Ford Parish Council

Ford Parish Council Neighbourhood Development Plan 2017-2031
Consultation Statement

Published May 2017

1. Introduction

1.1 This consultation statement has been prepared to meet the legal obligations of the Neighbourhood Planning Regulations 2012 in respect of the Ford Neighbourhood Development Plan.

1.2 The legal basis of the Statement is provided by Section 15(2) of Part 5 of the 2012 Neighbourhood Planning Regulations, which requires that a consultation statement should:

1. Contain details of the persons and bodies who were consulted about the proposed neighbourhood development plan;
2. Explain how they were consulted;
3. Summarise the main issues and concerns raised by the persons consulted; and
4. Describe how those issues and concerns have been considered and, where relevant addressed in the proposed neighbourhood development plan

2. Background

2.1 Ford residents along with others objected to the 2008 Eco Town proposals. It would be fair to say that the process left a lasting legacy against developers and a huge suspicion that any form of development was just another way of starting the Eco Town.

In 2011 it was decided that the Parish should produce a Parish Plan and this was started with a survey of all residents (see Parish Plan results - http://ford.arun.gov.uk/main.cfm?type=EVIDENCEOFCONSULTA)

Arun District Council (ADC) had not allocated the airfield for development in the emerging Local Plan and there was no Parish housing allocation.

Then the Government introduced the NDP legislation. Ford Parish Council applied to become a Designated Area and this was approved by ADC on the 6th December 2013.

3. Neighbourhood Plan Process

3.1 A NP team consisting of parishioners and Parish Councillors was formed to work towards the creation of a NP. As part of the process they looked at derelict or unused farm building sites and the abandoned Tarmac production complex. They wrote to Tarmac but were informed that they had just sold the site. It was decided from the start to include the local land owners and meetings were opened to non-Ford residents to gauge the public response.

3.2 In 2013 Grundon Waste Management advised the Parish that they were to build a large waste incinerator on the former Tarmac site. The Parish Council called an Extraordinary meeting on the 29th November 2013. The Parishioners were furi-

ous that having just fought off the Eco Town another massive development was planned that they felt was of no benefit, indeed it was detrimental to the area. At that meeting it was agreed that a plan encompassing the whole former airfield should be developed. It was expressed by those attending that if they did not take back control Ford would become one massive rubbish reclaiming site. The resentment from those attending was very strong and they instructed the Council to oppose the Grundon Development.

3.3 In 2013 a survey was carried out into what the community valued and to gather evidence to support the NP.

3.4 In the Local Plan Publication Version of ADC's Emerging Local Plan (October 2014), under Policy SP1 Ford was identified as a potential location for housing growth in the later part of the plan period, however no housing number was established.

3.5 In 2014 an Open Event was held at which further views were collected.

3.6 The next problem the group faced was the project was too large and complicated for the group alone. So many options had been looked at over a two year time span and although in favour of some development, size, type and location within the airfield space proved very complicated.

3.7 An advisor was employed to help to write the plan and suggest some options for the development of parts of the Parish.

3.8 The proposed solution was simple, the group decided that in order to progress they should work with the land owners and their agents to try and develop a master plan with their help, expertise and resources. The plan had to be acceptable to the group; contain certain elements that had been identified through the Parish surveys and would have to be supported by the Parishioners at referendum, so we saw no conflict of interest.

A meeting was called and the group's ideas explained to representatives of Barton Willmore Associates of The Blade, Abbey Square, Reading, Berkshire. The group informed them that they had reached a place that they could not progress from regarding how to set out any development.

The group informed them that they wanted them to work together to provide a plan in accordance with the survey findings. Once done a public meeting would be called and if the plan was supported it would proceed along those lines. If the Parishioners did not approve the plan the group would stop work at that point and not submit a housing allocation in the Plan.

They readily agreed to help and there have since been two Parish open days using the plans they prepared around development areas the group proposed.

3.9 In February 2015 the first plan showed 650 to 700 houses. Parishioners voted to continue with this Neighbourhood Development Plan approach.

3.10 ADC submitted the draft Local Plan to Examination on 30th January 2015 which was subsequently suspended on 16th July 2015 to allow ADC to consult on the revised Objectively Assessed Housing Need (OAHN) to inform the revision of the Local Plan.

The NP group engaged with ADC over the OAN shortfall shortfall and decided to consult on a higher housing number.

3.11 In November 2015 plans were exhibited and Parishioners' attending were asked to vote on which one they wished the group to follow (see November 2015 event display boards in Evidence Base). The vote proved narrowly in favour of working towards 1500 homes on the sites identified in the display maps. This number of houses would allow the site to provide the community infrastructure the parishioners were seeking.

3.12 Ford at that point became a reserved site for development identified by Arun District Council's Local Plan.

3.13 On the 22nd March 2016 the Group made a presentation to the Planning Committee of ADC explaining the aims of the Parish and showing details of the layout and content of the Masterplan for the site (see presentation in the Evidence Base). This was well received.

3.14 On the 3rd May 2016 the Pre-submission Plan and SEA was put out for consultation under Regulation 14. A list of all the responses can be found at http://ford.arun.gov.uk/main.cfm?type=REG14CONSULTATIONR
The responses were used to refine the Plan.

3.15 In March 2017 the emerging ADC Local Plan formally included Ford Airfield as a strategic housing site for 1500 homes. The group were unhappy that it also included an eight form entry secondary school which had not previously been requested. After representation this was removed from the emerging Local Plan as a site specific allocation pending further investigation work by ADC.

3.16 In May 2017 the NP group presented the final submission plan to the PC for approval to submit at Reg 15.

4. SEA

In June 2015 a SEA Screening Report was submitted to ADC which sought an opinion on whether an SEA was required. ADC adopted a screening opinion on 13th July 2015 which stated that SEA was required. The first phase of the SEA was the scoping stage. The Scoping Report (Appendix 3) was submitted to ADC on 25th November 2015 and a Scoping Opinion was adopted by ADC on 20th January 2016.

5. Note from Parish Council Chairman

As Chairman of the Parish and NDG I am aware that the parish wants a master plan for the airfield not ad-hoc piecemeal development. I believe that the past uncertainty over the area of development has prompted the group and helped the Parishioners to decide their own realistic and sensible approach to development. This was after considering all the pressures of a part brown field site and the government's determination to build houses.
Throughout the process the group has worked closely with the Neighbourhood Plan adviser at ADC and thanks her for all her input.

