

EAST PRESTON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN Annex B1

Pre-Submission Plan Schedule of STAKEHOLDERS Comments Received

17th April to 29th May

No.	Organisation / Name	Page / Policy	Representation	Observation & Recommendation
1.	Action in rural Sussex / Rowena Tyler			
2.	Angmering Parish Council			
3.	Angmering-on-Sea Estate Residents Association			
4.	Angmering-on-Sea Lawn Tennis Club	7vii	<p>26/05 -</p> <p>At the last meeting of our Management Committee we considered the details of the above Plan.</p> <p>The views of the Angmering-on-Sea Lawn Tennis Club are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. We support the proposals within the Plan.2. We strongly endorse the Designated Green Spaces which include the Club site.	

			<p>3. We strongly support the classification of the Club grounds and premises as an Asset of Community Value</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this important Plan for East Preston.</p> <p>Yours sincerely,</p> <p>Philip Olver Chairman</p>	
5.	Arun Access Group / Mike Clough			
6.	Arun Business Partnership / Miriam Nicholls			
7.	Arun Co-ordinated Community Transport			
8.	Arun District Council / Cllr Paul Bicknell (Angmering)		17/04 – called to ask for hard copy	
9.	Arun District Council / Cllr Andy Cooper (Angmering)			

10.	Arun District Council / Cllr Dudley Wensley (Angmering)			
11.	Arun District Council / Cllr Mike Clayden (Rustington)			
12.	Arun District Council / Cllr Florence Harrison (Rustington)			
13.	Arun District Council / Cllr Philippa Bower (Rustington)			
14.	Arun District Council / Cllr Ray Steward (Rustington)			
15.	Arun District Council / Simon Meecham			
16.	Arun District Council / Charlotte Hardy			

17.	Arun District Council / Donna Moles	<p>22/04 - Very well done in getting this out. We will also include on our website and comment within your consultation period.</p> <p>29/05 -</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Arun District Council (ADC) comments The comments are reflective of comments from all departments of ADC</p> <p>The comments are to be approved by the Assistant Director Planning and Economic Regeneration or his nominated representative prior to submitting to The Parish before the end of the consultation period. (approved on 29th May 2014 and emailed to East Preston on 29th May 2014)</p> <p>The Council fully supports the community's initiative to produce a Neighbourhood Development Plan. Neighbourhood planning aims to give people greater ownership of plans and policies that affect their area. The government is clear that the intention of Neighbourhood Development Plans should be to set out policies on the development and use of land in a neighbourhood area and that the local planning authority has a duty to support production of the plan.</p> <p>Our duty at this stage is therefore to assist the East Preston Neighbourhood Plan Group in making sure the draft you subsequently submit to us is in a form that will allow the Examiner at a forthcoming examination recommend that it goes ahead to referendum. The comments are reflective of comments from all departments of Arun District Council. These comments do not contain our comments on Strategic Environmental Assessment or any other supplementary</p>	
-----	-------------------------------------	--	--

		<p>documents that may be required.</p> <p>ADC pre-submission comments</p> <p>We have tried to outline the areas where there may be some degree of divergence with national or local planning policy, to help you in preparing justification for these departures. The following list is intended to be a guide on some key issues identified in the plan:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Buildings of character should be referred to as buildings or structures of character. 2. Check the name of the conservation area – ‘East Preston/Rustington (Station Road)? 3. 2nd para of quote under para 1.5 (p6): Possible formatting issue but there are a couple of instances where there do not appear to be spacing between words. <p>Suggest that the following minor correction is made: (underlining is simply to emphasis where the space is needed) “policies and neighbourhoods should plan positively to support them. Neighbourhood plans and orders should not...”</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. Para 2.17: Minor correction needed. Minor correction required as follows: “It also contains of two Areas of Special Character...” 5. Para. 2.24: Include policy AREA 1 Conservation areas in the list. 6. Para 2.26: Minor correction required. Minor correction required as follows: <p>“(in March Feb 2014)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 7. It is suggested that perhaps the vision could be written in plain English for the general public. 	<p>1. 2.17 [p14] and 2.25 bullet point [p16] “or structures” added.</p> <p>2. Title of conservation area amended 2.17</p> <p>3. noted & corrected</p> <p>4. already noted</p> <p>5. add this to bullet point list [it is AREA 2, not 1]</p> <p>6. Date corrected</p>
--	--	--	---

