

## Regulation 14 Plaistow and Ifold Neighbourhood Plan 2023-2039 Comments & Responses Table

Contents in Draft NP	Page in Regulation 14 NP	Commentator	Comments-	Clerk's suggestions
General		Horsham DC	Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Regulation 14 Plaistow and Ifold Neighbourhood Plan (2023-2039) at Regulation 14. Horsham District Council has no further comment to make on the Plaistow and Ifold Neighbourhood Plan. We hope the consultation goes well.	Noted
		Surrey CC	Thank you for consulting Surrey County Council on the Plaistow and Ifold Pre-Submission Consultation on its Neighbourhood Plan 2023-2039. Please note that we have <b>no comments</b> to raise.	Noted
		Waverley BC	Thank you for consulting Waverley Borough Council on the above document. We have noted that the Plaistow and Ifold Neighbourhood Plan will not be allocating housing and employment sites in its plan. We understand, therefore, that the non-strategic housing allocation of 25 dwellings as set out in the Chichester Local Plan 2021-2039 will be identified in a future development plan document.	Noted
		Historic England	<b>See Appendix 1.</b>	Advice noted. The Local History Group, Plaistow Village Trust and the publication Plaistow Conservation Area Appraisal (May 2013) together with resident consultations were all used to identify designated heritage and non-designated heritage assets. The latter were assessed by the NPWG for inclusion in the Policy by the matrix process as required by the CDC Heritage Officer.
		CDC	<b>See Appendix 2.</b>	
		Natural England	<b>See Appendix 3.</b> Natural England does not have any specific comments on this draft neighbourhood plan.	Local designations include Ancient Woodland which carries its own protections, and it is not necessary to duplicate this in the NP. SSSI found in the parish include parts of Chiddingfold Forest and Shillinglee Lake again with their own protections. The CDC NP Officer advises that an SEA and HRA are not required for this NP.
		Loxwood PC	Thank you for letting the Parish Council know regarding your Regulation 14 Consultation. We have kept up to date with the NP throughout all of its consultation stages and support the Aims and Policies contained therein.	Noted

## Regulation 14 Plaistow and Ifold Neighbourhood Plan 2023-2039 Comments & Responses Table

		Comm. 4.	APOLOGIES FOR THE DULL PUNCTUATION SUGGESTIONS! BUT I HAVE SOME COMMENTS WHICH I WOULD ASK YOU TO CONSIDER FOR SECTION 8. I AM SO GRATEFUL FOR YOUR INCREDIBLE DEDICATION TO GET THIS DONE - IT IS A FASCINATING AND CONCISE READ. 3.2 AND 3.3 ARE MASTERFUL!	Noted
		WACT Comm. 3	The Trust welcomes the recognition in the Plan of the Canal as a Non-Designated Heritage Asset, but considers that AIM CAR2 should seek to enhance, as well as to protect, such assets. It considers that the Canal should also be recognised as a Local Green Space. Ifold is deficient in LGS's, the Canal accords with the NPPF's criteria for LGS's and, whilst much of it is adjoining the parish boundary, the value of the Canal to the Ifold community is clear. Recognition of it in Policy LGS1 would be consistent with the Plan's approach to heritage, biodiversity and connectivity.	Policy wording to be altered as follows: "AIM CAR2 To afford these properties and features a degree of protection <b>and enhancement</b> where possible, as well as historical and architectural recognition...." The WACT is a heritage Asset but does not meet requirements for Local Green Space designation as it is an extensive tract of land and NPPF 106 requires: "not an extensive tract of land". The majority of the WACT lies outside the parish.
		Sports England	<p><b>See Appendix 4.</b> Thank you for consulting Sport England on the above neighbourhood plan. Government planning policy, within the <b>National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)</b>, identifies how the planning system can play an important role in facilitating social interaction and creating healthy, inclusive communities. Encouraging communities to become more physically active through walking, cycling, informal recreation and formal sport plays an important part in this process. Providing enough sports facilities of the right quality and type in the right places is vital to achieving this aim. This means that positive planning for sport, protection from the unnecessary loss of sports facilities, along with an integrated approach to providing new housing and employment land with community facilities is important.</p> <p>Therefore, it is essential that the neighbourhood plan reflects and complies with national planning policy for sport as set out in the NPPF with particular reference to Pars 103 and 104. It is also important to be aware of Sport England's statutory consultee role in <b>protecting playing fields</b> and the presumption against the loss of playing field land. Sport England's playing fields policy is set out in our Playing Fields Policy and Guidance document.</p> <p><a href="https://www.sportengland.org/how-we-can-help/facilities-and-planning/planning-for-sport#playing_fields_policy">https://www.sportengland.org/how-we-can-help/facilities-and-planning/planning-for-sport#playing_fields_policy</a></p> <p>Sport England provides guidance on <b>developing planning policy</b> for sport and further information can be found via the link below. Vital to the development and implementation of planning policy is the evidence base on which it is founded.</p> <p><a href="https://www.sportengland.org/how-we-can-help/facilities-and-planning/planning-for-sport#planning_applications">https://www.sportengland.org/how-we-can-help/facilities-and-planning/planning-for-sport#planning_applications</a></p>	<p><b>These are the polices referred to by Sports England: NPPF 2024 Para 103.</b> Access to a network of high-quality open spaces and opportunities for sport and physical activity is important for the health and well-being of communities and can deliver wider benefits for nature and support efforts to address climate change. Planning policies should be based on robust and up-to-date assessments of the need for open space, sport and recreation facilities (including quantitative or qualitative deficits or surpluses) and opportunities for new provision. Information gained from the assessments should be used to determine what open space, sport and recreational provision is needed, which plans should then seek to accommodate.</p> <p><b>Para 104.</b> Existing open space, sports and recreational buildings and land, including playing fields and formal play spaces, should not be built on unless:</p>

