <li>- Details of site levels and where finished floor levels of the dwellings will be set in relation to existing site levels will be provided.</li> <li>- A single vehicular access will be from Coombe Road with a visibility splay of 2.4m x 40m.</li> <li>- The application must be accompanied by a detailed foul and surface water drainage strategy including sustainable urban drainage, and must demonstrate how surface water drainage can be satisfactorily accommodated so as to alleviate current problems in Coombe Road adjacent to the site.</li> </ul> |  |
|--|--|--|

|           |                       |   |   |
|-----------|-----------------------|---|---|
|           |                       | <p>- A landscape and visual impact assessment will be required and should inform the design and layout of the site proposals and must show how the planting will mitigate the wider visual impact.</p> <p>- Planning permission will be granted with permitted development rights in Classes A, B, C and E of the General Permitted Development Order 2015 (as amended) removed to ensure that dwellings retain the rural character in this peripheral location.</p>  |   |
| <b>2b</b> | Policy EM17 (Site B9) | <p>We are in general support of Policy EM17: Land at B9 (Corner of Coombe Road) in principle, however we believe the following amendments should be made:</p> <p>As stated in paragraph 2.15 over the next 5 years the Housing Needs Report indicates a potential demand for 24 homes - given the constraints of being in a National Park, this NDP proposes a build of 15 - 17 new dwellings. Also, Strategic Policy SD23: Housing allocates 15 houses to East Meon in the period from 2014 to 2032. However Policy EM17 of the Neighbourhood Plan allocates site B9 from 2025 - 2036. This would mean that East Meon would not be meeting its allocation requirement and other sites could be brought forward to fill the need. The housing need is for the next 5 years and site B9 should be allocated for the full Neighbourhood Plan period, from 2016 - 2036.</p> <p>ĉ Bullet point 1 states that the development will accord with the layout shown in the Neighbourhood Plan. The layout is conceptual and is only meant to provide a guide to the level and type of development can be created on this site. A future developer may wish to change and improve the design of the dwellings or the layout; however the wording of the policy is currently too proscriptive to allow this. We suggest that the wording of the first bullet point of this policy is changed to as follows: 'Development will be in general accordance with the layout shown above'.</p> | <p>The housing needs survey identifies that some supply will arise from movement within the housing market. The housing allocation is spread across the plan period. East Meon wishes to avoid all the supply being delivered at once as this will impact severely on the village infrastructure. The scheme described in the policy will need to be omitted as it is not in the same ownership, however green infrastructure to link sites B2 and B9 in the ownership of the landowner could be secured through the policy as the scheme. Use the word 'indicative' as advised by SDNPA to describe layout. The archaeological requirement should remain as revised by SDNPA. The landscape buffer should also accord with SDNPA advice. FFL details needed as suggested. Meeting required with landowner. Landscape Appraisal should consider impacts and landscape buffer.</p> |

|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
|  | <p>As stated above in response to EM15, as part of any planning application the local authority will determine which surveys and reports are necessary. Policy EM17 states that both an Archaeological Investigation and a Biodiversity Mitigation Plan must be undertaken. However neither of these may be necessary for this particular site. Therefore we suggest that these bullet points should be removed from the policy; allowing the local authority to determine which surveys and reports are needed. Bullet point 12 states that - Any planning permission for the residential development shall ensure that provision is made to secure:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o The implementation of the Scheme in full by the development;</li> <li>o The transfer of all the land comprising the Scheme to an appropriate public body (which may be the Parish Council) to secure its provision as green infrastructure in perpetuity;</li> <li>o The payment of an appropriate commuted sum to secure the long term maintenance of the Scheme <sup>™</sup></li> </ul> <p>The land that would have been used for the 'Scheme' <sup>™</sup> (which we understand was land to the north) is not in the same ownership as the allocated land B9, consequently the policy should not refer to this land.</p> <p>In discussion with the Neighbourhood Plan Group, it had been previously agreed that the 'Scheme' should be removed from the illustrative plan in the Neighbourhood Plan. Therefore, bullet point 12 from Policy EM17 and the text on paragraph 4.74 that states 'secures additional open space for biodiversity' should also be removed from the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>Considering the above, we believe Policy EM15 should read as follows:</p> <p>Policy EM17: Land at B9 (Corner of Coombe Road) Land at B9 is allocated for a maximum of 5 dwellings for the period 2016-2036 the proposal will include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Development will be in general accordance with the layout</li> </ul> |  |
|--|--|--|

|  |  |   |  |
|--|--|---|--|
|  |  | <p>shown above.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The mix of dwellings will comprise 2 x 3 bed and 3 x 2 bed.</li> <li>- A landscape and visual impact assessment will be required and should inform the design and layout of the site proposals.</li> <li>- A detailed landscape scheme will be submitted showing how the development is assimilated into the landscape.</li> <li>- Details of site levels and where finished floor levels of the dwellings will be set in relation to existing site levels.</li> <li>- Details of cut / fill balance and methods for spoil disposal will be provided.</li> <li>- A single vehicular access will be from Chapel Street/ Coombe Road with a visibility splay of 2.4m x 40m will be provided the access will need to be cut into the existing bank to form a 'sunken lane', details of the engineering works and tree loss and tree planting must form part of the proposal and visual impact assessment.</li> <li>- Foul and surface water drainage strategy including sustainable urban drainage will be required.</li> <li>- Planning permission will be granted with permitted development rights in Classes A, B, C and E of the General Permitted Development Order 2015 (as amended) removed to ensure that dwellings retain the rural character in this peripheral location.</li> </ul> |  |
|--|--|---|--|

## Comments from Residents

| Ref | Resident's Comments:   | EMNDPSG Response   |
|-----|--|--|
| 1   | <p>Thank you for giving me the opportunity to comment upon the Pre-Submission Draft of the East Meon Neighbourhood Development Plan 2016 - 2032. It is readily apparent that a huge amount of work must have been expended in preparing such a thorough and well-founded suite of Draft documents. For this reason the nature of my comments (below) are minor in their nature:</p> <p>p.23; section 4.28<br/>Wording: Should that be The East Meon Pattern Book (cf. also Glossary entry at p.47)?</p> <p>p.23: Policy EM7: Building Materiality and Detailing<br/>Regarding facing wall materials; and not mentioned in the text: tile hanging (cf. Court House)?</p> <p>p.36: Policy EM15: Land at B2: (South of Coombe Road)<br/>Consider: tightening up the wording for the landscape and the foul and surface water drainage conditions to reference the site and dwelling finished floor levels condition? Not sure if you can call for simultaneous submission of condition information? In any event: consider any risks associated with the matter of levels (and heights etc.) otherwise becoming un-co-ordinated (i.e. circumvented) in successive conditions submissions.</p> <p>p.38: Policy EM16: Land at B3/B4: (Coombe Road)<br/>Consider: inclusion of additional conditions in relation to landscape and site and dwelling finished floor levels, generally as at B2 above.</p> | <p>Suggest add advice re FFL in the policy B2 and B3/4 (and potentially other site policies). Amend other errors and clarifications as suggested</p>   |
| 2   | <p>I would like to go on record as broadly supporting the NP and the need for one but I am appalled with the proposed development at location B2. It's position on Coombe Road could not be worse as this is an area that has always been prone to flooding, I have sent an email to Chris Moor, showing pictures taken Wednesday 22nd June 2016. As I understand it in East Meon we have combined rain water run off and sewage all in one and the drainage in the proposed section of Coombe Road can barely cope at present and any potential increase could have catastrophic consequences for a large number of residents, we could see a large area covered with sewage. This would of course be an intolerable situation and would be a grave concern on a health and safety issues. Area B1 would be a much more sensible location for the proposed 6 dwellings, it is a similar site with similar landscape, it would have a much smaller visual impact to the landscape, would cause</p>   | <p>The development gives the opportunity to improve the current drainage -note policy EM15 seeks to ALLEVIATE current problems in Coombe Road. Also, supported by policy EM13. No change</p> |