		<p>8. Para. 3.2: This states that no targets have been set for the indicators. Why have no targets been set?</p> <p>9. Para. 3.3: Are the buildings you wish to designate worthy of designation? Do they meet the established criteria?</p> <p>10. The development principles in the supporting part of Policy 1 should be reviewed to ensure the list is deliverable and justified eg. 4.18: Can this be enforced? Is vegetation classed as development?</p> <p>11. Para 3.7: The last sentence of this creates some confusion – is it intended that this was supposed to reflect that their monitoring will always be separate but could coincide with the Local Plan at times? Remove the existing sentence and replace with this possible modification, if the intention is as thought.</p> <p>“Dependent on when the Arun Local Plan goes through Examination and is adopted, this may coincide.”</p> <p>12. The order of the supporting text and policies can make it confusing as to exactly where in the document the text relates. It is recommended that the supporting text or justification is placed before a policy so that there is added clarity and ease of use.</p> <p>13. Para 4.23: Is the last sentence (regarding the change of use only being allowed in those buildings sufficiently isolated from other residents) likely to be realistic and achievable in the parish?</p> <p>14. Para.4.30: Should the plan wish to do an Article 4 Direction, it should do so via the appropriate procedure. Including this in a paragraph in the plan without any discussion does not constitute a start of what is quite a complicated and lengthy procedure. Please arrange a meeting to discuss</p>	<p>7. some text redrafted</p> <p>8. The NP is giving an indication of how progress will be measured against the objectives rather than proposing a specific target</p> <p>9. Yes – justification in text clarified.</p> <p>10. redrafted and clarified</p> <p>11. Replaced with wording based on ADC’s draft.</p> <p>12. It was decided to leave formatting as it was</p> <p>13. The paragraph has been redrafted</p> <p>14. Text has been amended (now para.4.29) to say “The Parish Council will therefore propose that ADC considers making an Article 4 Direction to remove permitted development</p>
--	--	---	---

		<p>this with ADC planning officers.</p> <p>15. Para. 4.31: Whilst the principle is understood. Can the plan prevent blocks of flats adjoining blocks of flats?</p> <p>16. Para 4.32 There is mention in this paragraph that it is essential that permitted development rights are suspended. However, this policy would only apply to anything requiring permission. Suggest that the following sentence is removed in its entirety. "It is therefore essential that rights of permitted development for alterations that change the street scene should be suspended."</p> <p>17. Para. 4.8 "These policies establish.." Which? It is assumed from reading on that this is intended to be either all policies in the plan or Policy 1 above. As there seems to be the need for a minor correction just after this as well I have combined the solution together. The last sentence seems slightly repetitive and not needed. For clarity the following amendment is suggested: The policies in this neighbourhood plan (or specifically in Policy 1) establish a series of general principlesThey then set out policies include a policy for each of..." And the removal of the last sentence.</p> <p>18. Policies 2,3,4 and 5: It may aid the reader if an extract of these areas were included below the policy so that the reader did not need to refer to the proposals map.</p> <p>19. Policy 3 ii. Minor addition needed to the end of this point. Suggest one of the following amendments is made: "..basic form of the roof is not to be altered" or "basic form of the roof is not altered"</p> <p>20. Policy 6: As currently written this does not make it clear which sites are actually being allocating plus they are not on the proposals map. It is</p>	<p>rights..."</p> <p>15. Has been redrafted</p> <p>16. Sentence removed and paragraph redrafted.</p> <p>17. Redrafted to clarify</p> <p>18. The Character Areas do not lie in discrete zones, so impossible to do, unless used whole-parish one-colour/one Char.Area maps. Instead, have cross-referenced to colours, ie "roads lined in red on the Proposals Map". Map itself has had the Character Area nos. added</p> <p>19. noted and amended</p> <p>20. Policy 6 in the preSubmission draft has been omitted in the final NP</p>
--	--	--	---