## Regulation 14 Plaistow and Ifold Neighbourhood Plan 2023-2039 Comments & Responses Table

		<p>Sport England works with local authorities to ensure their Local Plan is underpinned by robust and up to date evidence. In line with Par 104 of the NPPF, this takes the form of <b>assessments of need and strategies for indoor and outdoor sports facilities</b>. A neighbourhood planning body should look to see if the relevant local authority has prepared a playing pitch strategy or other indoor/outdoor sports facility strategy. If it has then this could provide useful evidence for the neighbourhood plan and save the neighbourhood planning body time and resources gathering their own evidence. It is important that a neighbourhood plan reflects the recommendations and actions set out in any such strategies, including those which may specifically relate to the neighbourhood area, and that any local investment opportunities, such as the Community Infrastructure Levy, are utilised to support their delivery.</p> <p>Where such evidence does not already exist then relevant planning policies in a neighbourhood plan should be based on a proportionate assessment of the need for sporting provision in its area. Developed in consultation with the local sporting and wider community any assessment should be used to provide key recommendations and deliverable actions. These should set out what provision is required to ensure the current and future needs of the community for sport can be met and, in turn, be able to support the development and implementation of planning policies. Sport England’s guidance on assessing needs may help with such work.</p> <p><a href="http://www.sportengland.org/planningtoolsandguidance">http://www.sportengland.org/planningtoolsandguidance</a></p> <p>If <b>new or improved sports facilities</b> are proposed Sport England recommend you ensure they are fit for purpose and designed in accordance with our design guidance notes.</p> <p><a href="http://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/tools-guidance/design-and-cost-guidance/">http://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/tools-guidance/design-and-cost-guidance/</a></p> <p>Any <b>new housing</b> developments will generate additional demand for sport. If existing sports facilities do not have the capacity to absorb the additional demand, then planning policies should look to ensure that new sports facilities, or improvements to existing sports facilities, are secured and delivered. Proposed actions to meet the demand should accord with any approved local plan or neighbourhood plan policy for social infrastructure, along with priorities resulting from any assessment of need, or set out in any playing pitch or other indoor and/or outdoor sports facility strategy that the local authority has in place.</p> <p>In line with the Government’s NPPF (including Section 8) and its Planning Practice Guidance (Health and wellbeing section), links below, consideration should also be given to how <b>any new development</b>, especially for new housing, will provide opportunities for people to lead healthy lifestyles and create healthy communities. Sport England’s Active Design guidance can be used to help with this when developing planning policies and developing or assessing individual proposals.</p>	<p>(a) an assessment has been undertaken which has clearly shown the open space, buildings or land to be surplus to requirements; or</p> <p>(b) the loss resulting from the proposed development would be replaced by equivalent or better provision in terms of quantity and quality in a suitable location; or</p> <p>(c) the development is for alternative sports and recreational provision, the benefits of which clearly outweigh the loss of the current or former use.</p> <p><b>CDC Adopted Plan Policy P15 (PIPC inserts in red)</b> Open Space, Sport and Recreation Residential development proposals should retain, enhance, improve access and increase the quantity and quality of public open space, playing fields, sport and recreation facilities (including indoor facilities) and provide improved links to the green infrastructure network and existing rights of way. 1. New residential development (excluding replacement dwellings) in accordance with the development thresholds set out in Table 6.1 (<b>only sites over 20 must provide amenity and natural green space. Equipped play space required for sites over 50</b>) will be required to contribute towards: a) The on-site provision of new open space, sports and recreation facilities (including indoor facilities); b) Improving the quality and accessibility of existing open space or indoor facilities. New or improved facilities should be provided in accordance with the quantity and access standards as set out in Tables</p>
--	--	--	---