|   |  |   |
|---|--|---|
|   | less disruption to far fewer local residents and has no drainage issues.   | required.   |
| 3 | <p>We have reviewed the proposals and firstly would like to thank those involved in the work undertaken during the course of the Neighbourhood Plan process.</p> <p>We support the proposals and believe they offer the best solution in terms of addressing both the requirements of the village and the planning objectives.</p>   | noted   |
| 4 | <p>Our reading of the plan raises a number of questions and matters of concern (the order does not indicate priority):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Affordable Housing The Vision statement refers to the need to make, 'Provision for affordable housing for applicants with strong local connections'. In addition, the section Affordable Housing 4.18 (page 21) states that to comply with the National and local policies, 'affordable housing will be provided on all development sites,'</li> <li>• It is difficult to see how compliance can be achieved with site B3/4 only having 3 bedroom properties.</li> <li>• It would seem the only affordable housing is at A3, where it is specified. If this is not the case, can details of further provision be provided?</li> <li>2. Enclosures - Policy EMB 8, page 24 Refers to the need for enclosures for gardens. When development starts will existing hedges/trees be retained where they mark boundaries to identified sites? If so, this would: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Help to minimize the impact of these new building sites.</li> <li>• Avoid the considerable delay due to growing time for new planting.</li> <li>• Lessen destruction of wildlife habitats.</li> </ul> </li> <li>3. Drainage - Policy EM 16, page 38. Land at B3/B4 Refers to ' Foul and surface water drainage strategy including sustainable urban drainage to be incorporated' <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Given this eventuality, clearly the current situation would have to be taken into account. This involves a septic tank system which serves Garston Farm (the tank location) and 1 and 2 Garston Farm Cottages.</li> <li>• A very high water table (almost to the surface in winter) has caused considerable problems over many years, exacerbated by the chalk being some 15 feet below soil level.</li> <li>• The current system runs underneath the proposed site adjoining 1 Garston Farm Cottages, which is only one factor to be dealt with, for instance, the current septic tank system only has the capacity for the three properties connected to it.</li> <li>• Will there be a system of foul drainage, including septic tank or digester, or will the new development be connected to main drainage? If the latter is the case, would that include 1 and 2 Garston Farm Cottages?</li> </ul> </li> <li>4. Site B9 There seems to be no one who can understand this site being included. Those of us who use this part of Coombe Road/Chapel Street know how potentially dangerous this blind corner can be. There is a serious accident waiting to happen brought home to one when confronted on the bend by a tanker, tractor or other vehicles. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Please note the vision statement in the Plan, 'Any new development must ensure highway safety'.</li> </ul> </li> <li>5a. Access on to Coombe Road We are not the only people to be astounded by the proposed number of new access points on such a narrow lane – B3/4, B2 and B9. Problems are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Gaining access to Coombe Road from some existing properties is hazardous.</li> <li>• The increase in traffic will increase the danger of using the road</li> <li>• The lane is so narrow that the only place on the straight stretch from Garston Farm to Duncombe Road where two vehicles can pass each other safely is outside Garston Farm Cottages and this often necessitates one</li> </ul> </li> </ol> | <p>The NPPG now requires sites of less than 10 units to commute payments off site for affordable housing. In the National park sites under 5 are guided by this same principle. The payment is commuted to the LPA following construction. This leaves A3 as the only site where on-site provision is possible.</p> <p>It is accepted good practice that hedges and trees should be retained on site where they exist. This has been allowed for in the sketch designs. It is also enshrined in the relevant Local plan policies so there is no requirement to repeat in the NHP.</p> <p>Private drainage systems that can demonstrably</p> |



|   |  |  |
|---|--|--|
|   | <p>vehicle coming to a standstill. • While the traffic survey apparently concluded that average speed was just over 30mph, there is no security if some vehicles are passing entrances at speeds approaching 50mph. • Parking outside school reduces the road to a single track almost back to the entrance to B9. • There is an existing entrance on the bend adjacent to B9.</p> | <p>accommodate the new development will be required if access to public systems is not available. Planning application must demonstrate how they adequately drain both foul and surface water. It is not necessary to specify the solution in the plan.</p> <p>B9 can accommodate a well-contained cluster development that can meet the technical constraints and therefore can be considered a sustainable site. Visibility is very good at the access location. Overall the additional movements generated by B3/4, B2 and B9 are not significant given the level of traffic already in the network. This level of additional traffic generation would not sustain a highway objection.</p> |
| 5 | <p>Our Vision' 3.3 (page 13) One of the, 'Guiding principles raised consistently through consultation was...'Safe access to/from East Meon School'. Given that access can be seen as a route to school as well as the gate area, it is difficult to see how safety can be achieved given the points raised in the section, including 'Vision' point 3.4.</p>                       | <p>Any new access to a development scheme will only be approved it is</p>  |

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <p>'Any new development must ensure highway safety'. 5b. Important Gateway All these properties have access onto one of the main routes (or gateways) into the village and the Plan's 'Vision', 3.3, was to, 'Maintain valued views in/out of the village, including village gateways'. Since our inclusion in the National Park, there has been significant increase in walkers and cyclists accessing the village by this route and it would be reasonable to assume that some have been on the South Downs Way. It does not seem to meet the spirit and aims of this plan to include all the development on this important and much used way into our community. 6. Building Concentration Again we are not a lone voice when we note, without understanding, the concentration of new development in one confined area of the village, with the vast majority being in one road. • This is made more significant by the fact that the previous development of The Green and houses in Duncombe Road are also in the same area.7. Number of Proposed Properties Total number of properties proposed is 17, but the number required is 15. Which site, or sites are going to have their number of properties reduced? 8. Marred Views. The Neighbourhood Plan Objectives, 3.5, page 14, 'seeks to ensure that any new development is in harmony with the rural environment, protecting views of the village when approached by road or on foot and views from the village of the surrounding downland'. Serious questions are raised as to whether this objective has been achieved when one considers sites B2 and B3/4 and to some extent B9. Introduction to the Plan (1.7 and 1.8, page 4) claims to, 'protect the village from inappropriate development ...' by 'Identifying key views to be protected from within the village and into the village from the surrounding downs.' This has clearly not been achieved. There is further evidence of non-compliance highlighted by the section on Visual Impact: • 4.23 Policy EM5 states, 'development must contribute positively to the village's setting within the National Park, protecting the important views in and out of the village that are valued by the community and visitors alike.' • 4.24 The importance of the protection of views mentioned in 4.23 is, '... indicated in the consultation feedback (see evidence base) and therefore requires specific protection. • One of these key views identified – both in and out of the village – was the north/south line from Small Down and from the West Meon Road. • The site at B2 mars the view from Small Down and the footpath beside Duncombe Farm. • The site at B3/4 can be seen from Small Down, the footpath below Chalk Dell Cottages and Colchenna, the footpath at Forty Acres and Coombe Road as it descends from Coombe Cross and the South Downs Way. • With respect to B2, this is recognised in policy EM15, page 36, 'A landscape and visual impact assessment will be required and should inform the design and layout of the site proposals and must show how the screen planting will mitigate the wider visual impact. • If this is required for B2 it brings into doubt the advisability of this choice of site. • If an impact assessment is considered necessary for B2, then why not B3/4, given Policy EM5, page 22, Protection of Valued Views,' ....all development proposals must be accompanied by a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment and must demonstrate low or negligible impact on landscape views.' • Also, if the screening is required for B2, why is it not considered necessary for B3/4?</p> | <p>safe. The additional level of additional traffic generation would not sustain a highway objection to any of the proposals.</p> <p>The village is subject to views from all points of the compass (see SDNPA emerging Viewshed study) the more significant views are from the north given the elevation of Park Hill. The geography of the village has meant topography and the heritage constraints of the conservation area, and lack of available sites limit the expansion north. East and West flanks of the village are generally highly exposed and unrelated to the core. This has meant that physical limitations mean that new development is naturally concentrated to the less constrained areas to the south.</p> |
|--|--|

|   |   |   |
|---|---|---|
|   |   | The proposal for a southern circuit and woodland belt as recommended by the SDNPA as a response to consultation will go a long way to dealing with new development and existing impacts identified in the Viewshed study. Change proposed to add woodland mitigation and southern circuit. Change site B3/4 to include preparation of a landscape appraisal as per other sites. |
| 6 | I am happy with the village parish council proposal   | Noted   |
| 7 | It is clear that a huge amount of time and effort has gone in to creating the NDP. I have now read the draft in full and agree with the proposed sites. It would appear that these have been carefully chosen to limit the impact of further development on the village, whilst in some cases benefitting those who's land will be used. It is good to see that concerns about surface water drainage have been well documented, and that new properties will not be allowed to add to the problems. I would like to thank the committee for all their hard work.   | noted   |
| 8 | A very comprehensive and considered draft which has clearly benefitted from detailed research and input from across the community. Thanks to the team behind this for all the effort they have gone to.   | noted   |
| 9 | I hold: "There is a strong bias towards larger dwellings" and the further statement, "This significant bias towards large dwellings was seen as a barrier to a more balanced community" .....ref 2.11 on P10 are inappropriate in relation to the village (the subject of the EMNP ), since this statement is clearly based on the housing stock in the parish. From my own survey of the housing stock in the parish including the village, it is evident that the significant number of larger houses are well outside the village, e.g. Leydene, farm homes, converted barns and their ilk . I believe there is total lack of credibility to imply that such housing , in the case of Leydene more than a mile from the village, is a basis for advancing these quoted arguments with respect to | Refer to housing needs survey. No change required.  |