		<p>recommended that the policy is modified to make mention of the sites that are being allocated, presuming they are intending the following: 14-16 Worthing Rd; and 123-125 North Lane What evidence do you have that the sites selected are 'available'? Please ensure this is included in your evidence base and referenced in the plan. It is suggested that the first sentence relating to the Worthing Road site is removed and the 8 units is linked to where the evidence/information for that is - the SHLAA, or your own site appraisal?</p> <p>21. Para 4.34: This mentions 3 sites being EP10-EP12. It is recommended that there is at least broad mention of where these are.</p> <p>22. Para. 4.43: Within this paragraph it mentions that the allotments need to be officially designated – by whom? Is there a process? Otherwise the proposal map would not be in conformity with the development plan, as from looking at the map it is not already. Please discuss further with ADC parks and green spaces.</p> <p>23. Policy 9: This talks of ‘one or more of the following’ being used, but there is no list outlined under it. This is required or there is no link for the policy to anything that they may be wishing and also it is hard to comment on or judge its suitability without this aspect. It is recommended that the list that seemed to be intended is listed as part of the policy.</p> <p>24. Para 4.48: The beginning of this paragraph is incorrect, there is no intention for this to be monitored by ADC, either through the LP particularly or by engineers. It is recommended that either the reference to ADC is removed from the beginning sentence or potentially the whole</p>	<p>21. Policy 6 in the preSubmission draft has been omitted in the final NP</p> <p>22. The Parish Council has already initiated contact. No detailed response from ADC yet. Unsure why proposal map not in conformity, as it is existing open space on the Green Infrastructure Network Map for 2014 LDP</p> <p>23. Added 9.i – 9.iv</p> <p>24. Removed first phrase completely.</p>
--	--	--	--

		<p>first sentence is removed.</p> <p>25. Policy 10: How will this be achieved? Have you discussed this with the relevant ADC team at all?</p> <p>26. Para 4.57: Minor amendment required. Minor amendment required as follows: “..present used in by the ..”</p> <p>27. Proposal 1: As advised before, there is a procedure for nominating the assets which the parish needs to follow and listing it in your plan does not start this process. Please contact ADC land charges department to discuss how to formally apply for the nominations. It is also suggested that in order to keep this proposal in the plan that it is written less restrictive so that it allows for longevity of the proposal so a possible suggestion might be “Development of any assets on the List of Nominated Assets of Community Value, held by Arun District Council unless...”</p> <p>28. Sentence at the end of para 5.4: This talks of a timely opportunity to consult with the public, this is concerning because whatever is put forward should be informed by the people of the Parish anyway. As written this opens up the opportunity for people including developers to challenge this aspect. If it is a more generic one it allows for the process to occur.</p> <p>29. Para 5.7: Clarity required here. Either include the Fire Station on what it submitted for consideration, following due process, as Asset of Community Value or remove/rewrite this paragraph.</p> <p>30. Proposal 2: It is recommended that you consult ADC Conservation Officer.</p> <p>31. Proposals Map: This does not identify the area of the designated sites for allocating the housing</p>	<p>25. wording amended to provide the information [consultation is ongoing]</p> <p>26. noted and amended</p> <p>27. Proposal reworded to show that the process is understood and will be followed.</p> <p>28. Last portion of sentence omitted.</p> <p>29. Reworded to clarify.</p> <p>30. ADC Conservation Officer has been contacted with full details of Proposal and structures involved</p> <p>31 Policy 6 in the preSubmission draft has been omitted in the final NP</p>
--	--	---	---

			<p>32. It is advised that the entire document be checked for typographical errors as this has not been done by ADC as part of this process.</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>Well done on getting to this stage.</p> <p>There is a danger that this plan may be classified as one that is not 'positively prepared' as the policies are very 'conservative'/restrictive. None-the-less for the most part it achieves the ethos of Localism.</p> <p>It may be worth just looking through them to word them more positively because although not entirely wrong, an examiner may have the similar viewpoint.</p> <p>We have made the suggestions in this document in the spirit of easing the draft plan's progress to adoption, and they should not be taken as the District Council requiring or requesting changes to the document, as ultimately any decisions over the eventual contents and whether to take comments on board rest with the East Preston Neighbourhood Plan Group.</p> <p>The Council fully supports the community's initiative to produce the neighbourhood Development Plan and welcome any further discussions on the comments made.</p>	<p>32. checking carried out</p> <p>Some wording has been amended</p>
18.	Arun District Council / Nigel Lynn – Chief Executive			

