



Walberton Neighbourhood Development Plan 2019 - 2031

Consultation Statement

1. Introduction

Regulation 15 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 (as amended by the Neighbourhood Planning (General) (Amendment) Regulations 2015) requires that where a qualifying body submits a plan proposal to the local planning authority it must include (inter alia) a consultation statement being a document which:

- ◆ Contains details of the persons and bodies who were consulted about the proposed neighbourhood development plan
- ◆ Explains how they were consulted
- ◆ Summarises the main issues and concerns raised by the persons consulted
- ◆ Describes how those issues and concerns have been considered and, where relevant, have been addressed in the proposed neighbourhood development plan

This consultation statement has been prepared to meet the requirements of that regulation in respect of the Walberton Neighbourhood Development Plan.

2. Background

The Parish of Walberton covers an area of 1,044.19 hectares and has a population of 2,175 (2011 Census). The Parish is in general rural but contains three distinct villages Walberton Fontwell and Binsted each in its own setting. Walberton Parish Council (PC) provides local government service for the whole Parish. The surrounding parishes are Slindon to the north, Yapton to the south, Tortington to the east, Aldingbourne, Barnham and Eastergate to the west. The nearest major towns are Chichester (8 miles), Bognor (5.5 miles) and Littlehampton (5 miles).

Walberton is the largest of the three villages; it lies between Binsted to the east and Fontwell to the west. It has a form, with development either side of The Street, and along the roads leading into the village.

Binsted has the smallest population. It is spread out along a single road, part of which is privately owned; there are some very large properties intermingled with farm cottages and buildings. There are few new buildings apart from some extensions/ rebuilds and two barn conversions.

Fontwell is a more compact settlement than Binsted. It is situated in the northwest corner of the Parish, bounded to the north by the A27; its central street is the old A27 route, Arundel Road.

Walberton Parish produced a Neighbourhood Plan which was “made” by Arun District Council in March 2017. The referendum vote was 95.66% in favour and a turnout of 48.17% - the highest in Arun District.

Since then Arun’s Local Plan has been updated and Walberton Parish commenced work on a Review of their Plan in July 2017.

The Steering Group continued their work with new members whose skills encompassed an international sales and marketing event planner, an international company managing director, a system analyst, a veterinarian, software and network engineer, builder / property developer, statistician, technical / scientific author, finance officer and local authority land agent, chartered engineer.

3. Community Engagement

The Group agreed that, the previous eye-catching branding / logo, having successfully previously engaged our community, would be continued as an essential to promote maximum community engagement and also to ensure that the necessary consultation process drew in parishioners via the villages' website which contained links to important Plan processes and a dedicated email address.

Starting in May 2017 and continuing throughout 2020 issues of Neighbourhood News, banners and posters were produced to promote various aspects such as Open Days, Drop-In events, the Survey & Questionnaire, and the Consultation Day. Over the period there were various different and bespoke sets of banners which were placed in different locations throughout the villages. Posters promoting these were also placed on all notice boards, various residents' houses, shops, the two pubs, dental surgery, all three churches, Village Hall and the Village Pavilion.

The banners and posters encouraged everyone to participate and increased awareness of the Plan Review process; as a side benefit, they also served to improve the cohesion between the three different villages. A total of three different newsletters was delivered to all 875 residences and the 72 businesses in the Parish over the Plan Review period. The Group also made use of a Facebook page and Twitter feed.

Branding was consistent throughout and parishioners have become aware of the Plan Review and are being kept informed on a regular basis. Regular updates on progress with the Review were given to the PC, which was sent all drafts of the Plan for consideration and comment. Hard copies of all key documents are kept in the Parish office for any councillor or member of the public to read.

4. Survey Responses

Taking advantage of the experiences of other parishes and having taken local soundings, the Group put together a local Parish questionnaire with a map of the area showing 11 possible development sites (Survey). In March 2019 the Survey was delivered by hand to each of the homes and businesses, a total of 1,044, in the Parish. Almost 400 responses were received and the results were then analysed with other inputs so as to seek continued approval of the objectives and policies for the Plan, overlaid with a Parish Vision.

The Survey results and specific site analyses can be found in the Evidence Base, along with analyses of the other responses and over 900 freeform replies. Below is a summary of the leading issues that were identified from the Survey, other than the housing site reactions.