|    |  |  |
|----|--|--|
|    | the village housing stock.   |  |
| 10 | <p>I question the assertive statement under 2.14 on p12: "Many households currently occupying 5+ bedrooms are seeking to downsize" How many of these alleged households are currently living within the village"?</p> <p>I find 2.15 with its conflicting numbers incomprehensible and suggest that it is rewritten in language that is intelligible to those not conversant with housing survey-planning lingo.</p>   | Refer to housing needs survey. No change required. Add to 2.15 that the 36 units represents the possible turnover in housing units based on the results of the survey.   |
| 11 | <p>Our Vision.</p> <p>Much as I share this sentiment about the built environment in the countryside of the parish around the village, I have to say that I can't relate the relevance of this to new housing in the village which is the focus of the EMNP, since the decision was taken to limit the EMNP to the village and not the parish.</p> <p>In the list of principles in 3.3, references correctly refer to the village, and I hold that the proceeding text needs to be referencing to the village too and not implying that the EMNP covers the whole parish.</p> | The EMNP does cover the whole Parish, the non - site specific policies apply across the Parish. Development in the isolated rural parts of the Parish is not sustainable and inconsistent with the NPPF. No change required. |
| 12 | <p>Dwelling Size on p20</p> <p>4.15 As the large house being currently being built in Workhouse Lane demonstrates, there is a developer ambition for large homes in the village. Thus I suggest that "no demand" in 4th line is replaced by "justified need".</p> <p>Policy EM3</p> <p>Once again I have to challenge the "current imbalance of stock that has very high proportion of larger dwellings" as being an inappropriate, misleading reference to the village housing stock, the sole focus of the EMNP.</p>   | Refer to housing needs survey. Developer aspiration does represent local need. Large houses will attract outside buyers. No change required.   |
| 13 | <p>Possibly I have missed it, but I have not come across any comprehensive study of this vital element of the village infrastructure, yet I understood one was written??</p> <p>4.39</p> <p>Surely this problem is significantly due to the infiltration of ground water into the drainage system because of the breakdown of the jointing material of the SGW drainage pipes, such that the drainage system is acting akin</p>  | The development gives the opportunity to improve the current drainage -note policy EM15 seeks to ALLEVIATE current problems in   |

|    |   |   |
|----|---|---|
|    | <p>to a field drain.</p> <p>4.41 It then follows that any new drainage connected upstream of Workhouse Lane will worsen the problem.</p>  | <p>Coombe Road. Also, supported by policy EM13. The EMNP cannot make the infrastructure providers make any changes, but developers can be required to upgrade. No change required.</p>  |
| 14 | <p>Affordable Housing on page 21</p> <p>4.19</p> <p>Having alleged under 2.11 that "This significant bias towards large dwellings was seen as a barrier to a more balanced community", it now states "Although East Meon has an excellent &amp; integrated socio-economic mix of dwellings and residents". It then continues with a new "very high proportion" contention, this time claiming: "The housing stock consists of a very high proportion of detached houses and bungalows with a lower proportion of terraced homes, flats and apartments" If this is so, then where are the terraced homes, flats and apartments within the proposed sites?</p>  | <p>Policy EM3 limits dwellings to no more than 3 beds. The schemes illustrated achieve small units in a style consistent with the village design. No change required.</p>   |
| 15 | <p>Congratulations to the team on producing a professional and well thought through draft plan. We are v grateful for the voluntary efforts of the PC and those who produced the report.</p> <p>Attachments/Evidence Base: there is duplication of the Housing Evidence Base, with the main report, and the main report with appendices, listed as separate items. They are the same report, one with appendices, so I would include only the one with appendices.</p> <p>1.24: The NDP is stated as covering the whole parish, but focussing on the built area and immediate vicinity. No rationale is given for this. This focus is not a requirement of the NP process. The decision to focus on the built area and immediate vicinity was taken by a previous Parish Council and previous NP leadership team and has not been tested in the consultation exercises. This could be a weakness at Inspector stage and consideration should be given to justifying this focus, or refocussing the Plan to include outlying areas.</p> <p>2.13 Change Household Survey to Housing Needs Survey to avoid confusion with the national Household Survey which is part of the Census.</p> | <p>Amend to reflect response.</p> <p>The EMNP does cover the whole Parish, the non - site specific policies apply across the Parish. Development in the isolated rural parts of the Parish is not sustainable and inconsistent with the NPPF. No change required.</p> |

|    |  |   |
|----|--|---|
|    | <p>2.15. There is an error in the estimated number of net new homes attributed to the Housing Needs Report, which was 20 (18 new and 2 concealed), not 24 as stated in the report. This is because there are 4 homes becoming available within the plan period which meet the needs of 4 of the new households. See Paras 5.46 and 5.47 and Table 37 of the Housing Needs Report. This is a confusing but important part of the Housing Needs Report which aimed to estimate the net new houses needed, not the absolute number.</p> <p>As the NDP proposed number is predicated on this erroneous number of 24, the net new totals can be brought down from the 15-17 proposed to 11-13 (subtracting 4 from each end of the range). Using a different mathematical approach, using percentages, <math>4/24 = 17\%</math> so the top and bottom of the range could be reduced by 17%, to give a range of 12-14.</p> <p>The arguments put forward to justify a smaller number of homes than were estimated in the Housing Needs Report could be made much stronger. The only argument offered is that E Meon is in a national park. No mention is made in this section of the history of above average growth in E Meon over the last 20 years, referred to in the preamble. Some benchmarking reveals that other villages in the NP have received much lower proportionate allocations (for example, Rogate received 12 on a base of 750 households, or 1.6%; E Meon is proposing minimum 3%, twice as many proportionally. See also Twyford NP). Given the above average growth of E Meon in the past a strong case could be made for a lower number.</p> <p>Delete the para beginning "However, the Housing Needs Report...". This confuses the reader who needs a clear "result" of the housing survey, and fails to take account of the netting off (available minus demand); it simply states the absolute number of houses becoming available, many of which, as the NDP states, do not meet the needs.</p> <p>3.3 final bullet: There was no clear expressed view by the village on whether development should be limited to within existing village boundaries, as the consultation sessions did not include the option to build some houses outside the village in the countryside, for example on brownfield sites.</p> <p>4.8: change Housing Needs Assessment to Housing Needs Report for consistency.</p> <p>The HN report is variously described as the Housing Needs survey, the Household Survey, the Housing Needs Analysis etc. which could cause confusion.</p> | <p>Development in the isolated rural parts of the Parish is not sustainable and is inconsistent with the NPPF the plan could not be supported by the examiner if it were to disregard the advice. No change required.</p> <p>The figure for a housing target is a minimum of 15 dwellings dictated by SDNPA and EH Local plan. Any departure from this would be inconsistent with adopted development plan. There is no case for a lower number. No change required.</p> <p>Revise for clarity. See above.</p> <p>Revise for clarity.</p> |
| 16 | <p>4.9 Site A3; these garages at A3 are used by residents, reduce traffic congestion in a very congested part of the village (one of the most congested), and one of them is used by a local business. The two new houses would remove 8 or 9 car parking spaces and add 4 more cars (2 per house), so that a net 13 more car park spaces would be needed. This would generate difficulty and potential conflicts in this crowded part of the village.</p>   | <p>Radian support the redevelopment of the garages on A3. It was understood that these are not used for parking</p>   |

|    |  |  |
|----|--|--|
|    | <p>Has Radian been consulted as they belong to Radian?</p> <p>Have the users of these garages been consulted?</p> <p>Recommend to delete A3 and lose 2 houses which is possible due to the error in the stated number needed at 2.15 (see above).</p> <p>Site B2: this proposed site impacts greatly on people living in Kews Cottages and Garston Farm Cottages, which is an area that has seen significant development in the last 20 years. I suggest to remove B2 and replace with B15 - see below.</p> <p>Site B15: This site can accommodate 3 houses. It is not in a flood plain nor is it in a conservation area (as for some erroneously mapped in the NDP). There is no rationale to reduce the settlement boundary in this location and the new houses could be built within the existing boundary, as required by the plan. this site is as sustainable if not more so than B2, B3, B4, and B9. There would be no landscape impact. I propose this site as alternative to B6.</p> <p>This would then make up a total of 12 new houses, within the proposed new envelope of 11-13 or 12-14.</p> <p>4.13: the proposed new settlement policy boundary does not include provision for site B9, if B9 is retained in the plan.</p> <p>It is not clear why the proposed settlement boundary has been drawn back within the conservation area at the south-east corner of the village.</p> | <p>as they are undersized. The inclusion of B15 would not meet the tests of NPPF to develop outside floodplain. The access is in the floodplain. Policy boundary will be adjusted after development. B15 was also the lowest scoring in the cumulative votes on the drop-in day. No change required.</p> |
| 17 | <p>A3 would deprive residents of the garages that were specific to the planning permission of the surrounding flats in order to alleviate congestion of parking and traffic adjacent to the school, parking is currently a nightmare in the High Street and surrounding roads. More cars on the road will exacerbate an already dangerous situation around the school area. The landscaping report describes the garages and parking area on A3 site as underused - how was this assessment arrived at? These garages are being used, and in more than one case support local businesses for self-employed village residents (Carpentry and a Landscape Gardener). The loss of these could cost local employment which cannot be an acceptable outcome in a rural community. The loss of the garages would add the need for the parking of at least 8 cars in this area and a possible 4 from the new houses, would create an untenable position for local residents, not to mention further gridlock for the</p>  | <p>Radian support the redevelopment of the garages on A3. It was understood that these are not used for parking as they are undersized. No change required. NHP team to seek alternative storage for users of</p>  |