19.	Arun District Council / Nigel Croad – Deputy Chief Executive			
20.	Arun District Council / Paul Cann			
21.	Arun District Council / Philippa Dart			
22.	Arun District Council / Cllr Ricky Bower (East Preston)			
23.	Arun District Council / Cllr Terry Chapman (East Preston)			
24.	Arun District Council / Cllr Dennis Wilde (East Preston)		22/04 – asked for a hard copy 23/04 – collected a hard copy	
25.	Arun District Council / Dee Christensen			
26.	Arun District Council / Karl Roberts			

27.	Bradbury Hotel – Royal Blind Society / Wendy Lewis			
28.	Sir Peter Bottomley MP			
29.	Arun and Chichester Citizens Advice Bureau / Carol Groves		17/04 – email bounced. Resent email from Outlook	
30.	Coastal West Sussex Clinical Commissioning Group			
31.	Compass Travel Services			
32.	East Preston & Kingston Bowls Club / Marion Brown – General Secretary		17/04 – asked for a hard copy	
33.	East Preston & Kingston Village Hall Foundation / Christine Trice – Chairman			

34.	East Preston Cricket Club / John Tanner – Chairman			
35.	East Preston Festival Committee		20/04 – “Hi Simon. A very interesting Assets of Community Calue”	
36.	East Preston Football Club			
37.	East Preston Infant School / Claire New – Headteacher		see below	
38.	East Preston Junior School / Kathy Lockyer – Headteacher		<p>26/05 –</p> <p>The East Preston Infant and Junior Schools have met and discussed the neighbourhood plan and are in full support of all the proposals within the plan. We are keen to keep the schools at the heart of the community.</p> <p>We have, however, noted that within the plan there is no real consideration of the needs of the local community regarding schooling and we would like to put forward our views for consideration.</p> <p>Expansion of schools</p> <p>The schools would like to ensure that you are aware that both schools have been approached by WSCC (Peter Proudly) to consider expansion to become three form entries (a 90 pupil intake per year as opposed to the current</p>	New paragraph added (4.53)

		<p>60). Feasibility studies have been carried out and plans have been drawn up to extend the Junior school and rebuild the Infant school. Both schools are very keen to expand for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The availability and flexibility of the current sites has the capacity to expand without any negative impact on the environment. - Both schools are generally oversubscribed and are concerned that in future East Preston families may not be able to attend a school in the village. Due to infant class size legislation, the Infant school is unable to take more than 30 pupils per class; and whilst the Junior school are able to take more than thirty pupils, large classes are not in the best interests of the children and it would be preferable to have an additional class to accommodate them. - Recent surveys on the Infant school have clearly shown that it is no longer fit for purpose. The building is of scolar construction and was not intended to be a long term permanent structure when it was built. The proposed building plans have recognised that remodelling the current building would not be financially viable and therefore have drawn up a plan for a new build for the infant school within the current site. - The Junior school can be easily extended on its current site. - These plans include the opportunity to provide further community facilities such as a nursery, community/ meeting rooms, and expansion of the 	<p>Noted, and added comment in paras. 4.52 and 4.53 on youth provision.</p>
--	--	--	---