Environment and Sustainability

- The existing setting of the villages within open countryside should be preserved, with no development in the gaps between villages
- Green spaces within the villages should be protected and enhanced. It is important to ensure key habitats and wildlife corridors in the Parish are protected
- It is important to protect archaeological sites of special importance, even those without statutory protection
- Traffic increases and road conditions were a concern frequently raised, as were flooding and sewerage worries
- Housing density, infrastructure and traffic volumes were the main additional concerns raised.

Village Facilities

- Facilities strongly supported for retention or improvement were existing village stores, bus services, allotments, sports and games and social facilities for young people
- The main additional or improved facilities referred to in responses were footpaths and cycleways, improvements to Doctors' Surgeries, traffic and road improvements, and playing field improvements

5. Housing Needs Survey

A survey was posted to all households in the Parish in July 2017 and the results can be seen in the evidence base.

A survey was posted to all households in the Parish in July 2015 and the results can be seen in the evidence base.

This Housing Needs Survey was commissioned and drew statements from 42 people indicating a need to move to more manageable accommodation, citing bungalows, flats, assisted living and sheltered accommodation as requirements. Of all the 59 residents who said that they would require a home in the next 5 years; 80% of them wanted a home to buy or own and 20% would want to rent

6 Diary of Consultation

The Group met formally on many occasions and an organised timetable of events, leafletting, publicity, consultation and information-gathering took place.

The Group diary reveals the following:-

2017

10 July	69	Holly Tree – first discussions about a Review
August		Housing survey
28 July		Public meeting – over 250 attendees
15 September	70	Holly Tree

2018

19 Feb	71	Holly Tree
1 March	72	Holly Tree

1 March	Developer meetings
26 March	73 Pavilion
29 March	74 Mallards
3 April	Developer Meeting
3 April	75 The Pines
19 April	76 Pavilion – Developer meeting
23 April	77 Pavilion
May	Neighbourhood News 8
16 May	Annual Parish Meeting – presentation to residents
15 June	Arun D C - “Methodology for Distributing the Housing Figures”
18 July	Arun Local Plan adopted – Steering Group review
4 September	78 Mallards
24 September	Meeting N Plan officer at Arun DC
8 October	79 The Pines with Arun District Council officer
22 October	Neighbourhood News meeting - Mallards
23 October	Meeting at Arun DC
2 November	80 The Pines
21 November	Developer meetings
November	Neighbourhood News 9
7 December	81 Connest - including a landowner

2019

14 January	82 Mallards
26 January	Open Day – 148 visitors
4 February	83 Mallards
18 February	84 Pavilion
8 March	85 Mallards
March	Neighbourhood News 10 and questionnaire 378
29 April	86 Pavilion
13 May	87 Pavilion
21 May	Annual Parish Meeting
3 June	Administrator meeting
7 June	Developer meetings
24 June	88 Pavilion
8 July	89 Pavilion
25 July	90 Pavilion
12 August	91 Village small hall
12 September	92 Gable House
11 November	93 Mallards
27 November	AECOM site selection meeting
10 December	AECOM SEA meeting
16 December	94 Mallards

2020

7 January	Meeting with Plan administrator
13 January	Developer meeting
31 January	Meeting with Arun DC officer
27 January	95 Pavilion
7 February	Meeting at Arun DC
10 February	96 Pavilion
17 February	Meeting with Plan administrator and IT
25 February	97 Mallards
9 March	98 The Pines
3 July	Neighbourhood News 12 distributed to all households and businesses
15 July	Residents and businesses
18 July	Consultation Display – Walberton Playing Field and Pavilion windows and web site

Ongoing: Monthly article in the Parish Magazine since July 2017

These reports are in the Evidence Base.

7. Housing Sites Site Selection Process

The Group publicised the intention to prepare a Plan Review by way of 3 editions of Neighbourhood News, posters, banners, 2 Open Day events, a public meeting and at the Annual Parish Meeting in 2018, 2019 and 2020.

Contact was made with the owners of all sites listed as available by Arun District Council in HELAA and all owners who had contacted the Group or the PC. It notified them of the proposed Open Day on 26 January 2019 and informed them that details of their site would be included on a map of possible sites for development; it invited them to provide further information if they wished.