|  |  |   |
|--|--|---|
|  | <p>school pick up and drop off times. As a Neighbourhood Plan in the full meaning of the title surely an alternative site for the garages should be sought in order to alleviate this outcome.</p> <p>Site B2 where the ground level is so much higher, presents an imposing development blocking the views from the cottages opposite and the southerly aspect of these properties. To quote the assessment criteria, deemed to be the guiding principles for the NP after resident's feedback, no large developments, max 4-6 houses, so why up to 8 here that will provide a ribbon development of the village? No bus service along this road.</p> <p>Sites B3 and B4 were both flagged as having significant issues concerning landscaping and access but were actively assessed and owners contacted to submit further details. Have these significant issues been completely overcome? No bus service along this road.</p> <p>Site B9 was not recommended during the February proposal and has not been voted on by the residents, it seems to have found its way back onto the agenda again despite failing the assessment on landscaping and access. It is hard to see why this site is still being considered with the highway access and character of the landscape completely at odds with development. This again contravenes the guiding principles set out, as the proposal is for 6-7 dwellings. Again a long walk to catch the bus at the Church.</p> | <p>garage. This will be built into a revision in the policy.</p> <p>The additional level of additional traffic generation would not sustain a highway objection to any of the proposals.</p> <p>Site B2 is proposed for 6 dwellings maximum. The layout has been designed as a cluster not a ribbon.</p> <p>The proposal for a southern circuit and woodland belt as recommended by the SDNPA as a response to consultation will go a long way to dealing with new development and existing impacts identified in the Viewshed study. Change proposed to add woodland mitigation and southern circuit.</p> <p>B9 is proposed for 5 dwellings. The site is within suitable walking</p> |
|--|--|---|



|    |  |  |
|----|--|--|
|    |  | <p>distance of bus services (less than 10 minutes). B9 can accommodate a well-contained cluster development that can meet the technical constraints and therefore can be considered a sustainable site. Visibility is very good at the access location.</p>                      |
| 18 | <p>The B15 site has been dismissed in the last NP assessment primarily due to the perceived flood risk which has now been the subject of a detailed report and the access road presents a very low risk and within EA planning requirements, the site itself and the parking are in Zone 1 with a proposed alternative evacuation route, all in Zone 1.</p> <p>The site provides for a small development of three 2/3 bedroom dwellings suitable and sustainable for young families, and downsizers, easy walking distance to the Church, Shop and School.</p> <p>The B15 site would balance the development of the village which seems to be expanding only in one direction, away from the original Church and Court House.</p> <p>The Character and Landscape report on B15 identified narrow gardens as a reason to omit the site, but no plans have been drawn up, there is an opportunity to provide significant gardens if required, for the proposed properties, the available site extends to a hectare. This assessment also omitted as unsuitable, sites B3, B4 and B9 due to landscape issues, is this report now to be ignored?</p> <p>The B15 site was deemed to be in the conservation area which it is not.</p> <p>The B15 site is as close to the Village amenities as site A3, and closer than the other proposed sites B2, B3, B4 and B9. The B15 site is a 2/3 minute walk from the Schoolhouse bus stop, accessed via the footpath adjacent to Compton Cottage.</p> <p>With the exception of A3, B15 is the only site which is adjacent to the current Parish Settlement Boundary, and grouped with other buildings, within the current settlement area.</p> <p>A sympathetic and high quality design is intended that will not adversely affect the landscape or views from the recreation ground or Park Hill.</p> <p>With ownership of the surrounding field there is scope to add some very sustainable green credentials to the development in terms of possible solar energy production or geo-thermal.</p> | <p>The inclusion of B15 would not meet the tests of NPPF to develop outside floodplain. The access is in the floodplain. Policy boundary will be adjusted after development. B15 was also the lowest scoring in the cumulative votes on the drop-in day. No change required.</p> |

|    |  |  |
|----|--|--|
|    | <p>This is a brownfield site, the only one proposed other than demolishing the garages at A3.</p> <p>The B15 site allows for the off street parking of 8 cars</p> <p>The B15 site borders the lane where there is already mains drainage, power and water supplies.</p> <p>The approach road is narrow but short and with appropriate passing spaces.</p> <p>The flood problem cited, is clearly demonstrated in the most recent high flood recorded in January 2016, see the photos on the East Meon NP website. Only a part of the access road is in the flood plain, the road rises to the access point, the entrance also rises steeply from the road, with the proposed site significantly higher than the roadway which is a sunken lane. Flooding occurs from Bridge Cottage towards Oxenbourne, on this occasion to some 30cms depth, but the access road, from East Meon to the point of access to the site, has only some surface water from the ford, partly across the road, the access remaining open and of no risk to emergency vehicles. An ambulance passed through on the afternoon the photographs were taken, managing to access the accident via the flood waters past the bridge.</p> <p>The 2002 EA Flood Report for East Meon and Frogmore, commissioned after serious flooding in the Winter of 2001 (Rarer than once in 100 years), showed the full extent of the flooding. The access road was not impassable, with only minor surface water from the Ford, it has not flooded since then, nor specifically after the EA remedial work at Frogmore carried out in 2003/4. A professional flood report for site B15 was offered during the consultation process, but was rejected as sufficient sites had been identified which did not have significant issues</p> <p>I have commission a full flood report by Geosmart which will be emailed to committee members but seems not to be able to attach to this site. In response, this report demonstrates, the access road does in fact present a very low flood risk and within the specific EA guidelines for planning. It also suggests further mitigation in the event of a flood by creating a separate alternative flood evacuation route all in Zone 1 along the edge of the field under the lime trees exiting through the existing gate and onto the recreation ground. This can be included in the plans and would present a dry route if flooding did occur.</p> |  |
| 19 | <p>My concerns re the developments on Coppice Corner and opposite the cottages lie with the impact it will have on traffic and drainage and the state of the road. I hope the problem of runoff from the fields will be addressed and in particular the potholes on Coppice Corner. To avoid driving your vehicle into the potholes, you have to veer to the other side of the road on a blind bend and with the inevitable increase in the numbers of cars, I fear the chance of accidents will be increased unless the condition of the road is improved. I am also worried about the increase of traffic going past the school. In addition, I would like to put on record my disappointment and sympathy for the residents along that part of Coombe Rd who will be adversely affected by these changes.</p>   | <p>The development gives the opportunity to improve the current drainage -note policy EM15 seeks to ALLEVIATE current problems in Coombe Road. Also, supported by policy EM13. The EMNP cannot</p> |

|    |   |  |
|----|---|--|
|    |   | make the infrastructure providers make any changes, but developers can be required to upgrade. No significant vehicle generation will arise from any of the proposed sites to prevent development. No change required.   |
| 20 | A fantastic amount of excellent and thoughtful work has gone into all of this. Our hope is that we can use this opportunity to do more than build houses and that is to make a useful contribution to the entire village - one example could be better drainage. Good to see the desire to look after that particular uniqueness that is East Meon  | Noted  |
| 21 | I commend the huge efforts of all those involved. After a very difficult start, the process did develop into an inclusive and open mechanism whereby the many factors and opinions could be assessed properly. Thank you to those that gave up their valuable time.   | Noted  |
| 22 | <p>I am immensely distressed over the proposed planning in Coombe Road, right outside my house. I am concerned about these points.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) The flooding issue in Coombe Road, especially as any building work will encourage water, sludge and debris to rush towards my house and my exposed air bricks.</li> <li>2) My house loosing value</li> <li>3) I have already lost the view behind my house and now it is proposed I completely loose the view at the front.</li> <li>4) Heavy traffic past East Meon Primary school, the traffic is heavy enough as it is.</li> <li>5) My visual impact on my view and also visitors to my house and the village.</li> </ol> <p>I wish to propose to the steering group that they look at the space on the football ground as this really is not a community building. It is not even used by the village.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>6) Why has site B1 suddenly disappeared, surely this is suitable for 6 houses where it does not flood.</li> </ol> <p>Also some sites were rejected due to planning for a mini estate or similar so why can't the steering group rethink these sites?</p> <p>I have had to visit my doctor because the stress and emotional upset of the proposed planning has made me feel very unwell. I was born in the house in which I live in now, I have seen so many changes over the years and</p> | The development gives the opportunity to improve the current drainage -note policy EM15 seeks to ALLEVIATE current problems in Coombe Road. Also, supported by policy EM13. The EMNP cannot make the infrastructure providers make any changes, but developers can be required to upgrade. Radian support the redevelopment of the garages on A3. It was |