			<p>existing youth club in an improved location within the school grounds (but not between the two schools)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The plans maintain separate Infant and Junior schools which both schools fully endorse as this enables the schools to expand and meet the needs of the children aged 4-11 in the village of East Preston without becoming too large and losing the distinctive smaller school community feel that we currently offer to families. <p>Proposed build of a new primary school in Angmering.</p> <p>We are keen that the neighbourhood committee consider the impact of a new primary school in Angmering on East Preston Schools and our families.</p> <p>Yours sincerely,</p> <p>Mrs Claire New (Head teacher EPIS), Mrs Kathy Lockyear (Head teacher EPJS), Mrs Claire Sayers (Chair of governors EPIS), Mrs Miriam Nicholls (Chair of governors EPJS)</p>	<p>Given that occupancy levels in the East Preston schools are so high, and that the proposed new primary school in Angmering would be meeting the needs caused by new housing development in that parish, the impact on East Preston is unlikely to be great. The safety of the journey to school is of great importance, and crossing the railway and a busy main road should not be encouraged for primary school aged children.</p>
39.	East Preston Village website / Graham Street			
40.	Energy Networks			
41.	English Heritage / Samantha Johnson			

42.	English Heritage / Alan Byrne			
43.	English Heritage / Martin Small		<p>22/04 – “Dear Mr Cross,</p> <p>Thank you for your e-mail advising me of the consultation on your pre-submission Neighbourhood Plan. However, Arun district (outside the South Downs National Park) is the responsibility of my colleague, Alan Byrne. I have forwarded your e-mail to him and I would be grateful if you could amend your records.</p> <p>Thank you again for contacting English Heritage.</p> <p>Yours sincerely,</p> <p>Martin Small”</p> <p>(Action duly completed)</p>	
44.	Environment Agency		<p>28/05 –</p> <p>Our ref: SX/2006/000230/OR-21/PO1-L01</p> <p>Dear Mr Cross,</p> <p>East Preston Neighbourhood Plan – pre-submission public consultation</p> <p>Thank you for consulting the Environment Agency on your pre-submission Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>Thank you for consulting the Environment Agency on your Draft Neighbourhood Plan. We are a statutory consultee in the planning process providing advice to Local Authorities</p>	

		<p>and developers on pre-application enquiries, planning applications, appeals and strategic plans.</p> <p>Together with Natural England, Heritage and Forestry Commission we have published joint advice on neighbourhood planning which sets out sources of environmental information and ideas on incorporating the environment into plans. This is available at:</p> <p>http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20140328084622/http://cdn.environment-agency.gov.uk/LIT_6524_7da381.pdf</p> <p>We aim to reduce flood risk, while protecting and enhancing the water environment. We have had to focus our detailed engagement to those areas where the environmental risks are greatest.</p> <p>We are pleased to see that the proposed allocations have been directed to the areas at the lowest probability of flooding and that they are all located within Flood Zone 1.</p> <p>We would welcome the opportunity to work with you to ensure environmental infrastructure is taken into consideration when funding local infrastructure.</p> <p>Yours sincerely</p> <p>Catherine Hutchins Sustainable Places Planning Advisor Environment Agency Direct Dial 01903 703858 Direct email catherine.hutchins@environment-agency.gov.uk</p>	<p>Not adding to NP, but the PC will be pleased to continue working with the Environment Agency.</p>
--	--	---	--

45.	Environment Agency			
46.	Ferring Parish Council			
47.	1 st East Preston Scouts Group			
48.	Forestry Commission			
49.	Friends of Langmeads / John Heaver – Chairman		<p>26/05 –</p> <p>This is on behalf of the Executive Committee of the Friends of Langmeads. Following a short discussion on the East Preston Neighbourhood Plan at its latest meeting earlier this month the committee tasked me to submit two comments in respect of Langmeads Field's purpose in the Plan.</p> <p>First, the Friends of Langmeads believes the relatively wild and lightly managed nature of Langmeads presents a gilt-edged opportunity not obviously present elsewhere in East Preston for promoting and protecting biodiversity. Paragraph 2.15 is relevant, along with Proposal 5.</p> <p>Second, as a site important for recreation Langmeads Field should, in addition to other listing, be specifically recorded as an amenity site. Certainly worth listing as a local green space, although that may not add too much in practice as it's in public ownership and should be protected. Policies 7 & 12 and Proposal 1 are, in part, relevant.</p> <p>John Heaver</p>	<p>Policy 6 wording amended to emphasise amenity value of Langmeads Field. Also mention of promoting and protecting biodiversity.</p>