The Group made a number of site visits before the Open Day to meet site owners or their agents and discuss their proposals, so as to ensure an even-handed approach and a proper level of information on which parishioners could make choices. Not all landowners fully embraced the Plan Review production process, while others became fully engaged.

The Open Day on 26th January was attended by 148 people. A map showed 11 potential sites.

The full responses to the Survey are available in the Evidence Base and confirm that there was overwhelming opposition to development in the gaps and countryside surrounding the three villages and on large sites and that there was support for development on brownfield sites (both inside and outside the Built-Up Area) and for the idea that the 60 homes should be on different sites throughout the Parish and not all on one site.

The Group had conferred about the method of choosing sites and a formal list of criteria was agreed, together with the way to apply them; the Group looked at other parishes' processes compared with its own preferences and terms of reference.

Assistance was sought through Locality and AECOM were appointed to review all potential sites within the parish and produce a report which can be found on the evidence base.

The Steering Group reviewed this report and took in to account the survey's unpopularity ranking of sites.

Further meetings with some site owners were held to discuss queries on, or refinements to, their proposals; the issue of sheltered housing was considered for example. The Group was then able to make its individual site assessments of all sites, against its pre-agreed criteria and reach its final recommendations for sites providing 68 homes including housing for the elderly and those wishing to downsize.

The Site Selection Analysis can be found in the Evidence Base along with an assessment against known constraints which included sustainability considerations.

The Steering Group benefitted from the involvement of professional independent specialists (AECOM) to ensure the site selection process was sound and accords with the national and local planning policies.

AECOM were also engaged to draft SEA and HRA reports to ensure the soundness of our developing environmental policies.

The Group found informal consultation with officers from ADC helpful in ensuring that new policies were in alignment with the new Local Plan.

8. Parish Resident Consultation

The Survey results, together with a total of over 900-freeform suggestions, were backed up with verbal and written comments collated from the Open Day and the Consultation Day. These included comments on individual sites especially where housing proposals on them were refined during the consultation process. -Details of these appear in the Evidence Base.

The Group is satisfied that the management of the consultation process with residents allowed it to elicit not only their site preferences but also the full range of parishioner worries and concerns and needs in the future. It also drew in their positive suggestions about the Parish's change and development in the years ahead.

Each of the leading issues, with others that were raised, was considered by the Group and carefully addressed. The Group was required to make judgements, where parishioners' preferences were deemed to conflict with legislation and guidance, for example in respect of local green spaces

The Group was grateful for and gratified by the level of engagement from landowners and residents, with the result that it believes it was able to produce a broadly acceptable and justifiable reviewed set of policies and new sites through a rigorous and fair process that will stand scrutiny.

9. Regulation 14 Consultation

Statutory consultees were consulted through the Regulation 14 process.

The Draft Plan was sent to a list of statutory consultees and others (see Evidence Base).

The Group responses are made next to each point raised and are apps need to this Statement. These are very detailed and cannot practicably be summarised here, but in respect of policy wording, policy reasoning and descriptive sections, the majority of changes made by the Group was in answer to comment from ADC and to the positive suggestions from Southern Water. Their valuable contributions have been embraced except where the Group felt that its role as representing localism and residents' opinions in a positive and sustainable manner was, on balance, to be upheld, having proper regard to NPPF guidelines, the current Local Plan and relevant legislation.

10. Conclusion

The Consultation Statement details how the Group consulted with residents and businesses in the Parish, widely and intensively. It sets out what processes were followed, and details how and when views were sought, what views were sought and how feedback was received on draft proposals. It indicates how and when Group judgements

were made and how the Plan was brought together and policies drafted. Finally, it confirms via the Evidence Base how the Group responded positively to all statutory consultees and how it then reframed policies accordingly.