|    |   |   |
|----|---|---|
|    | feel bitter that I may be about to loose my last view   | understood that these are not used for parking as they are undersized. Sites. No right to a view. Planning does not consider property valuation. BI was the most unpopular site in the consultation. No change required.  |
| 23 | I am writing to you to express my concerns over the proposed building of two houses on A3. The parking in Hill View & to the rear of Park Vista is all ready bad. It is not uncommon to find my car blocked in when I leave for work. The removal of eight garages & building on land which often has four cars parked on it can only make this worse. If both the new houses had two cars each this would add another sixteen cars trying to park in an all ready congested road. I am a self employed carpenter & I keep a lot of my tools in my lock up. If I lost the garage I would have to keep them in my first floor flat. This would mean I would have to load & unload my car every day, making many trips to & from my car. This could well end up with me becoming unemployed. Over the course of the last six years I have been restoring a vintage motorcycle which I keep in the garage. If it is not garaged over night the insurance is void. I know these are personal reasons but I strongly feel building on A3 will have an adverse affect on every one. | Radian support the redevelopment of the garages on A3. It was understood that these are not used for parking as they are undersized. It is possible that given the terms of your contract for the use of the garage Radian may be required to provide an alternative. No change required. |
| 24 | Thank you very much to the team that have put together the extensive data to enable me to clearly understand the brief of the plan. There is a lot of logic behind the draft and the from this information it is clear that you have selected the most practical and sensible places in the village and that the size of the plots and houses seem all within keeping of the village as a whole   | Noted   |
| 25 | I feel very upset that all the proposed planning is in Coombe Road. I also find it very worrying to think about the large amount of traffic it will cause, especially as this heavy traffic will be passing our Primary School. I feel the proposed building site will only make the flooding issue in Coombe Road worse and cannot understand how it could possibly make it better, as I have often been told. I am concerned about the slow worms and other wildlife in field B2 as these are a protected species. I would like to suggest to the NP steering group that they re-visit sites that were rejected due to the amount of dwellings previously being proposed. I feel that as the general village wish is to have small sites, which is fine but other sites need to be re-assessed. My personal view  | The development gives the opportunity to improve the current drainage -note policy EM15 seeks to ALLEVIATE current problems in Coombe Road. Also,   |

|    |   |   |
|----|---|---|
|    | <p>is that site B1 will be a more suitable site as there is not a flooding issue there and the farmer still gets to sell his land, but to have all three sites in Coombe Road is totally unfair and unrealistic</p>   | <p>supported by policy EM13. The EMNP cannot make the infrastructure providers make any changes, but developers can be required to upgrade. No significant vehicle generation will arise from any of the proposed sites. BI was the most unpopular site in the consultation. No change required.</p>  |
| 26 | <p><b>Location, Availability, Access, Traffic</b><br/> The EMNP Site assessment Summary wrongly asserts that existing access to Coppice Cottages is available. But this land is privately owned. So location of the B9 site access via the high coppice on the elbow of Coombe Road, the only access land which is available, will provide an extra hazard that can do no other than seriously worsen the traffic conditions in Coombe Road and Chapel Street for light and heavy vehicles, cyclists and pedestrians, which are currently just acceptably sustainable.</p> <p><b>Surface Water , Effect on Adjacent Properties</b><br/> Surface water also has a significant effect on road conditions at this proposed site. The EMNDP recognizes the recent increase in potential flooding (2014, 2015, &amp; 2016) but concentrates on the more northerly part of the village on the Meon Floor. However, the surface water on the Coombe Road elbow, though seasonally sustainable, could easily become problematic with increased hard surfacing of proposed site B9. It is quickly self-evident from the road surface at this point that the below average road surfacing is the result of underground springs and runoff from adjacent higher ground much more than the usual overhanging trees. Moreover the northern end of the immediately adjacent Coppice Cottages incorporates a traditional Meon Valley fuel cellar foundation structure which is well ventilated but originally designed to accept limited ingress of runoff during exceptionally long periods of heavy rain in order to protect the main structural foundations, to which Environment Agency Flood Alerts make frequent reference. Like the traffic conditions, this is currently sustainably acceptable on a seasonal basis, and probably has been for some hundreds of years; but with the considerable increase in hard surfacing which would be required on the proposed B9 site could become a</p> | <p>The assessment has been revised to remove reference to Coppice Cottages. A suitable safe access can be achieved from Coombe Road. The additional level of additional traffic generation would not sustain a highway objection to any of the proposals.<br/> The village is subject to views from all points of the compass (see SDNPA emerging Viewshed study) the more significant views are from the north given the elevation of Park Hill. The</p> |

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <p>serious problem for this adjacent property.</p> <p>Landscape Impact, Effect on Amenity, Effect on Street Character, Effect on Biodiversity<br/> In addition to the more obvious practical hazards of Traffic, Site Access, and the various, serious effects of Surface Water, the Amenity quality of Coombe Road would also be significantly affected by failure to meet the EMNDP and SDNP aspirations specified in: Landscape Impact, Effect on Street Character and Effect on Biodiversity.</p> <p>The EMNP Landscape Character Based Analysis of Potential Development Sites of July 2015 drawn up by David Hares Landscape Architecture for the EMNP Group is based on authoritative clarification of the SDNP planning values. It repeatedly emphasizes the importance of conserving narrow sunken lanes, hedgerows and tree belts.</p> <p>It specifically cites (p.22 at 5.2) the Coombe Road elbow as a particularly good example of these three elements coming together. It asserts: Vehicular Access would change the character of the lane; and the existing hazel copse [in which Coppice Cottages are set and so named] at high level above the lane, presenting difficulty of access. Well demarcated clumps of hazel are now fringed and interspersed with a variety of (self sown) trees and ground cover which provides an extraordinary biodiversity from bat roosts to habitat for a significant range of birds, ground mammals and entomological species. At the access point to Coppice Cottages are two Yew trees many hundreds of years old, and possibly as ancient as any remaining in the churchyard. The diverse over-arching canopy is uniquely restricted to the corner; it ends as it enters Chapel Street to the east, and the straight opposite Princes Cottages to the west to provide dramatic contrast with emergence on to the open section of Coombe Road. This is a unique enclosed landscape feature of great character and heritage, familiar and enjoyed by travellers moving to and for between the centre and the edge of the village.</p> | <p>geography of the village has meant topography and the heritage constraints of the conservation area, and lack of available sites limit the expansion north. East and West flanks of the village are generally highly exposed and unrelated to the core. This has meant that physical limitations mean that new development is naturally concentrated to the less constrained areas to the south.</p> <p>The policy for B2 requires the development to take the opportunity to improve the existing situation with surface water flooding.</p> <p>The development of B9 must demonstrate that greenfield run off rates can be achieved. Therefore, any increase in hard surfacing will be balanced against drainage mitigation in the form of</p> |
|---|---|

|    |  |   |
|----|--|---|
|    |  | <p>on –site storage. Whilst the loss if any biodiversity is regrettable the proposal does have the opportunity to rebalance the situation with additional mitigation through the planting of the woodland belt and create an accessible wildlife corridor with the changes suggested by SDNPA. The NPPF requires planning to balance harms and benefits. On balance B9 is a sustainable site if the mitigation set out in the policy is achieved.</p> |
| 27 | <p>1 &amp; 2 Coppice Cottages are situated on the south side of Coombe Road where the sharp corner has turned to the west. The recently re-instated proposed sites B9 and B2 are tightly adjacent to these properties, particularly B9 on the east side where familiar lines of sight of Butser Hill could well be screened off by two-storeyed houses immediately on the other side of the hedgerow. At the same time development of B2 is likely to screen off the open land to the west of Coppice Cottages, potentially hemming in these buildings all round, as well as annihilating open views of the South Downs for the properties along the north side of Coombe Road west of Princess Cottages, where the Amenity value of the properties mentioned is likely to suffer serious, adverse impact.</p> <p>All of the land involved currently lies within the Parish boundaries. However the newly proposed Settlement Boundary appears to take 10 m from the south settlement boundary of 2 Coppice Cottages. It is claimed that the proposed changes are to safeguard the adjacent developments of B2 and B9, but it is not at all clear from the map and accompanying explanations as to precisely what is being achieved by this change. Planning projects for existing properties can range from the acceptably discreet to the outrageously unacceptable, and</p> | <p>The emerging SDNPA Settlement Context Study for East Meon identifies the housing opposite proposed site B2 as creating a visual intrusion. The proposal for a southern circuit and woodland belt as recommended by the SDNPA as a response to consultation will go a long way to dealing with new development and existing</p>   |