50.	Girlguiding / Sue Kift – District Commissioner			
51.	Highways Agency			
52.	Highways Agency / Paul Harwood			
53.	Highways Agency / Elizabeth Cleaver		<p>23/05 –</p> <p>Thank you for consulting the Highways Agency on the East Preston Neighbourhood Plan 2014-2029 Pre-Submission Plan. We do not wish to make any comments at this time, but please continue to consult us.</p> <p>Yours faithfully,</p> <p>Elizabeth Cleaver, Assistant Asset Manager</p>	
54.	Homes And Communities Agency / Ken Glendinning			
55.	ICIS: Information for Life / Liz Hall – Manager			
56.	Kingston Parish Council		<p>28/05 –</p> <p>Kingston Parish Council would like to congratulate East Preston Parish Council on the Pre-Submission Plan document and</p>	

		<p>express thanks for this consultation opportunity. Kingston Parish Council has the following comments:</p> <p>Ref: Page 37 Proposal 4: Cycling and Cycle Paths Points 5.25 and 5.26 were noted. Point 5.27 'There is also support for safe cycle routes inland within the parish' is supported by Kingston Parish Council.</p>	
57.	Littlehampton Gazette / Tom Cotterill – Senior Reporter	17/04 - Nice one, cheers Simon!	
58.	Littlehampton Town Council		
59.	Marine Management		
60.	Marine Management / Angela Atkinson	<p>27/05 –</p> <p>Dear Sir/ Madam,</p> <p>Re: East Preston Neighbourhood Plan 2014-2029 Pre-Submission Plan</p> <p>Thank you for inviting the Marine Management Organisation (MMO) to comment on the above consultation. The MMO has reviewed the document and whilst we have no specific comments to make we would like to draw your attention to the remit of our organisation as you may wish to be aware of this in relation to the consultation.</p> <p>As the marine planning authority for England the MMO is responsible for preparing marine plans for English inshore</p>	

		<p>and offshore waters. At its landward extent, a marine plan will apply up to the mean high water springs mark, which includes the tidal extent of any rivers. As marine plan boundaries extend up to the level of the mean high water spring tides mark there will be an overlap with terrestrial plans which generally extend to the mean low water springs mark. In our duty to take all reasonable steps to ensure compatibility with existing development plans, which apply down to the low water mark, we are seeking to identify the “marine relevance” of applicable plan policies.</p> <p>On April 2014 the East Inshore and East Offshore marine plans were published, becoming a material consideration for the Marine Management Organisation (MMO) and other public authorities with decision making functions. The East Inshore and East Offshore Marine Plans provide guidance for sustainable development in English waters, and cover the coast and seas from Flamborough Head to Felixstowe. Marine plans will inform and guide decision makers on development in marine and coastal areas. More information including the East Inshore and East Offshore marine plans document can be found at http://www.marinemanagement.org.uk/marineplanning/areas/east_plans.htm.</p> <p>The next round of planning began in 2013 in the south plan area. Until such time as a marine plan is in place for the North West plan area we advise local councils to refer to the Marine Policy Statement for guidance on any planning activity that includes a section of coastline or tidal river. All public authorities taking authorisation or enforcement decisions that affect or might affect the UK Marine Policy Statement unless relevant considerations indicate otherwise. The Marine Policy Statement will also guide the development of Marine Plans across the UK. More</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>information can be found at http://www.defra.gov.uk/news/2011/03/18/marine-policy-statement/.</p> <p>The MMO is also responsible for issuing marine licences under the Marine and Coastal Access Act 2009 in England. Amongst other things, a marine licence may be needed for activities involving the construction, alteration or improvement of any works, dredging, or a deposit or removal of a substance or object below the mean high water mark or in any tidal river to the extent of the tidal influence.</p> <p>Alongside marine licences, we also issue consents under the Electricity Act 1989 (as amended) for offshore generating stations between 1 and 100 megawatts in England and for some ports in Wales and for granting consent under various local Acts and orders regarding harbours.</p> <p>The applications we receive may be subject to various forms of assessment. This includes environmental impact assessment, Habitats Regulations assessment, marine conservation zone assessment and assessment for compliance with the Water Framework Directive. Early consultation with the MMO is always advised and we would encourage applicants to engage early with the MMO alongside any application for planning consent to ensure that the consenting process is as efficient as possible. We will look to follow the principles set out in the Coastal Concordat in considering and application which is linked to an application for planning consent.</p> <p>We are also an advisor to the Planning Inspectorate, Secretary of State and other consenting bodies for various consents affecting the marine area. This includes Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects under the Planning Act</p>	<p>No change to NP, and note that the proposed Beach Access improvement (Policy 9) will be above the mean high water mark.</p>
--	--	---	--

