

## **Summary of Representations made on the Regulation 16 Submission version of the Rowlands Castle Neighbourhood Plan.**

1. This document provides a summary of the representations submitted in accordance with Regulation 16 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 to the Rowlands Castle Neighbourhood Development Plan (BNP). This document is produced in compliance with the Neighbourhood Plan (Referendum) Regulations 2012.
2. East Hampshire District Council (EHDC) published the Rowlands Castle Neighbourhood Plan for consultation from 13 February to 27 March 2023, in accordance with Part 5 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012. 13 representations were submitted during the publicity period and can be viewed in full at – <https://www.easthants.gov.uk/planning-services/planning-policy/neighbourhood-planning/emerging-neighbourhood-plans/rowlands>
3. Below is a summary of the main points raised in the representations: -

### **Policy 1 – Gaps Between Settlements**

EHDC – question the size and extent of the proposed gap, response to Reg 14 comments on this matter are noted however, we consider our comments on the extent of the gap are still valid.

SDNP – Unclear whether the extent of the gap is necessary, The most south easterly part of the gap does not seem to relate to coalescence with the settlement of Havant which is more to the south of RC. As currently presented the Map 2 does not clearly show the location of the main settlement of Rowlands Castle.

Local resident – support the policy

Henry Adams – support the policy

## **Policy 2 – Landscape Character and Views**

Local resident - comment – visual clutter should be avoided and removed from the key views identified where possible. Excessively bright or coloured external lighting should be discouraged to preserve the rural night-scene of the village and also the dark skies within the nearby South Downs.

Henry Adams – comment on the accuracy of the descriptions of the view points and photographs.

SDNP - The policy as currently drafted is quite long and complex to reference. Given that a significant area of the parish falls within the National Park (over 50%) the policy could usefully include reference to conserving and enhancing the landscape of the National Park and its setting. Clarify whether views A5 and A6 are actually within the Parish of Rowlands Castle these appear to be taken from outside the plan area. Policies of the RCNP should only be applied to the designated neighbourhood area, therefore these two views should be removed from the policy.

## **Policy 3 – Local Green Spaces and Protected Open Spaces**

Henry Adams – comment - Map 9 shows various Local Green Spaces, including a vertical linear wooded area along the western and eastern sides of Shipwrights Way/Staunton Way. This area does not meet the requirements of paragraph 102 of the NPPF in terms of designations of Local Green Space and further evidence to justify its designation as Local Green Space should be provided. References to Ecological Network Opportunity Area's should be deleted as they are not referred to elsewhere in the Neighbourhood Plan.

EHDC - The wooded area along the western and eastern sides of Shipwrights Way/Staunton Way – this is a designated SINC and is therefore already protected under Policy CP21 JCS. Protected open space appears to cover a range of parcels of land, some of them very small and which most likely originated from the original planning permission for the developments and are unlikely to be considered suitable for development in the future. Some of these also have protected trees on them, which would also restrict any development potential.

SDNP - It is not clear in the policy or supporting text why the plan seeks to designate some areas as Local Green Spaces and others as Protected Open Spaces. The Local Green Space identified as Wooded Area along the western and eastern sides of Shipwrights Way/Staunton Way, appears to be quite extensive in size. It would be helpful to provide further justification to demonstrate why this is not considered to be an extensive tract of land.

## **Policy 5 – Design and Local Character**

SDNP - It is unclear how 'highest standard of design' would be assessed and could be difficult to apply consistently.

## **Policy 6 – Over 55's Housing**

EHDC - The policy refers to the settlement boundary as established by the East Hampshire Local Plan – Second Review 2006 – this is incorrect, the most recent local plan which defines settlement boundaries is the Housing and Employment Allocations Local Plan adopted in 2016.

SDNP - It is unclear how this policy will offer anything more than existing policy in the East Hampshire Joint Core Strategy and South Downs Local Plan. Further consideration should be given to whether this policy is necessary.

## **Policy 7 – Rowlands Castle Village Centre – Non-residential development**

EHDC- The evidence listed for this Policy does not include an explanation as to how the extent of the village centre under Policy 7 has been defined.

SDNP - It is unclear how this policy will offer anything more than existing policy in the East Hampshire Joint Core Strategy and South Downs Local Plan. Further consideration should be given to the change in use class system, and this should be referenced in the supporting text so it is clear where the policy can influence development.

## **Policy 8 – Parking**

Local resident – comment - The loss of front gardens to open, hard paved and featureless parking courts in front of houses is something should be discouraged.

EHDC - Previous comments on the detail of the policy still stand – if the purpose of the policy is to retain existing parking provision within the village centre then the title could be amended to reflect this.

## **Policy 10 – Community and Sports Facilities**

Sport England – general comments and links to further guidance on how the planning system can play an important role in facilitating social interaction and creating healthy, inclusive communities.

EHDC - this policy refers to the Recreation Ground which is also defined as Local Green Space under Policy 3.

## **Policy 11 – Walking Cycling and Horse-riding Access**

Network Rail\_- support the policy objectives of providing pedestrian/cycle routes to connect the station with the rest of the parish. This encourages commuters or residents to utilise sustainable forms of transport, such as rail, as oppose to relying on cars.

Local resident – comment - New development should be open, inclusive and permeable where possible, avoid gated developments.

EHDC - Refer to maps 17 and 18 in the policy

SDNP - The maps supporting this policy clearly provide some geographical / spatial information relating to the policy, but they are not referenced in the policy itself.

## **Other Comments**

Fowler Architecture & Planning Ltd on behalf of Shorewood Homes Ltd – object - under the Regulation 14 version of the Neighbourhood Plan (NP), land off Links Lane was included within the proposed Settlement Policy Boundary. The Regulation 15 Version of the NP, shows the site omitted from the proposed Settlement Policy Boundary. It is noted that no objections to the Settlement Policy Boundary as part of the Regulation 14 consultation, were received. Therefore strongly object to the proposed Settlement Policy Boundary, and therefore request that this designation is amended to reflect what was shown at Regulation 14 stage.

BJC Planning on behalf of Land and Partners Ltd – promotion of land at Mays Coppice Farm comprising of 70 dwellings divided into 42 self and custom plots and 28 affordable dwellings, on the basis that the proposal positively contributes to all the policies expressed in the Neighbourhood plan.

EHDC –

General – add para numbers

Vision and Objectives - Clarify the relationship of the Plans objectives with individual policy objectives;

Settlement Policy Boundary - Map 15 differs to the adopted development plan policies map, request this is clarified;

SDNP –

General – add para numbers

Vision and Objectives - Consideration should be given to how these different objectives relate to each other. Provide further clarification on the relationship between overall plan objectives and policy objectives.

## **No comments**

West Sussex County Council

Southern Water

Surrey County Council (Minerals and waste Planning Authority)

Historic England

National Highways