Suzanne Clark on behalf of

The Walberton, Binsted and Fontwell Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Group

Walberton Neighbourhood Plan – Reg 14 – responses from WSCC and ADC

WSCC	Policy and response	SG comments
Presentation	Suggest better maps are needed to identify sites and policies	Agreed (MC/AV)
Getting Around	Request a clarification on footpaths/footways on p.20; also clarify our objective re Scotland Lane	Agree to review wording (PB)
Education	The school numbers are not in line with latest reported figures	Accept and will make necessary corrections (BillP)
Housing Policies P 37	It is suggested that part of the Housing policies should aim to ensure there are more and better sustainable links between housing and facilities	Disagree – GA 2 should be sufficient
ARUN DISTRICT COUNCIL	A few minor errors	Agreed to edit
Local Green Space	Clarify the parish split on map of Dandara; query the boundaries of Avisford Grange LGS	Maps to be corrected where necessary (MC/AV)
Pages 29-30	Suggest reference should be made to the Green Infrastructure Framework mentioned in the LP	Agreed- the green area shown on the ADC map coincides with the important gap between settlements (AR/AV)
Conservation Areas VE4	Should there be design guidance?	No – that is role for ADC to impose

VE Buildings of special character	Should Old Smithy be there?	No – this section to be revised (AR/MC)
VE 10 Biod.	Suggest some action is required beyond the policies. Improve legend on Schedule Map.	No – amend reasons to allow for action but no policy required
VE 12 Views and Vistas	Appendix was missing, query the photo from Tye Lane and clearer presentation required	Agreed – general overhaul required
HP 6 Housing Mix	Can we clarify? Do we not want an affordable houses policy?	SG to consider what evidence we have to be more specific needs. ADC affordable policies should be enough, unless we can ask for Walberton preference.
HP 16 Sussex Business Park and CL 1,2,3	Evidence is needed to support this policy; might require a full review to identify the need for employment sites	E.Lawrence to be asked to provide market evidence plus Kevin Owen’s email of support.
CL 9 Child Care	There is no evidence that a child care facility is needed; concern about the facility so close to the Trunk Road.	The size and likely demographics of Dandara and NT field together bound to raise the demand – forward planning; WalbertonPlay Centre will provide support. Discuss the siting of the child care on the indicative layoutplan with N.T.

Walberton Neighbourhood Plan – Reg 14 Report – responses from statutory consultees (not ADC or WSCC)

CONSULTEE	Policy and response	SG Comments
Historic England	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Better map to identify housing sites and buildings of special character ➤ Suggest new core objective to conserve historic environment ➤ Long Wall – needs a historic impact assessment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Agreed (MC,AV) ➤ Agreed – a draft has been circulated ➤ That will be the responsibility of the landowner at the time of a planning application
Natural England	No specific comments	N/A
Southern Water	Suggest a new policy to in support of the Lidsey SWMP	This would logically be part of the policy VE7 which is a saved policy and will not be amended. The Lidsey SWMP is mentioned in the description of the Parish paras 3.4.5
Barnham & Eastergate Parish Council	Suggest the connection with neighbouring villages could be explored	The importance of the gaps between settlements will be emphasised and there will be a reference to the Green Infrastructure Corridor promoted in the Local Plan.

National Trust	No comments, supportive	N/A
----------------	-------------------------	-----

Walberton Neighbourhood Plan – Reg 14 Report – Landowners/Agents responses

Proposed Site	Comment	Any action
<p>Choller Farm adjoining Eastergate Lane: Henry Adams claims there is no justification for limiting growth to 60 units as that is not ADC formal policy. The NP should look further forward ahead to benefit the wider area. Claims LP and NP out of date and this site is convenient and suitable.</p>	<p>ADC have given clear support for working towards the 60 house target. This, combining with a further 400 new houses already committed more than satisfied the demonstrated need. The current market is very slow and it is unlikely that present permitted development will take place in near future. Parish is concerned that sustainable development of a community means a steady growth step by step. Services are barely adequate for the present population. These views backed by the AECOM Report</p>	<p>SC contacting ADC</p>
<p>Welbeck – their objection to the Reg 14 is in the form of a draft appeal against the last refusal of consent for development on this land. The claim is that development would be in sympathy with Dandara and careful landscaping would overcome previous landscape and access objections.</p>	<p>There is nothing new in the appeal draft. ADC and WPC have been consistent in opposition which reflect the overwhelming opposition of the population. Wandleys Lane will anyway come under pressure from Dandara; another estate of 157 would be ruinous. The Plan provides for the 60 extra homes and this site is not required.</p>	