|    |   |   |
|----|---|---|
|    | <p>as such can of course be accepted or rejected by any current planning regime. Specific fears can also be safeguarded by many different legal instruments such as mutually agreed covenants. It therefore seems unnecessarily draconian to impose a blanket ban on virtually all legal planning requests for existing properties, simply to protect properties not yet built, from intrusive planning which might not occur, but which, even if it did, could be equally well regulated by other means.</p> <p>It is to be hoped that during the next consultative period, there can, if necessary, be provision for some clarification and discussion on the degree to which such imposed settlement boundary changes deprive existing property owners of their current right to submit planning applications in accordance with whatever specific needs to adapt to unpredictable circumstances might arise for them on a particular case basis.</p>  | <p>impacts identified in the Viewshed study. Change proposed to add woodland mitigation and southern circuit. The changes to the settlement boundary at 2 Coppice Cottages is consistent with the adopted SNPA methodology.</p>   |
| 28 | <p>I'm not keen on the development on A3. With the pressure on parking in the village I don't think it's a good idea to remove these garages</p>  | <p>Radian support the redevelopment of the garages on A3. It was understood that these are not used for parking as they are undersized. No change required.</p>   |
| 29 | <p>I object to the inclusion of site B2 (south of Coombe Road, opposite Kews Meadow and Coombe Road Terrace) within the development proposals. This would constitute a fundamental break to the village boundary - at present there is no modern development to the south of Coombe Road - and the site is much more visible and sensitive than indicated in the Landscape Analysis. What is described therein as a 'hedge' is not, being a recent random planting of hawthorns and trees which would make very little impact on a row of new houses, particularly as the land rises sharply behind. Furthermore, the views indicated as being minimally affected by development have been assessed from a point at the bottom of the hill whereas the first close view of the village for walkers approaching on the footpath from Small Down is as they enter the field at the top, on a level with Duncombe Farm. That view will be seriously affected by development and cannot in any effective way be screened. At present the old, established hedgerow along Coombe Road provides, in combination with the road itself, a clear and clean visual break between the pastoral and the built elements of the village landscape. If development proceeds the walker will be greeted with a series of garden boundaries of no doubt varied character and planting and, inevitably, a more urban feel. There will also be an impact, further afield, on views across the village from the footpath between East Meon and Drayton and from the parallel road which forms perhaps the most dramatic vehicular approach to the village. Thus the site is 'significantly visible from adjoining</p> | <p>Given that East Meon sits in a bowl all sites will have some visual impact. The landscape assessment carefully considered all the sites and ranked them accordingly. Over time mitigation planting will contain the development, albeit this may take 10 years to reach maturity. No significant vehicle generation will arise from any of the proposed sites.</p> |



|    |   |  |
|----|---|--|
|    | <p>areas of the National Park', as identified in the Landscape Analysis as a criterion for avoiding development. The location of an adjoining footpath further adds to the sensitivity as does the fact that the development would also be visible to the very large number of walkers who approach the village from the west along Coombe Road. In spite of the hedge and higher level of the field the development will be clearly visible and have a deleterious impact. I believe, therefore, that site B2 should be categorized as having high sensitivity rather than medium and should be ruled out for development.</p> <p>In addition, there is already significant traffic along Coombe Road up to Duncombe Road, both residential and farm, and the fact that all the proposed development sites lead off it will exacerbate the situation and further diminish the rural nature of this small road, as well as taking more traffic past the school. This does not seem to me to be in any way an even spread of development proposals across the village. Site B9 (north of Coombe Road and adjacent to the football field) might be challenging to achieve but it would have the distinct advantage of not further pressurizing narrow country lanes. It is also very well screened from the south and east by existing housing, has the football field to its north, is not near public footpaths and is distant in the other key view, from Park Hill. Those sites along Temple Lane, beyond Anvil Close have been discounted because of the impact on the junction opposite the church but they could surely be serviced by a new access between Forge Cottage and Temple Brow.</p> | <p>An alternative access between Forge Cottage and Temple Brow was not offered by the landowners, and is likely to be outside their control. No change required.</p> |
| 30 | <p>Thank you for giving me the opportunity to comment upon the Pre-Submission Draft of the East Meon Neighbourhood Development Plan 2016 - 2032. It is readily apparent that a huge amount of work must have been expended in preparing such a thorough and well-founded suite of Draft documents. For this reason the nature of my comments (below) are minor in their nature:</p> <p>p.23; section 4.28<br/>Wording: Should that be The East Meon Pattern Book (cf. also Glossary entry at p.47)?</p> <p>p.23: Policy EM7: Building Materiality and Detailing<br/>Regarding facing wall materials; and not mentioned in the text: tile hanging (cf. Court House)?</p> <p>p.36: Policy EM15: Land at B2: (South of Coombe Road)<br/>Consider: tightening up the wording for the landscape and the foul and surface water drainage conditions to reference the site and dwelling finished floor levels condition? Not sure if you can call for simultaneous submission of condition information? In any event: consider any risks associated with the matter of levels (and heights etc.) otherwise becoming un-co-ordinated (i.e. circumvented) in successive conditions submissions.</p>  | <p>Suggest add advice re FFL in the policy B2 and B3/4 (and potentially other site policies). Amend other errors and clarifications as suggested</p>                 |

|    |  |  |
|----|--|--|
|    | <p>p.38: Policy EM16: Land at B3/B4: (Coombe Road)<br/> Consider: inclusion of additional conditions in relation to landscape and site and dwelling finished floor levels, generally as at B2 above.</p>   |  |
| 31 | <p>this development plan seems very extensive and I am concerned that east Meon will end up like the green lane development in canfield. as for the proposed development at coombe road I feel that there will not be any green areas left, therefore I strongly oppose all further development.</p>   | <p>No development was not an option open to EMNP. No change required.</p>  |
| 32 | <p>I am fully aware that this draft is to ensure the continued growth and development of the village as well as protecting its historic and rural settings, with that in mind I would like to know why the only proposals are in the southwest of the settlement boundaries when the plan states that the village would like development to be spread across the settlement area? There has already been much development in this area and I find it hard to believe that these are the only possible sites available for consideration within the village.</p> <p>Site B9 concerns me greatly because of the proposed access from the corner of coombe rod. This area is already difficult to negotiate at times. There is already an access road to copse cottages which the owners refuse to use because it is too dangerous on that corner. I cant see how the proposals address that fact? I have trouble enough emerging from the Radian owned carpark on coombe road. How will the plans address surface water issues? This is also the same with site B2 the area in front of this development floods very easily and I can only see further development there making the situation worse.</p> <p>The final issue I would like to see addressed is how are these sites going to deal with construction traffic? are all contractors vans etc. going to be confined to the site boundaries? Parking can be very difficult at times in the radian car park as it is let only having a dozen contractors vehicles using it.</p> | <p>The development gives the opportunity to improve the current drainage -note policy EM15 seeks to ALLEVIATE current problems in Coombe Road. Also, supported by policy EM13. The EMNP cannot make the infrastructure providers make any changes, but developers can be required to upgrade. No significant vehicle generation will arise from any of the proposed sites. New highway access point will be assessed for safety by the Highway Authority. Planning condition requiring contractor parking can be imposed, however, enforcement is difficult. No change required.</p> |
| 33 | <p>B9 is not suitable in my opinion, and I object to this proposed site, because, 1) It is prone to flooding( like other</p>   | <p>Policy EM13 deals with</p>  |