## Regulation 14 Plaistow and Ifold Neighbourhood Plan 2023-2039 Comments & Responses Table

			<p>Active Design, which includes a model planning policy, provides ten principles to help ensure the design and layout of development encourages and promotes participation in sport and physical activity. The guidance, and its accompanying checklist, could also be used at the evidence gathering stage of developing a neighbourhood plan to help undertake an assessment of how the design and layout of the area currently enables people to lead active lifestyles and what could be improved.</p> <p>NPPF Section 8: <a href="https://www.gov.uk/guidance/national-planning-policy-framework/8-promoting-healthy-communities">https://www.gov.uk/guidance/national-planning-policy-framework/8-promoting-healthy-communities</a></p> <p>PPG Health and wellbeing section: <a href="https://www.gov.uk/guidance/health-and-wellbeing">https://www.gov.uk/guidance/health-and-wellbeing</a></p> <p>Sport England's Active Design Guidance: <a href="https://www.sportengland.org/activedesign">https://www.sportengland.org/activedesign</a></p> <p><i>(Please note: this response relates to Sport England's planning function only. It is not associated with our funding role or any grant application/award that may relate to the site.)</i></p> <p>If you need any further advice, please do not hesitate to contact Sport England using the contact details below.</p> <p>Yours sincerely,  <b>Planning Technical Team</b>  <b>E:</b> <a href="mailto:planning.south@sportengland.org">planning.south@sportengland.org</a></p>	<p>6.3 and 6.4 (Parish numbers allocation of 25 maybe insufficient for this depending on sites chosen and numbers per site) using the household size multiplier in Table 6.2. Provision will be secured by way of condition or legal agreement. 2. Development resulting in the loss of existing open space, playing fields, sports and recreation buildings and land must satisfy the following criteria: a) They are replaced by accessible and appropriately located open space, sports and recreation facilities that are of better or at least equivalent quantity and quality; b) Where the Chichester Open Space, Sport and Recreation Study including Indoor Sports Facilities and Playing Pitch Strategy (or latest update) identifies a surplus in a typology, the future needs and potential to meet shortfalls in other types of open space, sports and recreation provision in the local area need to be taken into account; c) There are no adverse impacts on biodiversity, heritage assets or the integrity of the green infrastructure network.</p> <p><b>Adequate protections exist in higher level planning statute and CDC will carry out an open spaces/recreation facilities assessment during the DPD process.</b></p>
		Comm. 5.	<p>Considering the widespread resistance to further housing developments in the parish and the apathy shown by residents whenever input is sought regarding the plan, we think the Parish Council has done a brilliant job in creating and displaying this Draft Neighbourhood Plan. Thank you for your efforts and thank you for the Drop In Events.</p> <p>The discussions regarding the heritage sites, the local green spaces and the need for better pedestrian and cyclist connectivity are of particular interest to us and these were comprehensively covered in the Plan. Our only suggestion would be to create a more definitive, detailed plan for new footpaths, bridle ways and cycle paths to present to residents and the Highway Authority, rather than just the nebulous commitment to working with the Authority. Aside from this minor point, this is altogether a brilliant Draft Neighbourhood Plan.</p>	<p>The detail required for such a commitment is outside the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan in the time available but will be advanced outside of the NP work.</p>