Appendix A - Summary of representations made at Reg 14

Consultee	Section	Comment	Response
Mr Waller	1.2	Section 1.2 states that the FNP Steering Group is a delegated decision body on behalf of Ford Parish Council. Thus its activities should be as transparent as those of the Parish Council itself. Unfortunately this is not the case. As is evident from the Ford PC website, the majority of the agendas and minutes of the Steering Group meetings have not been made available for public scrutiny, thus suggesting that there has been something to hide. To alleviate this implication, all the agendas and minutes of the FNP Steering Group should be posted on the Ford PC website as a matter of urgency.	Minutes of meetings to be added to web site.
Mr Waller	1.4	Section 1.4 introduces the SEA which is said to "inform the proposed policies in this document". However, as mentioned above, this is not surprising as it has been prepared by Barton Willmore planning consultants who, quite clearly, have hijacked the FNP as a back- door means of achieving their long-held objective of gaining planning permission from ADC for a major strategic housing development on Ford Airfield on behalf of Wates Developments Limited, Redrow Homes Southern and Landowners at Ford Airfield. Indeed, at least one of the latter has been closely associated with both the Parish Council and the NP Steering Group throughout the development of the NP and its predecessor, the Parish Plan. This clear conflict of interest should therefore be publically declared.	
Mr Waller	3.1	Section 3.1 contains the first of 3 mentions of the parish church. The others are in Section 3.3.2 and 3.3 (page 15). This duplication is unnecessary and confusing. It should be corrected.	Each mention is in a different section and needs to be so.
Mr Waller	3.2	In Section 3.2 there is no evidence of the size of the Housing Waiting List in Ford. Perhaps this is an omission, or perhaps there isn't one. This should be an important part of any NP's baseline, especially as on page 13 it has already been stated that Ford does not have a housing allocation in the Local Plan.	1093 residents in the area - registered as living in the Arun District.
Yapton PC	3.2	There is no evidence of the size of the Housing Waiting List in Ford. This should be an important part of any NP's baseline, especially as on page 13 it has already been stated that Ford does not have a housing allocation in the Local Plan.	The 2014 survey showed a small number of people requiring housing in the future.
Mr Waller	3.3	In Section 3.3 (on pages 14 and 15) the paragraph concerning the roads is thoroughly confusing. It needs to be re-written. There is also an overlap here with the two paragraphs in Section 3.5. A joint re-write would be sensible.	Strengthen text
Yapton PC	3.3	The paragraph setting out the road network is confusing. Where the Parish is served predominantly by Lanes (B roads) both the name of the Lane and B road number should be used. Distances need to be stated opposed to loose references to 'pinch points' and 'middle parts' of roads.	Strengthen text
Mr Waller	3.7	The first paragraph in Section 3.7 is confusing. It could be taken to imply that "the majority of economically active residents are full time employees" in the Parish's 128 businesses. I suspect that this is not the case. Clarification is required.	Figures for residents employed in Ford are not known. Plan has been updated to reflect this
Yapton PC	3.7	Section 3.7 is misleading. It could be taken to imply that the majority of economically active residents are full time employees in the Parish's 128 businesses. This does not tie in with the SEA which states that 76% working residents drive to work which would imply that they work beyond the Parish boundary as indicated in the 2014 Ford Survey Q8 Where do you usually work? 70%+ residents answered outside the Parish boundary.	Figures for residents employed in Ford are not known. Plan has been updated to reflect this
Mr Waller	5.1	In Section 5.1 a number of key principles are listed, apparently stemming from the review of Ford in Chapter 3 and the consultation events described in Chapter 4, however four of them do not seem to be supported by the evidence set out in these earlier chapters of the FNP, viz: "Extending Ford to a small village not a larger town". This principle would seem to be at risk by the proposal to build a minimum of 1500 extra houses. "Retaining Ford Airfield Market". This has not been mentioned before, and as it operates on some of the airfield's brown-field land, it would preclude building thereon. Is this the best use of such land? Also, the new inhabitants of the very large numbers of houses proposed may not themselves be happy to have such an activity (and the associated traffic) on their door steps. "Creating affordable housing for local people". Again, the need for this has not been mentioned before. Where is the evidence that this is an aspiration of the people of Ford? "Creating housing for the elderly". There is no evidence in the FNP that this is something that is needed in support of the people of Ford. If there is evidence it should be highlighted in either Chapter 3 or Chapter 4, and then it can rightly become the basis for appropriate policies. As it stands, several of the Policies in Chapter 6 are not supported by local evidence – which should be the basis of any NP.	The original objective was to keep the village as a small village. However later consultations developed the idea coming from residents that they wanted to create a village heart. To do this they voted to accept housing to support that ambition. The November 2014 consultation opted for the housing and its preferred choice. The Market site is an extant business which has planning consent. There are no plans to remove it. The 2014 survey showed support for housing for local people. This does not just mean local to Ford Parish but to the wider Arun District area in line with the ADC Housing Strategy.
Mr Waller	5.2	Section 5.2 one of the core objectives of the FNP is said to be "To retain and protect the character and cultural heritage of the Parish". Unfortunately this is then completely ignored by the statement that "The FNDP will allocate two sites for a total of approximately 1500 homes", which - by any measure - will undoubtedly change the character and cultural heritage of the parish. Also, the figure of 1500 homes has not been justified in the earlier chapters of the FNP, and there is certainly no local need – other than the need of the local landowners to sell their land to the developers for construction in accordance with the plans recommended by their planning consultants - who have clearly played such a large role in the development of the FNP itself.	Wording amended
Mr Waller	6.3	Object to this Policy on the basis that it is a strategic development in support of a possible increase in ADC's yet-to-be- agreed house-building target, and especially because it fails to take any account of the wider infrastructure and other implications of such a large development on the adjacent areas in Arun District. This proposal should be dealt with under the aegis of the Local Plan, not the FNP, especially as all the evidence to date, and well as earlier planning judgements, has shown that such a large development at Ford is unsustainable.	The NP is a reflection of the wishes of those residents who have taken the trouble to express them.
Mr Waller	2.1.1	Section 2.1.1 stresses that paragraph 16 of the NPPF requires an NP to develop plans that support the strategic development needs set out in Local Plans and to focus on development that is outside the strategic elements of the Local Plan. However, the ADC Local Plan has not yet designated Ford as a sustainable area for strategic development, and the FNP should instead therefore be concentrating its attention on meeting local development needs in support of its existing population. 8. In support of the above comment, I draw attention to the fact that the inclusion of proposals for large-scale housing development in the Ford NP is contrary to Arun District Council's policy concerning Neighbourhood Plans, as explained in the Officer's Report covering its consideration on 25 November 2015 of a proposal for the building of 400 homes on land at Fontwell, viz: "NPs are formulated on the basis of a specific quantum of required development. In this case, the Barnham & Eastergate Plan is prepared on the basis of 200 dwellings to be provided within the Parish during the Plan period. The policies contained within the Plan therefore relate to this level of development and are intended to be locally specific. Policies with NPs are not to be used to consider strategic scale development - that is the role of Local Plans". 9. It is of course quite possible that, as part of the on-going development of its stalled but emerging Local Plan, Arun District Council will highlight additional locations for long- term strategic housing development, and it is not surprising if its eyes are drawn to Ford Airfield. However, it is disturbing that a combination of Ford Parish Council, the landowners of the airfield, the potential developers and their planning consultants seems to have hijacked the neighbourhood planning process in Ford in order to gain a local tick-in-the-box for such a large strategic development before the vast majority of the people in Arun District have even had an opportunity to comment on the suitability and sustainability of ADC's draft proposals. The housing proposals in the Ford NP should therefore be restricted to meeting the local needs of the Ford community, taking full account of the views expressed in the responses to the surveys of residents conducted in 2012 and 2014.	This misses the point that the residents who have engaged with the process are clear that they want a heart to the village and no more dirty' industry. By taking control through the NP process they are seeking to manage their own destiny.
Yapton PC	2.1.1	Section 2.1.1 stresses that paragraph 16 of the NPPF requires a Neighbourhood Plan 'to develop plans that support the strategic development needs set out in Local Plans, including policies for housing and employment;' However, the FNP seems to be selective in its use of evidence base for its key policy relating to housing. It also pre-determines Arun District Council's ongoing findings relating to future sustainable housing sites which have yet to be fully assessed, consulted upon and agreed at all the necessary Arun District Council Committees. YPC are concerned that FNP has exceeded its intended purpose in planning terms. Arun District Council's own policy concerning Neighbourhood Plans, as explained in the Officer's Report covering its consideration on 25 November 2015 of a proposal for the building of 400 homes on land at Fontwell, states: "NP's are formulated on the basis of a specific quantum of required development. In this case, the Barnham & Eastergate Plan is prepared on the basis of 200 dwellings to be provided within the Parish during the Plan period. The policies contained within the Plan therefore relate to this level of development and are intended to be locally specific. Policies with NP's are not to be used to consider strategic scale development - that is the role of Local Plans". YPC believe that for neighbourhood planning purposes Ford should therefore be concentrating its attention on meeting local development needs in support of its existing population. This approach would also better reflect the views expressed in the responses to the surveys of residents conducted in 2012 and 2014. YPC find it implausible for FNP to have policies based upon a Parish SEA which will have ramifications on the wider eastern area of the District. YPC would expect a policy of this magnitude to be properly considered at District level with District-wide community engagement and consultation and subject to a genuinely independent SEA and planning process. YPC believe that the inclusion of any yet-to-be-agreed large-scale strategic housing development site in a Neighbourhood Plan as wholly wrong and undemocratic.	
Mr Waller	2.1.2	In Section 2.1.2 (on page 10) it is stated that "the FNP is being prepared in anticipation of the adoption of the new Arun Local Plan". However, as this new Plan has not even been written, albeit that there are as yet untested thoughts turning to the prospect of strategic housing development at Ford, the idea of including such strategic development in the FNP is unwarranted and premature. The wording used in the draft FNP is therefore premature and inappropriate. As far as the Arun Local Plan is concerned it is stated that the FNP must "demonstrate conformity with the strategic policies contained in the District Council's development plan". However, because of the conflict in timescales, the latter will not have been agreed, let alone consulted on, by the time that the FNP arrives at the next stage of its drafting process, and this is yet another reason why the FNP should not be based on the assumption that strategic housing development may eventually be found to be sustainable at Ford. Similarly, in respect of the statements about the Arun Local Plan 2011-2031, the proposed modifications are by no means firm, they have not yet been spelt out in detail, they have not been approved by the Council for public consultation, they have not been subject to an independent SEA, and they have not been endorsed by a Planning Inspector. Thus they are not a sound basis for use in the FNP. Indeed, in contrast, the FNP states that "the parish does not have a housing allocation designated within the emerging Arun District Council Local Plan", thus confirming that the idea of planning for any strategic development at this stage is definitely premature. Also, the information that "there is pressure from other parishes for Ford to use land on the former airfield for housing" is not a sound basis for the amount of development proposed in the FNP. The latter stems solely from long-standing NIMBY proposals from villages to the west of Ford determined to avoid large-scale housing developments in their own areas. Thus, contrary to the stated idea that the inclusion of any yet-to-be-agreed large-scale strategic development at Ford would justify a statement of "General Conformity of the Neighbourhood Plan", it is clear that it would be nothing of the sort. The FNP has been hijacked by the Ford landowners, their developers and their planning consultants as a premature short-cut aimed at achieving the District Council's early approval for such a development without being subject to all the various stages of public and other consultation involved in the development of a Local Plan.	