			<p>2008.</p> <p>We would suggest that reference to the MMO's role in consenting projects be made within planning documents to ensure that necessary regulatory requirements are covered.</p> <p>If you have any questions or need any further information please just let me know. More information on the role of the MMO can be found on our awebsite www.marinemanagement.org.uk</p> <p>Yours sincerely,</p> <p>Angela Atkinson Relationship Manager</p> <p>E stakeholder@marinemanagement.org.uk</p>	
61.	Marine Management			
62.	Natural England / Consultations			
63.	Natural England / Piotr Behnke			
64.	Neighbourhood Watch / Robin Hargraves			
65.	Network Rail / Clive Robey			

66.	NHS / Julia Hugason-Briem		22/04 – “Dear colleague, Thank you for your email. Tina Tompkins is now the contact at Coastal West Sussex CCG. I have copied her into this email so that youj have her contact address. I would be grateful if you could remove my name from your contact list. Best wishes, Julia” (Action duly completed. Tina already on list.)	
67.	Open Dinghy Club – Neil Harwood (Commodore)			
68.	St Mary the Virgin Church / Fr John Lyon		17/04 – email bounced. Resent email from Outlook	
69.	PCT / Ian DeBruin		22/04 – email bounced	
70.	PCT / Tina Tompkins			
71.	Renewable UK		17/04 – email bounced. Resent email from Outlook	
72.	Rustington Parish Council		17/04 – email bounced. Resent email from Outlook	
73.	Scotia Gas Networks / Lee Crampton			
74.	South East Coast Ambulance Service			

75.	Southdowns National Park / Andrew Triggs			
76.	Southern Water		<p>23/05 –</p> <p>We welcome the opportunity to comment on the above named document.</p> <p>Southern Water is that statutory water and sewerage undertaker for East Preston. Southern Water has a statutory duty to serve new development, and is committed to ensuring the right water and wastewater infrastructure in the right place at the right time. The adopted East Preston Neighbourhood Plan and adopted Arun District Local Plan, will inform Southern Water’s investment planning. Adoption provides the planning certainty required to support investment proposals to Ofwat, the water industry’s economic regulator. Investment proposals are prepared every five years through the price review process. The next price review is in 2014. Ofwat’s price determination will fund the investment programme in the period to 2020. There will be another price review in 2019, covering the investment period 2020 to 2025.</p> <p>Please find following our response in respect of your specific policies. In summary, we seek policy provision to support the delivery of utility infrastructure, in line with the National Planning Framework (NPPF) and Planning Practice Guidance.</p> <p>We hope that you find our response useful and that it will be taken into account when drafting the next version of the Neighbourhood Plan. We would be grateful if you could keep us informed of any future progress that is made.</p> <p>Yours sincerely,</p>	

			Clare Gibbons Development Manager	
77.	Stagecoach UK Bus			
78.	Sussex Police / Sgt Ian Cheesman			
79.	Sussex Police / Sgt Hannah Pearson			
80.	Sustrans / Martyn Brunt			
81.	East Preston Royal British Legion Club			
82.	UK Power Networks / Matt Rudling			
83.	UK Power Networks / Kylie Bentley			
84.	UK Power Networks / Ask the Expert			