**Regulation 14 Plaistow and Ifold Neighbourhood Plan 2023-2039 Comments & Responses Table**

	National Highways	<p>Thank you for your email of 02 February 2026 consulting National Highways on the above referenced Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>We are concerned about the safety, reliability, and operational efficiency of the Strategic Road Network (SRN), in this case the A23 and A3 in the vicinity of the parish.</p> <p>We have read the Plan and supporting documents.</p> <p>Given that the Plan is not seeking to allocate any sites for development and the distance of the parish from the SRN, we are satisfied that this Plan, if made, would not have an unacceptable impact on the safety, reliability, and/or operational efficiency of the SRN. Our formal response to this consultation is <b>no objection</b>.</p> <p>Should you or any others have any queries regarding our response, please contact us via <a href="mailto:planningse@nationalhighways.co.uk">planningse@nationalhighways.co.uk</a>.</p> <p>Kind regards,</p> <p><b>Nigel De Wit MRTPI</b>, Spatial Planner</p> <p>South East Region, Operations Directorate</p> <p>National Highways</p>	Noted.
	WSCC	<p>The Parish Council may wish to add a glossary of terms used in the draft Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>Matters related to minerals and waste local plan The West Sussex Joint Minerals Local Plan 2018 (Partial Review March 2021) (JMLP) and West Sussex Waste Local Plan 2014 (WLP) form part of the Development Plan for Plaistow and Ifold neighbourhood plan area. The Parish Council should update paragraph 1.4 and make reference to both the JMLP and WLP. The County Council also recommend making reference to Policy M9 (Safeguarding Minerals) of the JMLP and the Minerals and Waste Safeguarding Guidance in paragraph 1.4. This is because parts of the neighbourhood plan area are underlain by the clay reserves safeguarded by Policy M9.</p>	<p>Glossary to be added as an Appendix.</p> <p>The PC consider an updated is not required as this would be a replication of higher planning statute.</p>
	Comm. 7	<p>The photographs at the beginning of the document could give a better balance and view of the settlements. Plaistow seems over represented compared to Ifold which is the largest settlement, there is none of the centre Ifold of the settlement showing the attractive street scene or sylvan nature of the settlement, the main road view is dominated by highway signage.</p>	<p>Updated after Autumn 26 consultation to include Loxwoodhills Pond photo. Photos of The Drive and/or Chalk Rd in Ifold to be further added to the front cover and Ifold entrance with roads signs removed.</p>

## Regulation 14 Plaistow and Ifold Neighbourhood Plan 2023-2039 Comments & Responses Table

		SDNPA	<p><b>See Appendix 5</b></p> <p>Firstly, the Plan needs clarity about the two local planning authorities (LPAs) covering the Parish, that is Chichester District Council and the South Downs National Park Authority. The consequence of there being two LPAs is the Neighbourhood Plan will form part of two separate Development Plans for the Parish area inside and outside the South Downs National Park. Secondly the Plan needs to be explicit that those parts referred to as AIM are aspirations for the Parish rather than policies. The format with the use of boxes and the wording for the AIMS still gives an impression they are equivalent to the policies.</p>	Added at 2.2 that “where the document refers to LPA it relates to CDC and SDNPA.”
1.0 Introducti on	5.	Comm 4.	1.6 Comma after ‘future’	Updated.
		Comm. 6.	<p>The plan document has been very well prepared and has considered so many of the issues facing Plaistow and Ifold and the surrounding area.</p> <p>As a result, there are not going to be too many comments as I agree largely with what has been tried to be achieved.</p> <p>There are two key issues:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Ensuring that we have appropriate ways to deal with water and wastewater - any development must take this into consideration as we are going to find much more extreme rain and water challenges as the climate evolves.</li> <li>2. The environment and the natural beauty are protected, most particularly dark nights</li> </ol>	Noted.
		SDNPA	<p><b>See Appendix 5</b></p> <p>Para 1.3 Add wording to clarify the status of the AIM sections with the Plan. Add a second sentence to the paragraph. “Those sections of this Plan preceded by the word ‘AIM’ refer to community aims and aspirations. They are not policies and do not form part of the Development Plan policies for the Parish.”</p> <p>Para 1.4 Add wording at the start of the paragraph to clarify the position in the Parish with the two local planning authorities and the two Development Plans of which the Neighbourhood Plan will form part. Amend the existing wording to clarify the position for the parts of the Parish inside and outside the South Downs National Park.</p> <p>Add sentence at the start of the paragraph and amend what would become the second sentence. “For planning purposes, the Parish is split between the two local planning</p>	Additional wording added.