Jill Mirza	3.3.1	Reference is made to" buildings or structures of character", but would it be possible to see similar detail given to listed buildings, in particular, reference to preserving and enhancing the setting of listed buildings would be welcome. Secondly, I was most surprised to see that despite the emerging Arun Local Plan having no allocation for housing in Ford (page 11), the Neighbourhood Plan proposes 1500 homes on the Airfield site (page23) This virtually triples the number of homes in the parish and appears to contradict the wishes of 95% of respondents to the 2014 Neighbourhood Plan Survey?	Remove the detail of the buildings as they are in the EB. Preserving and enhancing setting are fully detailed in Local Plan policy however we could add a policy.
Mr Waller	3.3.1	On page 16 the FNP is inconsistent. In Section 3.3.1 the four Buildings of Character are specifically delineated, yet in the following Section 3.3.2 four of the five Listed Buildings are not. This requires review.	Remove the detail of the buildings as they are in the EB. Preserving and enhancing setting are fully detailed in Local Plan policy.
Aziz Mirza	3.3.2	There's very little mention of the listed buildings (section 3.3.2). It's important that the area around listed buildings is protected from development, so that the building's setting is preserved. There are six listed buildings in Ford: I would suggest that the Neighbourhood Plan Group should consider establishing a Conservation Area (3.3.4) which links these six buildings (from Atherington House in the west to the Church in the east). Such a Conservation Area, which would travel along Ford Lane, would additionally include three out of the parish's four Buildings or Structures of Character I agree with the comments made by Historic England in their response 14 January 2016, see para starting "At 3.41 we disagree..." and the following paragraph relating to "providing a rural character setting to this building and others along Ford Lane" Furthermore, and to protect the rural setting as mentioned by Historic England, I believe the bio-diversity zone (policy EH6 on the map) should cover ALL land to the north of Ford Lane.	Remove the detail of the buildings as they are in the EB. Preserving and enhancing setting are fully detailed in Local Plan policy. Look at the suggestion about the new CA
Mr Waller	3.3.6	In Section 3.3.6 there is information about facilities for the elderly, but this is repeated in Section 3.7.6. A joint re-write would be sensible.	They are in different context. Don't agree.
Yapton PC	Background Documents	There are two important background documents missing from the list on page 47. These are The West Sussex Waste Plan and The West Sussex Transport Plan, both of which contain information pertinent to the FNP and should be considered.	Add - WS Waste Local Plan 2014 - WS Transport Plan 2011-26
Arun DC	BUA1	It is assumed that the first sentences before BUA1.1 are intended to be the policy, so this should be in bold. Bolding of first sentence needed and modification to map required. Will the BUAB include any of the existing development, or merely the proposed new development? It is not clear at the moment.	Yes should be bold. Suggest we do not add any existing developed parts of Ford in to the BUAB
Viridor	BUA1	The county council is the statutory Minerals and Waste Planning Authority; responsible for planning matters related to the extraction of minerals and the management of waste, and is also the Waste Disposal Authority; responsible for the management and disposal of household waste. As you are no doubt aware, the County Council make decisions on all planning applications for minerals and waste developments and are responsible for preparing a Minerals and Waste Local Plan. The Minerals and Waste Local Plan forms part of the development plan which sets out the planning policy against which planning applications must be considered. Neighbourhood Development Plans should not include policies or proposals for minerals and waste development, they should however be in conformity. The Pre –Submission Draft Map identifies waste sites, this is unnecessary for the Neighbourhood Development Plan. Of fundamental concern is that draft policies are included which look to control these waste developments. Policy BUA 1 relates to the built up area, and the types of developments to be permitted within this. This is not clearly defined on the proposals map. Policy BUA 2 and BUA 2.1 relate to new 'infrastructure development' yet identify existing wastes sites within Ford, where this would be applied. This is beyond the scope of the Neighbourhood Development Plan. These matters of non-conformity need to be considered and addressed before the neighbourhood Plan is progressed further.	Suggest we do not add any existing developed parts of Ford in to the BUAB BUA2 seeks to permit further development of those sites but with the not unreasonable caveat that they should not cause harm to the amenity of existing or proposed properties by way of noise or smell.
Yapton PC	BUA1	YPC would expect this proposed area to be significantly reduced in size and area to reflect the consultation's finding, that a desire to retain the Parish's rural feel be maintained. The boundary should reflect the area of airfield that has kept its defined boundary and not that land that has merged into the countryside with no clear delineation between former use and countryside/agricultural land i.e. that lying to the south of Ford Lane west of the access road to the Bleach of Lavant depot.	Will be shown on the Reg15 version
Clymping PC	BUA1	We note that this boundary is unclear on the proposals map at this stage and are unable to comment on this material point in this consultation.	Will be shown on the Reg15 version
Arun DC	BUA2	Similar to the previous policy none of the wording is in bold, although it is assumed that the bullet points and preceding paragraph is intended to be. What is this policy trying to achieve? These developments already exists. The wording needs at least some revision considering that the NP seems to deliberately not be allocating these within the allocations (simply recognising their use and status). Following on, there also needs to be a slight revision to the reasoning as the higher tier plans have policies relating to amenity and inappropriate location of new development. Therefore required distances etc. need to be adhered to and incorporated in the design (e.g. odour/noise) Some reference to phasing of infrastructure may be appropriate in this policy or at least cross-reference to where may be found. Recommend Bolding of the first paragraph and bullets needed to form policy wording. Additionally, following revisions suggested: "...These sites identified as being covered by this policy on the Proposals Map include:....."	
Barton Wilmore	BUA2	New Infrastructure Development It is unclear what the policy is since it is not in bold. Suggest amendment to first paragraph of the policy: "Infrastructure development at the sites shown on the Proposals Map ... " Final sentence of third paragraph contains a typographical error, suggest rewording as follows: "...FPC will work closely with the applicants to mitigate any adverse impacts on the setting of the village and the wider environment."	Agree
Mr Waller	BUA2	This Policy contains a hint that the proposed development of approx new 1500 houses may have an "adverse impact on the wider environment". This is undoubtedly so, but if any such development is approved as part of the FNP rather than the Local Plan, those who live in the wider area will be denied to opportunity to participate in the necessary wider debate. Also, this Policy says that Ford PC will work closely with "the applicants" to mitigate any adverse impact. Presumably the latter are Wates Developments Limited, Redrow Homes Southern and the Landowners at Ford Airfield, though it is unclear from the FNP as written that any application had been submitted by anyone (even in draft form).	This statement relates to any future applicants.
Grundon	BUA2	The Plan has failed to assess conformity with the planning policies of West Sussex County Council in relation to their minerals and waste Plans. These Plans contain allocated and permitted sites that are covered by policy to control their development and also to safeguard their ongoing use. Given that there are four waste sites within the Parish and two on its boundary we see this as a serious omission. Neighbourhood Plans are not supposed to include policies on minerals and waste and on their development or control. These are excluded development types under the Localism Act. However the Neighbourhood Plan identifies and seeks to place policy constraints on three waste sites in Policy BUA2 and BUA2.1. The above points we see as being issues of non-conformity and believe that these points should be rectified before the submission stage.	The development layout takes into account the aims of Policy W2 by locating sports fields around the waste sites.
WSCC	BUA2	This policy explains that the sites allocated on the Proposals Map for a waste incinerator (gasification plant), waste water treatment plant and recycling centre will be acceptable subject to the requirements of this policy. It sets out some key areas for consideration and states that any proposals on the above sites will need to have consideration to the proposals coming forward through the site identified in Policy SA1 (Ford Airfield). It is requested that Policy BUA2 is re-drafted to ensure that it has regard to the adopted policies of the West Sussex Waste Local Plan. It is suggested that this policy does not add to the requirements set out in the Waste Local Plan. Please note, all of the sites identified in this policy have planning permission and have already been determined in accordance with policy. Strategic Policy W2 of the adopted Waste Local Plan seeks to safeguard waste management sites from neighbouring development that may prejudice their continuing operations.	The development layout takes into account the aims of Policy W2 by locating sports fields around the waste sites.
Mr Waller	Chapter 4	This paragraph is very weak. 23. The first sentence refers to the Steering Group, which has very clearly been led by the nose by Barton Willmore, the developers and the Ford landowners. Indeed some of the latter may have even been members of the Group. This should be clarified. 24. The second sentence concerns the involvement of the community, but very carefully omits any mention of the 2012 and 2014 surveys and especially the results. For instance, in the survey of residents in late 2014 94% indicated that they were opposed to large scale or excessive development, and 73% supported only small scale development to meet local housing needs. This is important data, which shows that the majority of respondents in Ford are likely to be opposed to the idea of building a minimum of 1500 additional houses in the village. This is strong justification for an urgent review of the Barton Willmore-led proposals, even at this late stage. 25. Of the four "key issues" which are highlighted, the second issue makes no sense. What is meant by the "rural file" of the Parish? If it is supposed to mean "rural life", then that will surely be destroyed by the addition of a minimum of 1500 extra houses to the 500 or so already in Ford. Similarly, the third issue seems to be far exceeded by the proposal to build so many houses. As already stated, the FNP contains no justification whatsoever concerning the local Housing Waiting List and there is no housing allocation for Ford in the Local Plan. Thus, the vast majority of the new housing will be for outsiders, and the contention that the FNP's aim is to "provide homes for local people" is almost entirely specious.	The developers have never been part of the group. Barton Wilmore, representatives of Waites and others have been invited openly to consultation events and some meetings to discuss possible options. It has always been made clear what their role is. There are over 1000 residents of the Arun District currently on the ADC housing waiting list.The NP cannot restrict the allocation of housing to only those who live in Ford. It seek to support the wider District housing requirements.
Yapton PC	Chapter 4	YPC would like to state that the consultation process has been lacking with regard to informing and including adjoining Parishes during the FNP process. YPC believe that the key policy and aim of FNP – 1,500 homes to be located on a non-designated strategic housing site – will have a significant and detrimental impact on all adjoining Parishes and Town Councils thus requiring proper and full cross boundary and community engagement opposed to 'personal invites' to the 550 Ford residents only. YPC would question whether the large proposed housing scheme truly aligns with the results of the consultation surveys - 73% supported only small scale development to meet local housing needs and 94% indicated that they were opposed to large scale or excessive development; findings that do not appear to support the Parish's proposed threefold expansion. This is further backed-up by Q35 Which of the two options do you prefer A or B? 55% responded neither with only 40% responding to prefer either A or B. YPC would also like to express concern at the wording used in both the Resident's letter of March 2014 'The Neighbourhood Plan is your chance to put in place a legally binding document to STOP excessive building on the airfield.', and that used in Ford Event November 2014 questionnaire. Two options were given, extract below: Yapton Parish Council response Page 3 08 June 2016 YPC believe that the tone of the resident's letter is alarmist and the phrasing of the questions influences respondents through the words 'partial control' and 'full control' especially as neither full nor partial control can be given at this stage where the ADC LP has not been adopted and must be disregarded. This questionnaire produced 13 in favour of 1,500 homes 9 in favour of 750 homes and 3 don't knows. This is the only visible evidence supporting the community's desire for a large scale housing development of 1,500 homes in their Parish. Yapton believe that 13 votes is an insufficient response to formulate and drive the FNP and would ask for a wider and more in-depth analysis on local housing need for Ford before the FNP can go out for full consultation. The FNP contains no justification whatsoever concerning the local Housing Waiting List and there is no housing allocation for Ford in the Local Plan. Thus, the vast majority of the new housing will be for outsiders, and the contention that the FNP's aim is to "provide homes for local people" is entirely specious.	At the start of the process a member of the team was a serving Yapton Parish Councillor. Cllr Haymes is the District Councillor for both parishes and has been fully aware of the Plan from the start. As soon as the Plan was in a state that could be shown, Yapton PC were invited to a meeting where they were presented with the Plan. There are over 1000 residents of the Arun District currently on the ADC housing waiting list.The NP cannot restrict the allocation of housing to only those who live in Ford. It seek to support the wider District housing requirements.