<p>Land south of Blacksmith's Corner: This is a new site and has not been able to be assessed or put to the public. Henry Adams largely puts the same objections as for Choller (above). The claim is it is a natural extension of the village and well landscaped to reduce impact on the countryside.</p>	<p>The site is unsuitable because it would impact on the biodiversity corridor, would impact on the setting of the Conservation Area and is protected being within the important gap between settlements. The site was not formally considered as it was submitted too late and is not needed.</p>	
<p>Land west of Tye Lane (Langmead): this objection comes in the form of a proposal to soon submit a planning application for 140 housing units. Henry Adams proposes access from Tye Lane plus emergency and cycleway at the west end by Field Close. He wrongly claims AECOM's report was a desk study.</p>	<p>The site has been proposed several times in recent years but has been overwhelmingly opposed by residents. There are likely to be severe drainage issues and the open field is seen as an essential setting for the village. When land to the east of Tye Lane was developed, the Highway Authority agreed with the Parish Council that the road was not suitable being too narrow and with an almost blind T-junction into The Street. Furthermore, three of the options for the A27 Arundel Bypass would close the northern junction into to the A27. These consistently held views were confirmed by AECOM's assessment which followed careful site inspections.</p>	
<p>Pigeon House Farm: Lichfields thought that the land would be a natural extension to the village, although recognised that an application now might be premature.</p>	<p>Access to this land via Dairy Lane would be quite inadequate. Most importantly, the land forms part of the gap between settlements which is a key element in preventing the coalescence between Walberton and Barnham/Eastergate.</p>	

Walberton Neighbourhood Plan – Reg 14 Report – Resident’s responses

THEME	COMMENT
<p>Overall – out of 114 responses only 8 were unhappy about the general thrust of the Submission and many strong comments in favour.</p>	<p>The central theme of the NP is to retain Walberton, Fontwell and Binsted as villages – retaining the village feel and opposing the merger with other settlements. The protection of the surrounding countryside is essential.</p>
<p>Infrastructure and services- widespread concern that they will prove to be inadequate to support proposed development in the area. Rather than an acceleration, residents would like to see a slow down to allow services (such as doctors, water supply, sewers and surface water drainage) to be improved prior to new development.</p>	<p>Agreed – that is why the NP wants to provide for child care at Fontwell before the completion of Fontwell Meadows.</p>
<p>Overdevelopment at Fontwell – some 400+ houses are already proposed in the made NP. While the provision of the childcare land is welcomed, there is a feeling that this is a step too far and, at least, the National Trust land should be delayed until Fontwell Meadows is completed. Concurrent development of these sites would make life difficult for residents. Some feel the air quality adjoining the A27 may be problematical.</p>	<p>A well understood point of view – the triangle at Fontwell is valued, but it is inevitable that this site – being surrounded by the A27 and the Built Up Area – will get planning permission and so a negotiated form of development to be of service to the community is justified. The indicative layout will come under scrutiny at the application stage.</p>

<p>Conservation Policies – these are welcomed as they recognise the importance of biodiversity and the protection of heritage. There are suggestions to extend the biodiversity corridor at Fontwell and to introduce stronger design policies – e.g. carbon neutral housing. There should be a green approach to design.</p>	<p>Arun’s Local Plan has strong design policies concerning sustainable development and quality design within Conservation Areas. It is considered that it is unnecessary to duplicate these policies in the NP unless a special local priority can be identified.</p>
<p>Individual Sites – residents are generally content with the selected sites for development and support the inclusion of some flats and smaller properties. There is some concern that access to the land at the rear of Long Wall could be detrimental to the Conservation Area. Residents were very worried by the number of large sites that had been put forward and relieved that most had been rejected on sound planning reasons, backed up by AECOM’s professional endorsement.</p>	<p>The land at Long Wall will need care in design; the principle is sound, the land being within the Built Up Boundary but outside the Conservation Area. ADC will have the responsibility to apply policy.</p>
<p>Traffic – residents are concerned that the considerable numbers of houses to be built in the area is going to put a huge pressure on the local road system, which still consists of country lanes. Many hundreds of extra cars will make the roads less likely to attract cyclists. The issue of an Arundel A27 Bypass is a continuing concern.</p>	<p>The traffic build up is partly dependent on the rate of building; despite the pressure to find new sites, the evidence is that the rate of building is actually likely to slow down as sales are disappointing.</p>