85.	West Sussex Fire & Rescue Service		17/04 – passed on to Western Operations Group	
86.	Willowhayne Residents Association			
87.	West Sussex County Council / Sue Furlong			
88.	West Sussex County Council / Strategic Planning			
89.	West Sussex County Council / Lucy Seymour-Bowdery		<p>29/05 –</p> <p>Dear all</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment upon the Parish Council's Consultation Pre-Submission Neighbourhood Plan for East Preston.</p> <p>General</p> <p>In general, the County Council looks for Neighbourhood Plans to be in conformity with the District and Borough Councils' latest draft or adopted development plans. The County Council supports the District and Borough Councils in preparing the evidence base for these plans and aligns its own infrastructure plans with them. The County Council encourages Parish Councils to make use of this information which includes</p>	

		<p>transport studies examining the impacts of proposed development allocations. Where available this information will be published on its website or that of the relevant Local Planning Authority. In relation to its own statutory functions, the County Council expects all Neighbourhood Plans to take due account of its policy documents and their supporting Sustainability Appraisals. These documents include the West Sussex Waste Local Plan, Minerals Local Plan and West Sussex Transport Plan. It is also recommended that published County Council service plans, for example Planning School Places, are also taken into account.</p> <p>Proposals</p> <p>The pre-submission Neighbourhood Plan explains that these proposals will be pursued by the Parish Council, but will be non-statutory in status. The following specific considerations for the Neighbourhood Plan proposals should be noted:</p> <p>Proposal 3 (Sustainable Traffic & Transport): These aspirations have been noted. The County Council is in ongoing discussions with the Parish Council regarding the Eastern Arun Local Infrastructure Plan, which is used to guide local investment in highway improvement schemes identified as community priorities. Further discussion will be undertaken and the plan will be updated at appropriate intervals to ensure that it continues to reflect issues of current interest within communities.</p>	<p>Planning School Places referenced in new paragraph 4.53</p>
--	--	---	--

		<p>In the supporting text, please refer to the to the A259 Route Improvement Study 2013, which recommends a series of improvements in this area. The study is available on the Arun DC website:</p> <p>http://www.arun.gov.uk/main.cfm?type=TRANSPORT1</p> <p>5.22: Please amend 'school traffic plan' to 'School Travel Plan'.</p> <p>Proposal 4 (Cycling and Cycle Paths): Please amend 'Sustrans South Coast cycle route' to 'Sustrans National Cycle Network Route 2 (NCN2)' in the policy and supporting text.</p> <p>5.25: In the third sentence, please note that the County Council, Arun DC and Sustrans should be part of the discussions with local groups.</p> <p>Proposal 6 (Infrastructure Projects) identifies infrastructure investment priorities as potential for receiving contributions from the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). It should be noted that no mechanism currently exists for prioritising infrastructure needs across different public services and allocating funds to priority projects. The County Council is working with Arun District Council and other Local Planning Authorities to develop a robust mechanism and establish appropriate governance arrangements to oversee the prioritisation of infrastructure across different</p>	<p>Amended wording to Proposal 6</p>
--	--	--	--------------------------------------

			<p>services. This will be important to secure delivery of priority projects and the County Council would welcome the Council's support for establishing appropriate decision-making arrangements.</p> <p>Kind Regards, Lucy</p> <p>Lucy Seymour-Bowdery MA MRTPI Planner, Planning and Transport Policy Team, Strategic Planning, Communities and Infrastructure, West Sussex County Council</p>	
90.	West Sussex County Council / Highways & Transport			
91.	West Sussex County Council / Cllr Peter Evans (East Preston & Ferring)			
92.	West Sussex County Council / Cllr Deborah Urquhart (Angmering & Findon)			
93.	West Sussex County Council / Cllr Graham Tyler (Rustington)			

94.	West Sussex County Council / Coastal community and economic development			
95.	West Sussex County Council / East Preston Children & Family Centre			
96.	West Sussex County Council / East Preston Children & Family Centre / Julia Minnock – Manager			
97.	West Sussex County Council / East Preston Library			
98.	West Sussex County Council / East Preston Library / Jane Chilton – Cluster Manager		30/04 - Thank you for including me in the formal pre-submission consultation. We are pleased that you have recognised the Community Value of the library.	
99.	West Sussex			

	County Council / Heritage team / John Mills			
100	West Sussex County Council / Youth Service / Graham Vagg			