Yapton PC	Chapter 5	YPC welcome FNP vision to enhance and promote the rural character and vitality of their Parish. However, YPC fail to see how the FNP 'principles' derived from the consultations events translate into the FNP proposed Core Objectives and Policies. "Extending Ford to a small village not a larger town". This principle would seem to be at risk by the proposal to build a minimum of 1500 extra houses. "Retaining Ford Airfield market". There is no evidence base indicating how a 'drive-to' open air market can be made sustainable in transport terms by the very nature of this category of retailing experience. The Ford Airfield Market and Car boot website states that it is 'One of the South Coast of England's largest all year round Sunday Markets and Car boots open every week with permanent mud-free level access' One of the core objectives of the FNP is said to be "To retain and protect the character and cultural heritage of the Parish". YPC challenge the validity of this objective when followed by the statement that "The FNDP will allocate two sites for a total of approximately 1500 homes", which - by any measure - will undoubtedly change the character and cultural heritage of the Parish. YPC again seek clarity as to how the figure of 1500 homes has been justified as tangible evidence is missing from the FNP in terms of local need and Parish allocation.	The Core Objectives come from the consultation events and work done by the community. Ford Market is an existing business with an extant Planning permission. Building houses does not change the cultural heritage of the Parish. It will change the character but it is argued by residents that the dumping of waste sites on the airfield does more to damage the character than well designed housing will.
Yapton PC	Chapter 6	Several of the Policies in Chapter 6 are not supported by local evidence – which should be the basis of any NP. YPC would request that the omitted evidence be included or sufficient time provided for such additional work to be allowed to ensure a robust evidence base to form FNP far reaching policies which will impact adjoining Parishes and communities.	All of the polices are supporting the objectives of the Plan which were set out by the residents.
Arun DC	EE1	Would some small scale expansion of the industrial estates along Ford Lane be supported?	The policy is showing support for upgrading and extending all employment sites.
Arun DC	EE11	Cross-reference to policy SA1 and clarify this.	Done
WSCC	EE11	This policy supports the relocation of Ford Industrial Estate to land within the masterplan site and the re-use of the land for housing. This area should be shown on the Proposals Map for clarity.	Agree
Environment Agency	EE11	Should it be decided to relocate the industrial estate and re-use the land for housing, due to past industrial activity the land may be subject to contamination and the comments detailed in 2) above for Ford Airfield will apply.	Understood
Arun DC	EE3	The intention of this policy only becomes clear through reading the supporting text. The policy needs to be clear on its own and it is a requirement that new development recognises existing uses. Suggest the existing sentence is removed and replaced with the following: "New development should ensure there is no conflict with existing uses. Mitigation should be appropriate to minimise, as far as possible, the potential effects identified to future occupants."	Agree- see below
Barton Wilmore	EE3	Protection of existing businesses The proposed policy appears confused and would benefit from clearer wording. We would suggest text along the following lines: "Policy EE3: Safeguarding amenity Any new development must demonstrate how it will safeguard the amenity of existing or future residents without compromising future economic growth. Appropriate mitigation will be required to minimise the conflict between uses, but must not lead to a sense of severance within the community."	Agree
Arun DC	EE4	This mentions "site allocations should be on the Proposals Map" but it is unclear exactly which of these the policy is intended to relate to – all or one specifically, currently there is nothing identified with EE4. It is assumed this is intended to be the site allocations but then this would exclude those covered by BUA2 or EE3 etc. Clarification required.	Agree - look at wording
WSCC	EE4	This policy supports the change of use to Class B1 uses. However, it is unclear which areas this policy refers to on the Proposals Map. Further clarification should be provided.	Agree - look at wording
Arun DC	EE5	as part of this policy would you support a proposal for a cycleway along the river bank through the parish and would you support the provision of additional car parking near the station to serve both the station and the cycleway? Does this policy relate to tourism accommodation or all tourism related uses? ADC has a landscape study which can form a useful evidence base. Please note that this is currently being updated at the moment.	Add policies to say these would be supported
Barton Wilmore	EE7	Sustainable commercial buildings We are uncertain on the interpretation of the first bullet point and whether 'parking' refers to cars or bicycles. We would suggest one of the following dependent on the meaning of the policy: a. Secure vehicular parking and storage of bicycles for customers and employees Or b. Securing cycle parking and storage of bicycles for customers and employees	
Arun DC	EE8	What evidence is there to justify this policy? Evidence and clarity required. How does EE8 and EH5 differ?	It differs from EH5 because many of these uses are not on Graded land. It is justified as the District as a whole needs to retain employment opportunities and such uses contribute to the rural character of the Parish which residents have voted to retain.
Arun DC	EH2	Proposals should not harm the significance of the heritage assets. Some forms of energy generation, such as biomass, may actually be part of creating a sustainable business within agriculture and due to the quantity of higher grade agricultural land in the Parish, this may be restrictive to the intention of the vision that Ford still have the highest amount of land in agricultural use. If not removed, then at best the following addition should be made to the end of this bullet. "...unless justification can be provided as part of a wider diversification strategy, benefitting the wider parish."	Agree to last line addition
Mr Waller	EH2	It is surprising that no mention is made here of the adverse traffic implications of such activity, especially as the new residents of the 1500 or so new homes may not welcome such traffic in close vicinity to their dwellings, and especially in the light of the core objective "to retain and protect the character and cultural heritage of the Parish". HGV traffic associated with renewable energy plants is generally unwelcome in or near residential neighbourhoods.	This policy clearly states that it relates to individual properties or groups of properties. It specifically excludes agricultural activities .
Yapton PC	EH2	This contradicts policy BUA2 New Infrastructure Development and YPC would strongly object to an increase in any HGV traffic in the area.	This policy clearly states that it relates to individual properties or groups of properties. It specifically excludes agricultural activities .
Arun DC	EH3	...retain their local distinctiveness" is repeated twice in one sentence.	Typo - agree
Mr Waller	EH3	This Policy seems to be incomplete, in that it does not include the 4/5 Listed Buildings in the village. Reference is made to an "Article 4 Direction" (of what?). Also, does Article 4 apply in respect of buildings which are neither listed nor in a Conservation Area? This should be checked.	The policy is not about Listed Buildings. Buildings and Structures of Character are not Listed Buildings
Yapton PC	EH3	Buildings and Structures of Character. This Policy seems to be incomplete, in that it does not include the 4/5 Listed buildings in the village and ignores the importance of the protecting the buildings 'setting'. This should be included.	Buildings and Structures of Character are not Listed Buildings
Mr Waller	EH4	Most of the detail in this Policy reads as though this was a Local Plan. It is out of place in the FNP, which should not replicate information from the LP.	We are happy with the wording which has been approved in many NPs
WSCC	EH4	It is suggested that the first sentence is amended to the following: 'New development should aim to reduce the overall level of flood risk in the area through negotiations and use of developer contributions'. In the second bullet point, please remove reference to the 'SUDS Lead Local Flood Authority' and replace with the 'Local Planning Authority'. The SuDS approval Body part of the Flood Water Management Act 2010 was not enacted. In the third bullet point, it is suggested that 'seek opportunities' is added before 'to reduce flood risk overall' in the first sentence. This is because there is no requirement to reduce flood risk.	Policy reworded inline with Examiner comments on Aldingbourne NP
Clymping PC	EH4	Surface Water Management. "Consideration" only of SUDS schemes is at odds with the comprehensive requirement in policy SA1. Potential issues of flooding and drainage are a key concern for Clymping	See above
Arun DC	EH5	A correction is required as the DEFRA mapping system referenced is believed to be MAGIC, although since April this has been replaced by the Open Gov website. This simply refers to the exception being land shown on the Proposals Map, although this is not clear as to whether this is all coverage identified or a specific part. The following amendment is suggested to reflect the situation with national mapping of agricultural land "...Natural England (See the DEFRA online system OpenGov data website), ..." Additional wording needed to make it clear the land that is considered an exception. Reserve further comment on this following confirmation of what is covered under the exception situation.	See below
Barton Wilmore	EH5	This policy conflicts with other proposed policies, notably policies allocating land for development. We suggest the following amendment to the policy as follows: "All planning applications will need to be accompanied by an Agricultural Land Quality assessment. Outside of the built up area boundary identified on the proposals map, proposals for development on Grade 1, 2 or 3a agricultural land will be refused, unless the harm associated with the loss of this land is outweighed by the public benefits of the proposed development. Where it is deemed that development of Grade 1, 2 or 3a agricultural land is necessary, the proposed development should demonstrate how it has sought to develop poorer quality land in preference to that of a higher quality."	Agree
Arun DC	EH6	As written the policy does not support it's own1500 homes, needs to say unless agreed by this plan .... The intention of BOAs is that these are landscape scale areas that are identified as having appropriate characteristics for expansion of habitats, but this seems to be a protectionist policy and not encouraging the overall intent of this designation. The following amendment and additions suggested: "...Within this area, support will be given to the enhancement and expansion of habitats. Ddevelopment will not be permitted unless it is reasonably necessary for the purposes of agriculture and then only then if it is designed to minimise disturbance to integrate with habitats."	Agree
Natural England	EH6	Generally the Plan deals reasonably with the natural environment and we particularly welcome measures within Policy EH6 (Green infrastructure and Biodiversity Opportunity Area).	Noted
Arun DC	EH7	EH7 is labelled as being a Local Gap but this does not correlate to the policy name in the plan and there is no mention to the proposals map in this policy. It is recommended that an addition of key with relevant colours/shadings plus correction to labelling (specifically EH7 as identified).	?
Arun DC	EH7	This would be difficult to use for assessment of an application having no quantification, although linkages to the National Park and its setting could well be added into the justification. The proposals map includes reference to this policy number but calls it 'Local Gap' and there is no mention in either the policy or supporting paragraph about the proposals map. Separately this policy does not encourage or specify any exceptions or controls relating to any new lighting to be introduced into the Parish, on grounds such as safety. The proposals map needs reviewing and the policy re-wording.	EH7 Light Pollution - The policy makes it clear that any new lighting would have to conform to the highest standard of light pollution restriction at the time. That is enforceable and explicit. New lighting does not have to intrude on the night sky even if used for safety purposes.
Barton Wilmore	EH7	We consider that the proposed policy conflicts with the objectives of the plan seeking to create a heart for Ford, and the policies seeking to make allocations in the parish. Any new development is likely to have an impact on the unlit environment, no matter how minor. Therefore, we would recommend a reworded policy as follows: "Development proposals must demonstrate how they will minimise the impact of light pollution on local amenity and the night skyline."	The policy makes it clear that any new lighting would have to conform to the highest standard of light pollution restriction at the time. That is enforceable and explicit. New lighting does not have to intrude on the night sky even if used for safety purposes.