|    |   |  |
|----|---|--|
|    | <p>proposed sites in the village) 2) It's exit will be on the most dangerous corner in the village. 3) Digging up trees and a bank ,in the process, to gain access to the Coombe Road, will contribute to changing the "country " look of the centre of the village, into more of a suburban one. 4) Coombe Road already experiences a large volume of traffic at peak times. 5) The exit is very near to the school exit ,making it more hazardous for the children arriving and leaving school. 6) It could mean more cars parking in the Princes Cottages car park, which is inadequate for the residents already. 7) As with a lot of other places in the village, there is a raw sewage problem, and although every time we have new houses built, we are assured the problem will be solved, it never happens.</p>  | <p>surface water flooding and drainage. No significant vehicle generation will arise from any of the proposed sites. New highway access point will be assessed for safety by the Highway Authority. Planning condition requiring contractor parking can be imposed, however, enforcement is difficult. No change required.</p>   |
| 34 | <p>We write as owners and occupiers (<i>Identity redacted</i>). We have only recently read the latest draft of the East Meon Neighbourhood Plan and were dismayed that the earlier February decision not to propose the B9 site had suddenly been reversed, and also at the rationale of the suggested boundary changes. Neither of the occupants (<i>Identity redacted</i>), nor several other neighbours affected by changes to this and the adjoining B2 site, had received any intimation that such a revision was under discussion.</p> <p>Nevertheless, despite the lack of notice that we received about this reconsideration, as occupants (<i>Identity redacted</i>), we wish to emphasize our objection to the proposal of B9 in time for its inclusion in the material being made available for members of the village on June 4th.</p> <p>The reasons given on the latest draft come nowhere near to justifying reinstatement of the proposal. They are simply given as reducing the number of dwellings and making the access as safe as possible.</p> <p>In regard to access, the primary concern must be the safety of all aspects of traffic in Coombe Road, and in particular its effect on the School runs (EMNP 3.4). The EMNP Site Development Summary states that to create a safe access: alternatives are available, including via the existing access to Coppice Cottages. But this is a serious misconception. The access land to Coppice Cottages is privately owned and not available; and in any case, no new access to the high ground there or anywhere on the sharp corner of Coombe Road could do other than worsen the current level of safety to and from the School.</p> | <p>Policy EM13 deals with surface water and drainage. No significant vehicle generation will arise from any of the proposed sites. New highway access point will be assessed for safety by the Highway Authority. Biodiversity mitigation will be required. Although a technically challenging site there are no technical 'show stoppers' to development. It requires a sensitive proposal. No change required.</p> |

|    |   |   |
|----|---|---|
|    | <p>The present balance of technical Environmental issues such as Access, Run-off, Flooding, with important Amenity values of an aesthetic, ecological and historical nature associated with Local Green Space, is just sustainable. But to attempt to implement the latest B9 proposal seriously risks the loss of the unique historic deep lane coppice character of this part of Coombe road, as well as the current sustainable level of pedestrian and road traffic safety mentioned above. It would thereby fail drastically to achieve the laudable aspirations of SDNP environmental balance outlined in the EMNP preambles.</p> <p>What is crucial is that the problems inter-relate significantly on this particularly unsuitable site, so that to attempt to alleviate each one will only worsen the whole, making it even less appropriate. We therefore feel very strongly that the B9 proposal is seriously flawed and have quickly set down some very specific points and hinted at some important, more general issues, that we consider have not yet been properly taken into account.</p> <p>During the consultation process, as householders directly involved in the major effects of this area of the EMNP, we will be pleased to enlarge on the above issues in a focused and hopefully positive way; and also to include reference to boundary change, and alternative siting, as may be required.</p> <p>But meanwhile the significant problems still evident in the revised B9 proposal remain, and continue to confirm, overwhelmingly, the non-viability of development on this particular site</p> |   |
| 35 | <p>The Neighbourhood plan is a tour de force. I wonder at how the authors navigated and acknowledged all the pieces of official bossiness that the plan has to comply with. Within these confines it seems to me to be excellent.</p> <p>However, I feel that the confines of the official bossiness result in a plan that does not seem to have the best result for the village as a balanced community.</p> <p>The objectives I would place high are in part the same as those of the plan. The skew of the population towards the older people means that younger people need to be catered for. The skew of older people wanting to downsize also works against younger people being able to compete for what smaller houses that there are available.</p> <p>I was born and brought up in a countryside that was a thriving local economy not a dormitory for commuters.</p>   | <p>Development in the isolated rural parts of the Parish is not sustainable and is inconsistent with the NPPF the plan could not be supported by the examiner if it were to disregard the advice. No change required.</p> |

|    |   |  |
|----|---|--|
|    | <p>The dormitory village is here to stay; but there remains a need for housing that is affordable for country folk. Further, some need premises from which they can work, or at least have reasonable parking for white vans from which tradesmen work.</p> <p>This requires positive planning encouragement and does not fit all the business who would like to influence how we live. All that is required is a small corner and not necessarily in the village as such.</p> <p>Lest this be thought to be pie in the sky, recently one young craftsman from the village made us a pair of doors and needs a workshop. Another is doing some building work and needs a house that he can afford with a decent sized parking space for his white van. Also the young professionals who work for me drive for miles to work.</p> <p>Local housing is too expensive for young people. This is a problem that needs fixing.</p> <p>Other points are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Why put all the new houses up the end of the village which dictates their owners driving past the school and through the village to work?? A bit of lateral thought can avoid that.</li> <li>- Why shoe-horn all new building into a shrunk village boundary?</li> <li>- People have lived with fields all round them for centuries. I have been lucky enough to do so for most of my life and in centuries old houses. Again a little lateral thought suggests that a few houses in such places as Frogmore, Oxenbourne, and farms like Lower and South farms and Tigwell would have scarcely any visual impact.</li> </ul> <p>The countryside is a living community, not a vision set in aspic for the benefit of town dwellers. The latter are of course welcome, but that does not mean that people should be shepherded out of living in the countryside</p> |  |
| 36 | <p>I object to the proposed development at B9 I am a regular user of Coombe road and think that to put access on that already dangerous corner so near to the school would be an accident waiting to happen .</p>   | <p>No significant vehicle generation will arise from any of the proposed sites. New highway access point will be assessed for safety by the Highway Authority. No change required.</p> |

|    |  |   |
|----|--|---|
| 37 | <p>I think it is shameful that you should even be considering covering this beautiful meadow (B9) with concrete currently being used as pasture for sheep and their lambs. I also feel that the entrance is on a very dangerous/unsuitable bend, with many oversize farm vehicles using Coombe Rd, some at speed, serving the 3 farms facilities along this road.</p>  | <p>No significant vehicle generation will arise from any of the proposed sites. New highway access point will be assessed for safety by the Highway Authority. No change required.</p>  |
| 38 | <p>The potential sites listed are all bar one concentrated in the Coombe Rd area which seems unfair to the residents on the SW side of the village.<br/> They have already taken the new houses in the Green development and the disruption, extra traffic etc. It seems that Coombe Rd is to be in the firing line again.<br/> Has consideration been given to the extra traffic burden on the very narrow Coombe lane? Particularly as most traffic will be passing the Village School.<br/> There are also flooding issues with sites B2 and B9 as both these sites are at the bottom of the Downs.<br/> I would prefer to see new development within the original boundary described in the last village design statement.</p> | <p>No significant vehicle generation will arise from any of the proposed sites. New highway access point will be assessed for safety by the Highway Authority. The development gives the opportunity to improve the current drainage - note policy EM15 seeks to ALLEVIATE current problems in Coombe Road. Also, supported by policy EM13. The EMNP cannot make the infrastructure providers make any changes, but developers can be required to upgrade. There are no other suitable sites within the village boundary. No change required.</p> |
| 39 | <p>Having now read the draft plan and pattern book and most of the principal supporting documents it seems to</p>  | <p>Noted. The previous sites</p>  |

|    |  |  |
|----|--|--|
|    | <p>me the proposals for the sites are entirely logical and respect the principal wishes and needs of the village communicated during the lengthy process of the plan's development.</p> <p>The proposed updates to the village boundary also seem to honour the clear wish of the village (and the need to preserve the exceptional landscape and setting of the village) to keep new development tightly controlled.</p> <p>It is evident that a very thorough job has been done and interesting to note that the direction of the development of the draft plan saw no major change despite the wholesale change of personnel following the Parish Council elections. I think this demonstrates that the fundamental approach to the plan is sound even before considering the extent of professional advice taken and continuing communication with the SDNP.</p> <p>One small point of presentation - one of the most contentious issues quite naturally has been that of site selection and it is a pity that the document summarising the basis of selection does not incorporate or refer to (other than by the letter and number code) the original proposed sites plan, without which it is less easy for the casual reader to appreciate the spread and diversity of sites that have been considered and relate the decision criteria to each site. The plan is of course on the web site but is not specifically referred to as a document in the draft Neighbourhood Plan at 1.23 or in the links at Appendix A.</p> <p>The leadership group, the steering group and other helpers behind the scenes deserve huge thanks from the village for the enormous effort they have and continue to put in on our behalves.</p> <p>It would be an extraordinary waste and a worrying prospect for inevitable but less locally governed development if the village that voted convincingly to have such a plan was somehow unable now to back it.</p> | <p>considered are all within the supporting documentation. Referring to rejected sites does not aid readability of the final plan. No change required</p>  |
| 40 | <p>Overall I am very supportive of the Draft Neighbourhood Plan, and its policies. The choice of sites is logical and on the whole meets the stated wishes of the community. At the detailed level I would suggest some improvements:</p> <p>My biggest concern is site A3. From a landscape and planning perspective this is a suitable site. However I am told that there are severe parking issues in Hill View. This may exacerbate the problem with the school drop off and pick-up issues as discussed at the May 16th Parish Council meeting. As the Parish Chairman commented the main 2 related issues for all parishes are traffic and parking. Given that the 15 target can be achieved without these 2 dwellings it may be advisable to remove it from EMNP and allow this site to go through the normal planning application process where due consideration should be given to this.</p>   | <p>Radian supports the redevelopment of the garages on A3. It was understood that these are not used for parking as they are undersized. No change required. NDP team will build into the policy the requirement to seek alternative storage</p> |