Mr Waller	EH7	This Policy states that "there will be a presumption against street lighting" which seems to be inconsistent with the proposal to develop a residential area comprising a minimum of 1500 homes.	The policy makes it clear that any new lighting would have to conform to the highest standard of light pollution restriction at the time. That is enforceable and explicit. New lighting does not have to intrude on the night sky even if used for safety purposes.
Clymping PC	EH7	Light pollution appears to contradict policy H1	Don't agree there is no conflict. The policy makes it clear that any new lighting would have to conform to the highest standard of light pollution restriction at the time. That is enforceable and explicit. New lighting does not have to intrude on the night sky even if used for safety purposes.
Barton Wilmore	GA2	Parking and new development Our client considers the need to provide the maximum standards of off street parking to be an onerous requirement that will have negative sustainability effects. It will prohibit a creative design based approach to development in some areas where densities should be higher, for example around transport hubs and local centres. It may also lead to a car dominated environment where large driveways and parked cars create a physical separation from homes and the street, reducing passive surveillance. Having said that our client understands the need to provide sufficient parking, and would suggest the following amendment to the policy: "Car Parking should be accommodated within the curtilage of the dwelling in the form of a garage and/or parking space. Development proposals will be supported only if they include the maximum level of off street parking consistent with the current local standards, unless the applicant can demonstrate this would compromise the ability to deliver a high quality design or reduce the overall sustainability of a proposed development. Developments that reduce the amount of off- street parking currently available will only be supported if they make enforceable provision for equivalent off-street parking nearby. Parking spaces provided in connection with such proposals will be required to be made available in perpetuity."	Agree
Mr Waller	GA2	Most of the detail in this Policy reads as though this was a Local Plan. It is out of place in the FNP, which should not replicate information from the LP.	Don't agree
WSCC	GA2	Please refer to the County Council's Guidance on Car Parking in Residential Developments and the Car Parking Demand Calculator.	The policy states that the current standard must be applied
Yapton PC	GA2	Parking and New Development. YPC note that FNP stresses the problem with a high level of HGV movements within the Parish and the need to reduce and improve this traffic problem. Policy GA3 – Streets and Access Ways to serve New Development. YPC would request that the FNP looks beyond the confines of site SA1 and tackles the real problem that has prevented any large scale development in Ford or indeed the area west of the River Arun, poor transport links and infrastructure. The FNP is silent throughout on how to remedy the current congestion issue in the Parish and how it will tackle this issue which will only be exacerbated and magnified by the provision of 1,500 new homes without a road network solution.	This is dealt with within the SEA and as part of the Strategic Transport Plan work being carried out by ADC.
Clymping PC	GA2	GA2 is potentially at odds with the SEA that suggests the aspiration for cars to be the secondary transport mode. Clymping Parish Council agrees that the local roads suffer from HGV use for which they are not designed. Is there any evidence that the aspirational parking policy can actually be implemented without banning on street parking through traffic regulation orders?	
Mr Waller	GA3	Most of the detail in this Policy reads as though this was a Local Plan. It is out of place in the FNP, which should not replicate information from the LP. Also, the emphasis on safety seems to be undermined by the previous Policy EH7 which stresses a presumption against street lighting.	Don't agree. Safety is not dependent upon lighting that cause pollution it can and should be designed sensitively
Arun DC	H1	It is not clear if a design brief is required for every application or just strategic ones. This needs to be clarified. The explanatory text only refers to the second element of the policy. Further justification is required. What about broadband in the long list?	Amended. Broadband connections don't affect the design
Barton Wilmore	H1	The last sentence of the first paragraph states that the character of the parish must be reinforced. However, as we have set out in comment X above with regard to the objectives, this may conflict with the desire to change the character of the village through a new centre. Consequently, we would suggest the following amendment: "...a design brief which demonstrates how the defining characteristics of the parish (as referenced in the objectives of this plan) will be reinforced."	Agree
Yapton PC	H1.1	Lighting, contradicts Policy EH7.	No it doesn't
Arun DC	H2	mentions a Ford specific dwelling mix – what is this? There is specific mention of the CLT and a PC run housing association, although there is no detail provided anywhere about either of these. Further detail is required. It is not for parish council's to approve registered partners this is ADC's role as a Local Planning Authority in delivering affordable housing. The policy needs to be re-written.	Trevor?
Yapton PC	H2	YPC would expect a sustainable mix only part reflecting Ford's needs as the 1,500 proposed units would be for 'incomers' not residents due to the sheer quantity of housing suggested. The mix must therefore represent a broader population/ demographic base to be sustainable.	
Arun DC	H3	Is the policy related to 'windfall' or 'infill' development? The content reads more like 'infill'? At the beginning this mentions redevelopment sites, which currently would seem to be outside any likely built up area but then the penultimate bullet mentions they should all be in the BUA. Ensure that this full reflects intentions both in terms of policy wording and any decisions over where the BUA is determined; OR Remove the reference to redevelopment sites.	Amended
Barton Wilmore	H3	Windfall sites We would suggest clarifying / defining what is considered to be a 'small residential site'.	Amended
Mr Waller	H3	So, not only is the FNP supporting the strategic development of a minimum of 1500 new homes in the Parish, but it is also saying that "permission will be granted on infill and redevelopment sites" (not that the Parish Council has the power to grant planning permission). This looks like open sesame for Wates Developments Limited, Redrow Homes Southern and the Landowners at Ford Airfield, as well as other landowners, to cover the airfield in new houses as per their long-held ambition to build up to 10,000, or even 20,000, new homes there. It is noted that Condition viii stresses that "all development will be expected to use brownfield sites". However if this is a valid condition for windfall sites, why has a similar condition not been proposed in Policy SA1?	
Yapton PC	H3	YPC object. Without an indication of BUA2 map likely windfall sites cannot be objectively considered. YPC will not support a policy that encourages infill between the two built-up boundaries between the adjoining villages wishes to promote FNP Policy SP1.2. YPC would also state that any housing over and above the proposed 1,500homes would seem excessive.	The BUAB map will clarify this.
Arun DC	H5	This policy is not supported as this policy does not comply with Arun's Housing Allocations Policy. It is recommended that this policy is deleted.	It complies with the ADC Allocations Scheme 2014. This housing may not be delivered through Arun's housing allocations policy.
Mr Waller	H5	Since there is no local housing need, the whole of this policy would seem to be superfluous. It is not the job of a parish council to control who comes to live in a strategic housing development, albeit on its doorstep. Thankfully neither Britain nor West Sussex nor Arun District is yet a Soviet Socialist Republic, and this offensive and intrusive Policy should be deleted. If there is a need for any sort of gentle control, it should be exercised by ADC.	This housing may not be delivered through Arun's housing allocations policy.
Yapton PC	H5	Local Connection. YPC support the sentiment of the policy but fail to see evidence supporting its need.	This housing may not be delivered through Arun's housing allocations policy.
Arun DC	H6	Isn't this a design policy? Should this be covered within the design policy? 31.P44 policy GA2 and supporting text - This is named as being new development but is focused on housing so either requires addition of a paragraph mentioning where mentioned elsewhere or renaming. Suggest it is renamed.	Combined with H1
Yapton PC	Introduction	The introductory statement fails to give sufficient consideration to the Arun District Council Emerging Local Plan. Favouring instead, incomplete additional studies relating to possible housing policy which has yet to be presented to Arun District Council or indeed approved by the Council. YPC have grave concerns that FNP has gone beyond its remit of supporting and aligning with District level planning policy but running roughshod over it.	Dont agree
Arun DC	LC1	This policy needs to include affordable housing as currently set out it is not supported.	Why? The housing policies deal with affordable housing this is about care provision
Clymping PC	LC2	The policy is admirable but development should not proceed without suitable, viable local medical provision.	Agree but doctors surgeries always say they can cope.
Arun DC	LC4	Though there is no reason for us not to allow the designation of these in broad principle, it is not clear why LGS status if needed specifically for these areas and not LOS. Regardless of which one, it is important that the following paragraphs of the PPG are adhered to. Paragraph 020 states that the qualifying body should have made contact with the landowners at an early stage and allowed comment. Further under paragraph 022 it mentions that "if the features that make a green area special and locally significant are to be conserved, how it will be managed in the future is likely to be an important consideration." It is recommended that further expansion of the reasoning as to LOS would not be sufficient for these areas. Clear outlining of the contact with the Prison must be detailed in the Consultation Statement, particularly considering the content of para 022, that there would be no need for expansion at any point over the plan period.	This has been done. The Governor of the Prison has been involved in the Plan and the MoJ were a consultee but have not as yet responded. The land in question is not part of any know plan by the prison to expand.
Yapton PC	LC4	Designation of local green spaces. YPC would expect more open space to be designated within a rural Parish.	The designation of LGS is very strictly controlled. It cannot include large tracts of land. The only other land that could be considered falls into that category. The Policy restricting development outside of the BUAB gives protections to the rural areas.
Natural England	LC5	LC8.1 (p38/39) covers the site at the Ship & Anchor Public House. This is within an area identified as possible functional land for the Arun Valley SPA. It looks like the Plan is just confirming existing usage but note that any change in operations and/or size for this site will require appropriate screening.	No change proposed.
Environment Agency	LC5	The site at the Ship and Anchor pub which your Neighbourhood Plan seeks to allocate for camping and caravanning facilities is within Flood Zone 3. We are aware that an existing planning permission for this use is in place (Arun District Council Planning Permission Reference F/2/87). The NPPF and Table 2 of the Planning Policy Guidance on Flood Risk and Coastal Change classifies this use as being More Vulnerable and therefore an allocation of this nature would need to be supported with evidence of flood risk including a Sequential Test and if this can be passed an Exception Test, as defined in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). Without this evidence, the Environment Agency would consider this allocation unsound.	There is an extant permission of the site and no plan to change anything merely to secure the use of the land.
Arun DC	LC6	no.6 in the list are simply trees that edge the highway. What is County's view on this? And importantly planning should not replicate where there is protection through other routes. Suggest that this entry is removed.	See below
WSCC	LC6	This policy proposes to designate areas within Schedule B as Local Open Space where development would not be permitted. This includes highway verge fronting Yapton Road, as it is currently used by residents to walk along the road. As this is located on the edge of the Ford Airfield site, it is suggested that this policy does not preclude the potential for the addition of pedestrian infrastructure in this area in the future.	This has been considered by the group and they believe that the alternative footpath provided within the master plan site will provide such access and be safer and more pleasant than a path along the verge. The Community may seek to improve the biodiversity of the very by planting trees and shrubs in the future.
Arun DC	P31	WSCC as LLFA do not approve the Suds schemes. ADC Planning undertake this approval role. This needs to be corrected. ADC Engineers provide the technical expertise to the ADC Planners to apply appropriate planning conditions to each development. We then recommend that these conditions are discharged once the drainage designs have met our requirements. It may be useful to liaise with ADC Engineering Services to further understand the process.	Policy changed. N/A
Arun DC	P46	This lists Barnham Flooding & Pollution Position Statement, Atkins (2010) under the supporting documents but there is no understanding as to why it is included as this is not mentioned anywhere in the Plan and clearly relates to a separate area. There is nothing on the evidence base page of the website called Natural England Designations as they have listed in their supporting documents list. It lists a Housing Site Appraisal Report 2015 although this is not contained in the evidence base list on the website or elsewhere. Suggest this is moved into the Background Documents section. Either this evidence base ref. needs to be added to the webpage or removed from the list of supporting documents.	The Plan clearly references Ford in a number of places and specifically mentions the Ford WWT. Evidence Base improved
Arun DC	Page 10	GEN2 layout to look like those above	Done
Barton Wilmore	Page 11	General conformity of the neighbourhood plan This section should be strengthened as currently, as the plan correctly references, the neighbourhood plan may not be in full conformity with the adopted policies of Arun's Local Plan. We suggest amending and adding to the third paragraph as follows: "As stated above, it is recognised that the adopted Arun Local Plan is out of date and therefore the weight that can be attached to this is therefore more limited. In this regard, significant weight has been given to the NPPF in the preparation of this Neighbourhood Plan. The Arun District Local Plan 2003 (adopted 2003) covers the period up to 2011. Relevant policies may therefore be time expired, since it only planned for growth up to 2011. It is the view of the Neighbourhood Plan group, that if these policies would be considered out of date for the purposes of decision making, particularly in not identifying a policy basis for meeting the requirements of the NPPF, for example, meeting the full Objectively Assessed Need, it is illogical to give significant weight to the policies which would otherwise restrict development as a basis and test for the plan making process. Consequently, the Neighbourhood Plan seeks to acknowledge the adopted Local Plan, apply weight where appropriate and set a strategy for Ford which is compliant with National and International Policies, reflecting as best as possible the emerging Arun Local Plan, and realises the ambitions of the local community. However, the group acknowledges that once adopted the Neighbourhood Plan will may need to be reviewed... "	Agree
Mr Waller	Page 13	On page 13 there is reference to the West Sussex Waste Plan, but this document is not mentioned in the FNP's list of background documents on page 47.	Added
Arun DC	Page 18	Would the 'Flood Zones' look better with a space between each point – it looks cluttered	Agree
Arun DC	Page 18	It should be noted that Ford Airfield has an extensive existing surface water drainage system beneath it. This needs to be taken into account when considering any proposed redevelopment of the site. We hold some of this information on our GIS system.	Noted
Arun DC	Page 19	the point above would allow 3.6.1 Play provision to move down to Page 20 which lines up with the actual point	Agree
Barton Wilmore	Page 20	Community profile It appears there is a typographical error in the following text: The majority of economically active residents are full time employees with a larger lower than average proportion of residents either self-employed (8.3% v 9.8% national average) or working from home (1.7% v 3.5% national average).	Agree
Barton Wilmore	Page 20	We understand the parish council is holdings discussions with service providers and statutory consultees to understand the impacts of the proposed plan, and to identify any mitigation needed to address this. It is understood this will take the form of Ford Infrastructure Delivery Plan. Reference should be made to this in the document in the introductory text, but the neighbourhood plan group may wish to consider inserting a new policy at the end of the document as follows: "Policy Inf 1: Infrastructure provision New development must be served and supported by appropriate on- and off-site infrastructure and services. Planning permission will only be granted when infrastructure and services to meet the needs of the new development, including that set out in the Ford Infrastructure Delivery Plan, and/or mitigate the impact of the new development is already in place or will be provided to an agreed timescale. Infrastructure and services required as a consequence of development, and provision for their maintenance, will be sought from developers and secured by the negotiation of planning obligations, by conditions attached to a planning permission, and/or other agreement, levy or undertaking, all to be agreed before planning permission is granted."	Agree. Plan has been created
Barton Wilmore	Page 21	Community involvement to date We would recommend inserting a page break before this section so that it stands out more clearly as a separate section. The document also references a Consultation Statement, but this does not appear to be available at the moment. This will be needed for the Regulation 15 Consultation. We feel this section should be enhanced to include more details of the community engagement undertaken to date, giving the dates of key meetings and events, and provide a more detailed summary of the issues raised by the community (& other stakeholders). This will then provide a clearer justification for the vision and objectives, and ultimately, the policies proposed in the plan.	The Consultation Statement cannot be completed until the Reg 14 is finalised. It will the bring together all of the consultation and engagement details into one document.
Arun DC	Page 23	This mentions that the NP will set a built up area"to ensure that new development is only acceptable in the most appropriate location" although this is not on the Proposals map. The word 'only' may be too restrictive and contrary to the NPPF. The note on p26 is noted but this is a further 3 pages on, it would have been more effective to have been placed here. It is recommended that an addition needs to be made to the map to identify the area that is being termed the built up area.	See previous BUAB comments
Barton Wilmore	Page 23	5.2 Core Objectives The opening paragraph states that the plan proposes measureable objectives and manageable actions, but the two sub bullets are not specific. Bullet 1 suggests that the plan will seek to protect the character and heritage of Ford, but this conflicts with the preceding vision that Ford lacks a 'heart' for the community. We would therefore suggest this is amended as follows: • A) To retain and protect the defining characteristics and cultural heritage of the parish which are as follows: i. Xxx ii. Xxx	Agree?
Barton Wilmore	Page 24	"Sustainable Development" should feature in the bullet point list since it has a sub heading below.	Agree
Arun DC	Page 25	different fonts used in – an environmental role	Agree
Barton Wilmore	Page 25	Paragraph ending "... and refer to the numbers in those sections)." is missing a closing bracket (as shown)	Agree
Barton Wilmore	Page 25	All policies – justification Policies will likely need to have a greater justification than just referencing back to NPPF paragraphs and plan objectives. We would suggest strengthening each policies justification with additional text demonstrating why the policy is needed, and providing a summary of the SEA assessment of it, if and where this is necessary.	This is not in line with any other NP we have reviewed. The EB is referenced throughout the document
Arun DC	Page 26	6.5 Site Allocations – rise up page – will bring up bullet point from next page	Agree
Arun DC	Page 26	Onwards sustainable drainage in respect to all developments must comply with the ADC Supplementary Requirements for Surface Water Drainage Proposals which this does not.	The Plan makes provision for a SUDS
Barton Wilmore	Page 26	6.5 Site allocations "The FNP seeks to allocates two sites for residential led development within the parish which include: "	Agree
Arun DC	Page 27	Provision of a network – young person's isn't correct	Typo - agree
Arun DC	Page 29	6.6 starts lower on the page than necessary	Agree
Arun DC	Page 30	The above point would bring up the end of EH3.1 onto this page	Agree
Arun DC	Page 35	If the proceeding pages resolved spacing issues this would allow Policy EE8 statement to be on same page	Agree
Arun DC	Page 38	drop Policy LC5 wording to next page – it reads better	Agree
Arun DC	Page 39	Should it read LC5.1 instead of LC8.1 at present	Agree
Mr Waller	Page 4	On Page 4 of the FNP it says that the SEA "has been important in shaping the plan". However, the SEA has been prepared for Ford Parish Council by Barton Willmore planning consultants. These are the very same people who confirmed in a submission to the ADC Local Plan Inspector on 1 July 2015 that "they were working on behalf of their client - Wates Developments Limited, Redrow Homes Southern and Landowners at Ford Airfield" – and who for the past 15 or more years have been promoting the building of a large-scale housing development on Ford Airfield at every possible opportunity. It is therefore no wonder that the SEA is so supportive of the large-scale development being proposed in the FNP. Thus, in order to avoid any implications of collusion, Ford PC should ensure that it distances itself from any work being done on its behalf by Barton Willmore consultants, who have a clear conflict of interest.	
Mr Waller	Page 4	There is mention on page 4 of the now-defunct West Sussex Structure Plan, though for what reason is unclear. On the other hand, there is no mention of either the West Sussex Waste Plan or the West Sussex Transport Plan, both of which are particularly relevant as far as the Ford area is concerned. This anomaly needs to be resolved.	See above
Yapton PC	Page 4	On Page 4 of the FNP it says that the SEA "has been important in shaping the plan". However, the SEA has been prepared for Ford Parish Council by Barton Willmore planning consultants who confirmed in a submission to the ADC Local Plan Inspector on 1 July 2015 that "they were working on behalf of their client - Wates Developments Limited, Redrow Homes Southern and Landowners at Ford Airfield" and are promoting the need for a higher annual housing number for the District. YPC are concerned that the SEA is not a transparent document but could be compromised with a bias towards landowner/builder aspirations as opposed to Parish needs. The SEA fails to consider the wider implications of sustainable transport and the impact of traffic generated by the FNP policies. YPC believe this omission to have significant ramifications on the FNP especially where historically, and in all previous Sustainability Assessments of the Ford area have found traffic and a lack of infrastructure to be a barrier to any future large scale development in the area. FNP clearly states that the Plan has been moulded and driven through its extensive Community Engagement, YPC would question the level of rigour applied to both consultations and analysis of this work. Beyond resident consultations the actual extent of consultation with adjoining communities likely to be impacted by the FNP i.e. adjoining Parishes and Town Councils has been scarce and information available to the general public poor and inconsistent over the period 2012-present day.	
Mr Waller	Page 47	There are two important background documents missing from the list on page 47. These are The West Sussex Waste Plan and The West Sussex Transport Plan, both of which contain information pertinent to the FNP.	Covered
Mr Waller	Page 6	On page 6 it is stated that one of the objectives of the FNP stressed by local residents during the consultation process was that the FNP should "provide homes for local people", but nowhere in the FNP is there any evidence showing details of the local housing need in this very small hamlet/village. Instead, it is quite clear that the main aim of the FNP is to provide homes for some 1500 or so families who do not presently live in Ford.	Covered
Yapton PC	Page 6	On page 6 it is stated that one of the objectives of the FNP stressed by local residents during the consultation process was that the FNP should "provide homes for local people". There is no evidence within the FNP showing details of the local housing need within the Parish Plan Area which we would expect.	Covered
Arun DC	Page 8	Bullets overlapping page end	Agree
Arun DC	Page 9	Page overlapping	Agree
Arun DC	Proposals Map	The proposals map needs to have a clear key with the relevant shadings/markings. The purpose of a key is to be able to identify the extent of coverage by a policy.	Agree
Arun DC	SA1	Is there any certainty about the viability and likelihood of delivery for all the elements included in bullet point 5, particularly the health centre? Requiring a masterplan is appropriate but the penultimate paragraph maybe needs amending to require more of a statement of engagement as this is otherwise expressing more of a want than something for an application to be assessed against. Supplementary to the note above the last sentence of the policy mentions "either or all... community infrastructure being delivered through a CLT". However this is not then followed with any detail. In principle we support proposal for custom and self-build housing; support affordable housing proposal but needs to be explicit about seeking 30% affordable housing subject to sites of 15+ dwellings being viable. We also support CLT option for part of the development but it may not appropriate for the entire scheme; It is recommended that: Either evidence needed about the health centre element; OR The health centre should be removed from the bullet point. It is important to note that the policy requirement is likely to change so it is advisable to work very closely with ADC alternatively revise the wording so that it does not explicitly mention actual percentage etc. but that it accords with existing ADC policy. The complete removal of penultimate paragraph in SA1 is suggested and replaced with the following: "A Design and Access statement will be required setting out how the local community and stakeholders have been involved in the formulation of the masterplan." Movement of the last sentence from the policy to supporting text is suggested or significantly more detail will be needed. Even in the supporting text there may need to be some outline of the likely aspects, or minimum cross reference to new section providing this. The industrial criterion needs to be modified to say that service land will be provided in a phased approach.	See below