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <p>The choice of sites is sensible pragmatically as these are the only sites with good access. I understand from a member of the Leadership team that the capacity of the narrow lanes i.e. Temple, Workhouse and Frogmore Lanes were an important consideration. I believe this should be explicitly stated, to both better protect these lanes in future and to document this conclusion for those who follow on after you.</p> <p>The plans, as provided, do not enable access into surrounding fields. It would be good if this was tied up in the EMNP somehow.</p> <p>One of the existing Parish Council projects is to address the stiles around the village. As a quid pro quo the landowner beneficiaries should be asked to replace all the stiles on their land with kissing gates, to the benefit of the infirm and large dogs.</p> <p>The Community Vision statement 3.0 is confusing, see <a href="http://www.plainenglish.co.uk/">http://www.plainenglish.co.uk/</a> - even if written clearly it does not seem to add much, so I would beef it up or preferably exclude it.</p> <p>The Settlement Boundary Methodology should form part of the evidence base.</p> <p>At the public meeting on November 14th Steve Ridgeon sensibly stated that this this was a 15 year plan and that the development should be phased over this period i.e. we do not want the developments all happening straight away. As the developments will all be along Coombe Road there should be a gap of years between developments to not inconvenience the same community over a prolonged period.</p> <p>Also at the May 16th Parish Council meeting the Parish Chairman advised that the Pattern book would be an integral part of the plan and so it should also be reviewed. This document does have value but does not seem yet ready to be published e.g. here is a typo on page 23 regulaity and photos required on Page 19 . In each section I would recommend putting in None if there is a null entry under Lessons. Some of the lessons would be worth summarising as these support some of the EMNP policies. It should also be dated, otherwise the document could be changed without appropriate review.</p> <p>Overall I am very supportive of the Draft Neighbourhood Plan, and its policies. The choice of sites is logical and on the whole meets the stated wishes of the community.</p> <p>At the detailed level I would suggest some improvements:</p> | <p>for users of garages. This will be built into a revision in the policy.</p> <p>The level of additional traffic generation would not sustain a highway objection to any of the proposals. Each site would need to be assessed on its own merits. No change required.</p> <p>Any benefits arising from the development must fairly and reasonably be related to the development. It is not appropriate to seek improvements to stiles around the village.</p> <p>The Community Vision was revisited and not changed.<br/>The SDNPA Settlement Development Boundary</p> |
|--|---|



|    |   |  |
|----|---|--|
|    | <p>My biggest concern is site A3. I reviewed this site for the Leadership team. From a landscape and planning perspective this is a suitable site. However I am told that there are severe parking issues in Hill View. This may exacerbate the problem with the school drop off and pick-up issues as discussed at the May 16th Parish Council meeting. As the Parish Chairman commented the main 2 related issues for all parishes are traffic and parking. Given that the 15 target can be achieved without these 2 dwellings it may be advisable to remove it from EMNP and allow this site to go through the normal planning application process where due consideration should be given to this.</p> <p>B9 is the surprise as it was not recommended in the original assessment or in the SHLAA. I am not convinced that those most affected have had the opportunity to understand the issues and make their case.</p> <p>The choice of sites is sensible pragmatically as these are the only sites with good access. I understand from a member of the Leadership team that the capacity of the narrow lanes i.e. Temple, Workhouse and Frogmore Lanes were an important consideration. I believe this should be explicitly stated, to both better protect these lanes in future and to document this conclusion for those who follow on after you.</p> <p>The plans, as provided, do not enable access into surrounding fields. It would be good if this was tied up in the EMNP somehow.</p> <p>One of the existing Parish Council projects is to address the stiles around the village. As a quid pro quo the landowner beneficiaries should be asked to replace all the stiles on their land with kissing gates, to the benefit of the infirm and large dogs.</p> <p>The Community Vision statement 3.0 is confusing, see <a href="http://www.plainenglish.co.uk/">http://www.plainenglish.co.uk/</a> - even if written clearly it does not seem to add much, so I would beef it up or preferably exclude it.</p> <p>The Settlement Boundary Methodology should form part of the evidence base.</p> | <p>methodology is part of the evidence base.</p> <p>The plan seeks to phase development with defined periods associated with site developments to avoid all activity occurring at the same time</p> <p>Revisions to complete the Pattern Book will be made for Regulation 16 submission.</p> <p>The NPPF requires planning to balance harms and benefits. On balance A3 is a sustainable site if the mitigation set out in the policy is achieved including additional mitigation for storage facilities for those displaced by the development.</p> <p>15 is a minimum and a contingency is required.</p> |
| 41 | My question is regarding the proposal for site A3, am I correct in saying that a development of only 2 houses   | Radian support the   |

|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
|  | <p>does not count towards the overall total?</p> <p>Given that the 15 house requirement would be met by the other 3 proposed sites I would not be in favour of the A3 proposal. As mentioned in your report, it would increase the already significant pressure on parking in this part of the village.</p> <p>Will the EMNP be considering the increased pressure on parking that these developments will make?</p>   | <p>redevelopment of the garages on A3. It was understood that these are not used for parking as they are undersized. No change required.</p>   |
| 42   | <p>I think it is a good and comprehensive plan and well done to the team. I was surprised, however, to see no requirements on the new building on energy and water efficiency which I understand is being included in other neighbourhood plans. Clearly houses will have to be built to the regulatory standards but should we not also have some expectation that new properties should be of the highest standard. This would mean that they not only limit their impact on the wider environment but also ensure that the new occupiers have low energy and water bills in the future.</p>   | <p>Energy and water efficiency is dealt with under the new national standards and building regulation. The Code for Sustainable Homes was abandoned by the government.</p>                           |
| 43   | <p>I think this looks really good. Small sites in mostly limited areas that could not be expanded upon. The sites are also pretty unobtrusive and inside the boundaries. My only concern is that the height of the houses could not be increased after permission was granted as happened with the newest houses on Anvil Close. Also that the site on Coombe Road could not expand across the field. There is a definite need for less expensive houses for young families who do not qualify for social housing. This will be of benefit to both the village and the school</p>  | <p>Noted</p>   |
| 44   | <p>All the proposed developments are on or off Chapel Street and Coombe Road. It is essential these are not built without substantial improvements to these two roads, particularly if houses are built at Coppice Corner. Can this work be done without closing Coombe Road to traffic? There are at least a hundred vehicles belonging to houses on the Duncombe Road estate, The Green and Coombe Road, and if the road is blocked, the detour to the village must be almost five miles ( up to Coombe, across to Leydene and back to the village). This is unthinkable ... and it is equally impossible for these cars all to be parked on the village side of Chapel Street while the work goes on. Roadworks allowing single lane access will lengthen the process whilst being highly disruptive?</p> | <p>No significant vehicle generation will arise from any of the proposed sites, construction vehicles can be controlled by planning conditions although this is challenging. No change required.</p> |
| 45   | <p>Thank you very much for an opportunity to comment. I found this draft plan easy to read and I agree with much of the rationale presented. The ability to question the editorial team at the drop-in was also very valuable. The conclusion that arises of a small number of small developments is one that I feel very able to support.</p>   | <p>Noted</p>   |
| 46   | <p>As expected the west (socially/economically 'lower' area) suffers more than the east of the village</p>   | <p>Noted</p>   |
| <p><b>Summary of comments received by Letter</b></p> |  |  |

|    |  |   |
|----|--|---|
| 47 | The Glebe Strip should be designated as a Green Space                                  | The Glebe Strip is protected by a covenant. It was not put forward by residents during consultations.                                 |
| 48 | West of the village suffers more than the East of village. B 2 and B 9 are undesirable | Noted   |
| 49 | West of the village suffers more than the East of village. B 2 and B 9 are undesirable | Noted   |
| 50 | Support for the Plan   | Noted   |
| 51 | Support for the Plan   | Noted   |
| 52 | A Traffic Assessment should be included in the NDP with a Traffic Policy               | No comments raised by Highways England. Site design will include assessment of traffic impact.  |
| 53 | Support for the Plan. Will Pumping Station cope?                                       | Support. A number of policies refer to water management including the need for each site to not make the current situation any worse. |