Barton Wilmore	SA1	Ford Airfield Our client supports the allocation of Ford Airfield for at least 1,500 homes as set out in the policy. However, we would recommend the following changes to the policy: "This site specific allocation for development is identified on the Proposals Map. The following specifics must be addressed included as part of any planning proposal application on at this location site:" Please ensure all bullet points are numbered for ease of referencing. Bullets 4, 9 and 10 have a high degree of duplication. We would suggest these are combined into one criterion as follows: "A green infrastructure and open space network. The applicant should consider the provision of parks, gardens, natural and semi-natural green space, amenity space, children and young person's play space, allotments, sports pitches and village greens. These open spaces must be well connected to each other by footpaths and cycle routes, and to the wider community; new and existing. The exact green infrastructure, open space and sports needs are set out in the Ford Infrastructure Delivery Plan." Bullet 5, suggest amendment as follows to make reference to the Ford Infrastructure Delivery Plan: "A new local centre. The applicant should consider the provision of a new community hall, local shop, restaurant, elderly accommodation and health centre. These facilities must be phased to be delivered in line with the proposed development. The exact community infrastructure requirements are set out in the Ford Infrastructure Delivery Plan." Bullet 11, suggest amendment for the purpose of clarifying how vegetation should be identified: "Existing mature vegetation shall be identified through ecological surveys, and where possible shall be retained and to complement and enhance the development proposals." Please note that this policy seems to overlap with policy EH1: Protection of trees and hedgerows. Bullet 13, suggest amendment to make reference to Ford IDP: "Provision of a primary school and nursery, as identified in the Ford Infrastructure Delivery Plan."	Done
Mr Waller	SA1	I object to this Policy on the grounds that the earlier Chapters of the FNP have provided no quantitative justification of the building of a "minimum of 1500 homes". Also, the list of specific points to be addressed reads as though this was a Local Plan, and is out of place in the FNP, which should not replicate information from the LP.	
WSCC	SA1	Policy SA1 sets out the proposed allocation of a strategic site including a minimum of 1,500 new dwellings, a new local centre and employment space at Ford Airfield. This development was not included in the Arun Local Plan Publication Version that was submitted and subject to examination. The principle of this scale of development at Ford Airfield has therefore not been established. The County Council is working with Arun District Council on an update to the Local Plan evidence base and is examining a range of development scenarios including a strategic site at Ford. An assessment of some of the key transport issues has been provided in the SEA Topic Paper – Transport & Highways. However, this does not include sufficient evidence to support the allocation of this site (see comments below). The site is located in the village of Ford where there is a limited level of local services that are easily accessible by walking or cycling. Residential development will need to be linked to local employment and enhanced local services to reduce the demand to travel. Development at this site would rely on strong cycle and pedestrian links to Ford railway station. These should be provided through direct, convenient and attractive routes. There should also be frequent and direct bus services to nearby villages and towns. It is suggested that the Parish Council works closely with adjoining parishes to ensure off-road access for non-motorised users has suitable continuation beyond parish boundaries. The allocation of Ford Airfield for 1,500 dwellings has the potential to prejudice the existing and permitted waste uses in the area, including the Grundon and Viridor waste plants, and the waste water treatment works. Strategic Policy W2 of the adopted West Sussex Waste Local Plan seeks to safeguard waste management sites from neighbouring development that may prejudice their continuing operations. Policy SA1 of the Neighbourhood Plan should have regard to the adopted policies within the Waste Local Plan. Ford is within the catchment area of the Littlehampton Household Waste Recycling Site, Westhampnett Waste Transfer Station and the Ford Materials Recycling Facility (which is located within the Neighbourhood Plan area). Individual housing developments within a waste site catchment have a cumulative impact on such infrastructure. The impact needs to take account of various factors including existing site capacities and how capacity might be increased if necessary. This can be considered as the Neighbourhood Plan develops. The inclusion of employment space in the proposed site allocation will need to be supported by sufficient evidence. As further information is established regarding the scale of development proposed, this should inform any emerging evidence base work. The inclusion of a new primary school in the draft policy is supported. The County Council is working with Arun District Council to identify infrastructure requirements for a range of development scenarios as part of evidence base work to support the Local Plan. Careful consideration will need to be given to the proposed location of the school within the site. The County Council should be included as part of any discussions on the proposed location of a new school within the masterplan. Library provision including shelving and a self-service terminal should be identified as infrastructure for this site. This could be delivered as part of a new community centre.	
Yapton PC	SA1	YPC object to this Policy on the grounds that the earlier Chapters of the FNP have provided no quantitative justification of the building of a "minimum of 1500 homes". Also, the list of specific points to be addressed reads as though this was a Local Plan, and is out of place in the FNP, which should not replicate information from the LP.	
Environment Agency	SA1	1) Page 31 Policy EH4 states that "Development would not be supported in Flood Zones 2 and 3" which we support. We can see that the Proposals map shows that the majority of SA1 is located in Flood Zone 1. We suggest checking the site allocation boundary near to Rodney Crescent as it looks like a small amount of the allocated site could be within Flood Zone 2 which would be against your policy and we would have concerns for housing allocation in this Flood Zone without the Sequential Test being undertaken. 2) The proposed development site appears to have been the subject of past industrial activity which poses a risk of pollution to controlled waters. We are however unable to provide detailed site-specific advice relating to land contamination issues at this site and recommend that you consult with your Environmental Health / Environmental Protection Department for further advice. Where necessary we would advise that you seek appropriate planning conditions to manage both the risks to human health and controlled waters from contamination at the site. This approach is supported by Paragraph 109 of the National Planning Policy Framework. We recommend that developers should: • Follow the risk management framework provided in CLR11, Model Procedures for the Management of Land Contamination, when dealing with land affected by contamination. • Refer to the Environment Agency Guiding principles for land contamination for the type of information that is required in order to assess risks to controlled waters from the site. The Local Authority can advise on risk to other receptors, such as human health. • Refer to the contaminated land pages on GOV.UK for more information. 3) There is no mention of how wastewater will be dealt with from the site. Foul sewage from the development should be connected to the mains sewerage system.	
Clymping PC	SA1	Object as it is for an unspecified number of homes, greater than 1500. It includes undefined but very limited road improvements affecting Clymping.	The word 'minimum' is used to comply with ADC's requirement that all development proposals reflect the NPPF principle of sustainable development
Arun DC	SA2	The policy needs to be more explicit about seeking 30% affordable housing subject to individual site viability. The same situation as the previous policy applies with regard to the last paragraph. This is not something specific in terms of assessing an application. It is important to note that the policy requirement is likely to change so it is advisable to work very closely with ADC alternatively revise the wording so that it does not explicitly mention actual percentage etc. but that it accords with existing ADC policy. Removal of current final paragraph and replacement with the following is suggested: "A Design and Access statement will be required setting out how the local community and stakeholders have been involved in the detailed design."	The policy states - Provision of affordable housing in line with the prevailing ADC policy.
Yapton PC	SA2	Burndell Road YPC Object to this policy on grounds of sustainability, notably traffic and impact on YPC facilities and infrastructure.	This has planning permission.
Environment Agency	SA2	1) We are pleased to see that this site allocation has been directed to an area at the lowest probability of flooding and that it is allocated within Flood Zone 1. 2) As above, there is no mention of how wastewater will be dealt with from the site. Foul sewage from the development should be connected to the mains sewerage system	This has planning permission.
WSCC	SEA	Transport & Highways This paper provides an overview of some of the key transport issues with the proposed allocation of 1,500 dwellings at the Ford Airfield site. It includes an overview of the existing site conditions and its accessibility by car and sustainable modes of transport. The paper also includes an assessment of baseline and 'with-development' traffic conditions with a focus on Ford Road at the railway level crossing. The paper does not however, provide sufficient evidence to support the proposed allocation at Ford Airfield. It includes some unrealistic assumptions regarding the distribution of development generated travel trips and does not include background growth to assess future conditions over the plan period. There is also a sensitivity test that assumes an unrealistic anticipated reduction in car driver mode share that is not supported by sufficient evidence that it could be achieved, as well as containing an arithmetical error which reduces car traffic by more than stated. The paper identifies an increase in vehicle delay at the Ford level crossing, which the County Council considers to be severe, but does not propose to mitigate this impact. To provide sufficient evidence to support the proposed allocation at Ford Airfield, there would need to be an assessment of the impact of development at other key locations on the highway network. This should assess the cumulative impact of proposed development including other sites within the Arun Local Plan and the West Sussex Waste Local Plan. A package of mitigation measures should be developed to ensure that the residual cumulative impact of development is not severe. This is a key test within the National Planning Policy Framework that must be met if the Neighbourhood Plan is to meet the basic conditions before proceeding to referendum. It is suggested that the Parish Council's transport consultants work with Arun District Council and the County Council to develop the transport evidence base. The Parish Council should also engage with Highways England and Network Rail on this proposed allocation.	See amended SEA
Arun DC	SP1	Again the built up area boundary but no idea where this is. It is critical that ADC are able to see this as soon as possible so that any implications for the local plan can be taken into account.	Covered
WSCC	SP1	This policy sets out the proposed spatial plan for Ford, which includes support for a development of a minimum of 1,500 dwellings and community facilities. Further evidence needs to be provided to establish the principle of this development - please see comments under Ford Airfield Policy SA1 and SEA Topic Paper – Transport & Highways below.	Noted
Yapton PC	SP1	YPC object to this policy on the basis that a Neighbourhood Plan should not be promoting a Strategic Housing Site over and beyond the parameters of the emerging ADC LP, the current HELAA and Housing Supply numbers. A policy of this magnitude will have a significant detrimental impact on surrounding parishes and must be considered fully with an independent SEA by the broader community and not simply one of the smallest Parishes in the District. This proposal should be dealt with under the aegis of the Local Plan, not the FNP, especially as all the evidence to date, and well as earlier planning judgements, has shown that such a large development at Ford is unsustainable. SP1.2 The wording should be strengthened in support of deeper and clearer Local Gaps between both the Parishes of Yapton and Clymping. This would prevent the coalescence of the three Parishes retaining their individual identity and character.	Noted
Clymping PC	SP1	Object on the basis that this is a plan for an unspecified number of new houses greater than 1500. These are proposed to be built on site(s) outside the built-up boundary in the emerging Local Plan not as yet allocated as a strategic site. No evidence of the local housing need is provided	Noted
Clymping PC	SP1.2	SP1.2 Object given the lack of consideration of a gap between settlements between Clymping and Ford along Horsemere Green Lane, and the potential for coalescence of the villages	The FNP seeks to retain land to create a buffer between Climping and Ford.
A Lovell		Consultation Inadequate. Outside of the scope of a NP. Infrastructure has not been properly assessed. Conflict of interest	
Arun DC		There is no reference to ADC Local Plan policies (2003 saved policies and emerging Local Plan).	We believe this is covered on page 10
Arun DC		Whilst a primary school provision has been thought about, has any thought been given to secondary?	No. A new secondary school site has been allocated in Littlehampton which would cover this catchment area. There is also insufficient land at Ford to contain such a proposal if housing is also to be built.
Arundel TC		Objections relating to traffic impact on surrounding area and the NP promoting strategic development.	Noted
Aziz Mirza		In my view, the fundamental basis of this Plan contradicts the results of the 2014 Ford Neighbourhood Development Plan Survey. When asked (question 11, page 16 of Survey results) "do you agree with a plan for our village that seeks to have no further large scale or excessive development?" 80 per cent replied "strongly agree" and a further 15 per cent "agree". So 95 per cent of respondents say the Plan should have no further large scale development. That survey question was answered by 127 people, out of 555 households in the parish. As a statistician, I can see that this is a statistically significant survey response, so I cannot understand why the Neighbourhood Plan fundamentally ignores the results of what I consider to be the most important question within the survey.	Tis needs to be read in conjunction with later consultations.
Mr Hill		Houses agreed. The village will not be able to sustain the growth of 1500 house's but can adopt the 300 original agreed houses.	Much discussion has been had on this point at meetings. The figure of 300 will not make best use of the land and will lead to further piecemeal development without providing the key infrastructure needed to support it. That is the whole basis of the masterplan proposal.
Mr Hill		The main issue is the road infrastructure. The A259 is unable to hold the new level of purposed increase, Ford lane and the surrounding roads are not designed to take any more vehicles unless serious changes are made.	Noted
Mr Hill		Proposing a road from Clymping through the new estate to Walberton isn't acceptable as an improvement.	We have not suggested this
Mr Hill		The railway crossing at Ford will not be able to hold the increase level of transport without improvement or by-pass.	This needs to be shown in the Traffic Impact Study being carried out by ADC
Mr Hill		To conclude the issue I raise is that the road network around Ford, Yapton and Clymping isn't suitable. The A27 needs to be improved with a by-pass to include a new road network for the proposed site. To be honest it is well known that the council will build what houses they want as they do not have to live in the mess they are going to leave behind when finished. The local plan has already acknowledged that this is grade 1 agricultural land, that will be developed on, I am sure the farmers will agree but also agree on the price of the land. I am not against improvement, growth or the future, when done right. But as usual undertaken in a quick and slap dash manner is why this county is in such a mess as it is.	This needs to be shown in the Traffic Impact Study being carried out by ADC
Ms Hutchins		Having looked at the plans, I see that there is more residential buildings going up as well as a new school. The question I would like to ask is what about a doctors surgery or food shops? Also I see that there is no suitable pathway to go down to the main road (259). At the moment you have to take your life in your hands to even contemplate going to the QysterCatcher or Bairds farm shop, the only other route is across the airfield through Rudford industrial Estate walking down to the 259 and along the main road. I dread to think how the children are going to cope. Also will there be sufficient parking for parents to pick up their children? Or will the local residents have to bare the brunt of this. I can see that this is suppose to be for the community, which is a lovely sentiment but nestled within this community is a water treatment centre and a recycling plant.Are these safe? Do they comply with the European Unions health and standards? I love living in Ford. I love the countryside and I applaud in many ways what you are doing but I do have reservations about the whole scheme. Thank you for letting me put my thoughts down on paper.	A new combined cycle and foot path s proposed for the A259 in 2017.
Mr Langmead		There is a great demand for more houses in the Arun area and I see the airfield as a key area of development. We are at a critical stage of planning where the current residents and businesses can influence how the area is developed. My concern with the plan is any zoning may become restrictive in the future. I can see the need for planning a gap to stop Ford and Yapton merging but I question the size, both length and width of this gap. The area of green gap I would like to see removed from the neighbourhood plan is north of Ford Lane and south of the railway as this area has limited benefit to the neighbourhood plan. It is away from both Ford and Yapton's nucleus of development and so is unlikely to be developed and it is already listed as an ecological focus area. My concern also is although it is being put in place as a gap in house building this zone may become more restrictive in the future which would affect the development of my agricultural business as the green gap comes right up to the farm yard which would limit natural expansion and inhibit my permissive development rights as a farmer for agricultural buildings.	The policy has been amended
Mr Mrs Edwards		As residents of Ford we are not against new housing being built providing the infrastructure is put in place first. The reasons for this are as follows the A259 is at a stand still early in the morning with commuter traffic and school run,,also trying to get to Arundel is also near impossible due to the railway crossing at ford this will push more traffic through Arundel and the A27 is unable to cope now without a new bypass. Ford at the moment is tuning into an industrial town and no longer a nice quite village which is why most people bought properties to be away from towns and traffic, the scale of building proposed is moving away from village life. Ford is grade 1 agricultural land as the local plan identifies cannot see why concrete will be placed over good agricultural land!	Noted
Mr Weymouth		I send you a copy of my E-mail which I sent to you 23 Oct 2015 I still have the same comments some of which have been recently confirmed by Arun District Council. Vis that the airfield does not have to be built on. It is not on their list of Parish Allocations. Only on the list of Landowners willing to Develop. They also say that Ford Parish Council are offering the land to them in the proposed Neighbourhood Plan. WHY are you doing this? It is not in the Residents interest only the Landowners. So why are you supporting instead of apposing the development in support of your Residents?	See all previous comments. The land will be developed. The resident have said they wish to have control.
Edgcumbes		1. As a local business, we have grown in the past year. Doubling our staff count, and establishing a small café at the coffee roastery in Ford Lane. This has become a popular venue and is now self-financing. I am sure it has a good future ahead of it, and it certainly shows that there is a demand in the area for venues where people can come together in a social setting to form a small community. 2. Tourism – there is a perceived need for tourists, cyclists, visitors to the area for this café. We are sure therefore that a restaurant or larger café in Ford will be well supported. 3. You mention about creating / preserving footpaths in the Ford area. There is a clear need for a footpath along Ford Lane, and we are sure that this need will increase with further development. I wondered if any provision has been made in the plan for this facility. Obviously it would be a benefit for the Café on the lane, but additionally it would safeguard the many people who currently have to use the lane to walk along.	Will look at the footpath issue
Clymping PC		Neighbourhood Plans should consider the local community view of development relevant within their neighbourhood. Strategic scale developments of the size being proposed (a minimum of 1500 homes) should be the subject of Local Plans. This enables proper consultation and consideration of the district wide implications of such housing developments. District wide consultation has been very limited until this point. It is very clear given the history of the site that there are material, district wide considerations that should be taken into account but which are beyond the scope of a Neighbourhood Plan. The current Arun HELAA states in reference to the Ford site that: Currently development on this site would contravene policy and therefore the site would not be considered to be suitable. However, from the information available, the site could be considered for future housing potential, provided that any development included a comprehensive package of social, employment and transport infrastructure, appropriate to the creation of a new community. There are, however, constraints that will need to be addressed such as impact on the landscape, on the historic environment, on the transport network and flooding constraints. The Government determined in July 2009 that "this location has not demonstrated the potential to meet the sustainability and deliverability requirements for successful development as an eco- town at this time". The site currently lies outside the built up boundary and is therefore subject to Policy C SP1 in the emerging Local Plan. It is currently not a strategic, site specific or broad allocation. No evidence is given of local (Ford) housing need within the evidence documents.	Noted
Clymping PC		Evidence of support in Ford for the proposed scale of development is weak. The desire for a village "heart" and the retention of a rural setting and feel in open countryside are understandable and mirror the feelings of those living in Clymping. The outcome of the proposed FNP would be a community larger than Arundel (town). The results of the comprehensive survey carried out in 2014 and included in the evidence documents show that 73% of those responding supported only small scale developments for local needs whilst 94% were opposed to large scale development. In November 2015 an open morning was held to consider the pivotal decision to increase the housing target to 1500. Just 41 written responses are noted of which 24 were Ford residents (Ford population 1690), 12 for the proposal, 12 against. 17 responses were received from residents of neighbouring communities, 1 for the proposal versus 16 against, providing an insight into the concerns in neighbouring communities. Most of the concerns recorded in these responses against relate to loss of the open countryside, traffic congestion on inadequate local roads and access/ competition for local services e.g. schools, doctors surgeries. FNP therefore seems to be at odds with the intent in its section 1.3 "The purpose of the Neighbourhood Plan is to articulate the views and issues that are important to the residents of Ford Parish and give those residents a voice in shaping the future of their community".	Noted
Clymping PC		The Impact on Clymping The principles set out in the adopted Clymping Neighbourhood Plan include the desire to retain the current open rural setting of the village. Policy SP1.2 underlines the importance to Ford of maintaining a gap between the settlements of Ford and Yapton when in fact the villages have effectively already coalesced today. Conversely no attempt is included to ensure a "gap between settlements" between Ford and Clymping along the north of Horsemere Green Lane. Policy SA1 shows the area of development extending to Horsemere Green Lane. An opportunity for open space to maintain the open rural setting of Clymping and the separate identities of our parishes is being missed. A primary concern to Clymping residents is traffic and HGVs traversing the village, and the poor state of both the local roads and the junctions with the A259. Projects are already in process to alleviate the traffic impacts in Clymping as they affect the safety of drivers, cyclists and pedestrians. The FNP provides evidence of the majority of Ford residents commuting from the village to work today. There will also traffic flows to the retail centres in Littlehampton and Bognor Regis given the absence of facilities in Ford today. A material proportion of all these current journeys are through Clymping and with 1500 plus new homes, the pressure on Clymping's roads will inevitably increase, exacerbating current issues. Policy SA1 refers to road improvements to Ford Lane, Horsemere Green Lane and Yapton Road. Clymping Parish Council must be included in any discussions in these regards and we would add Church Lane, the inadequate junctions with the A259 and the overriding need for a new Arundel A27 Bypass before developments of this scale can be considered. Clymping and Ford residents today share many of the local amenities and infrastructure. Clymping residents use the GP surgeries in Yapton and there is already intense pressure on these services, as the FNP notes. Clymping primary school is effectively full and there are district wide pressures on schooling provision as new housing developments are added.	This will be addressed by the ADC Traffic Study. If the impact cannot be supported then the Plan will fail.
Clymping PC		Conclusions Clymping Parish Council objects to the proposal for strategic levels of housing development proposed at Ford through a Neighbourhood Plan. This should be a matter for the Local Plan and the District Council, given the district wide implications and the previously identified needs for a comprehensive package of social, employment and transport infrastructure. A Neighbourhood Plan is not a suitable vehicle for this. The impacts on Clymping village would be material given the two villages share the local social, drainage and (inadequate) transport infrastructure. Clymping Parish Council will resist the coalescence of the villages implied in the FNP given that is contrary to the intentions of the emerging Local Plan to maintain the "sense of place" for residents. There should be a "gap between settlements" for Ford and Clymping. It is our view that large-scale development of the Ford site should be considered only after: • the construction of the A27 Arundel Bypass and new link roads to both it and to the A259 trunk road to take traffic from the villages. • the implementation of suitable social infrastructure including schools and medical facilities.	Noted