**Regulation 14 Plaistow and Ifold Neighbourhood Plan 2023-2039 Comments & Responses Table**

			<p>authorities of Chichester District Council and the South Downs National Park Authority. The Neighbourhood Plan will form part of the Development Plan for the Parish outside the National Park in conjunction with the Plaistow and Ifold Development Plan Document (DPD). Add new last sentence to the paragraph. “The Neighbourhood Plan will form part of the Development Plan for the Parish for the area inside the National Park in conjunction with the South Downs Local Plan.</p> <p>New para to be inserted after Para 1.4 Add a new paragraph to explain that the Parish Council is required, as a relevant public body “to seek to further the purposes” of the National Park following changes to the legislation covering protected landscapes. The National Park &amp; Access to the Countryside Act 1949 has been amended by Section 245 of the Levelling Up &amp; Regeneration Act (LURA) 2023.</p> <p>Add a new paragraph as follows: “The National Parks &amp; Access to the Countryside Act 1949, as amended by section 245 of the Levelling Up and Regeneration Act 2023, requires all relevant public bodies which includes the Parish Council, to seek to further the purposes of the National Park: • Purpose 1 – To conserve and enhance the natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage of the area; and • Purpose 2 – To promote opportunities for the understanding and enjoyment of the special qualities of the National Park by the public.”</p> <p>Para 1.6 Amend the wording to clarify the use of the Neighbourhood Plan in the two LPA areas. “In the future planning applications for development will be assessed against the policies in the DPD, the South Downs Local Plan and the Neighbourhood Plan as appropriate.</p>	
2.0 The Plan Area	2.1 Geographical Context			
	2.5 Settlements	Comm. 4.	2.10 Comma after ‘green’	Updated.

### Regulation 14 Plaistow and Ifold Neighbourhood Plan 2023-2039 Comments & Responses Table

		Comm. 7	2.7. should state Ifold was originally a large landed Estate, wording is inaccurate. 2.8 Plaistow could have a better description, it is the original historic village of the Parish characterised by a large number of grade II listed dwellings around a large village Green .....	2.7 amended. 2.8 amended.
	2.16 Rural Character	Comm. 6.	The rural character is core to the very charm of the area and must be protected so that all transportation development takes into consideration the rural nature and the road network, which could not support significant increases of traffic	Noted.
	2.19 Social Characteristics			
	2.23 Economic Characteristics			
4.0 Housing	4.1 Local Housing Need	Comm. 6.	Broadly in agreement.	Noted.
	<b>Policy H1 – Local Housing Need</b>	<b>SDNPA</b>	<b>See Appendix 5</b> Amend the wording for circumstances where development was proposed within the National Park part of the Parish. Amend the policy as follows: First sentence, “...with the Chichester Local Plan 2021-2039 Policy H4 or the South Downs Local Plan as appropriate.” Second sentence, “...identified Parish housing need as evidenced in the Local Housing Needs Assessment APPENDIX A and the latest CDC Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment (HEDNA), or the South Downs HEDNA, available at the time the planning application is submitted, as appropriate.”	Amended.
	4.10 Settlement Boundary of Ifold	Comm. 6.	In favour of the ability to apply policy H2 and stop further erosion of the character of the area.	Noted

**Regulation 14 Plaistow and Ifold Neighbourhood Plan 2023-2039 Comments & Responses Table**

	Policy H2- Housing Development - Ifold Settlement Boundary	Comm. 6.	In agreement with policy - H2.	Noted
	4.14 Density & Design Principles	Comm. 6	Broadly in agreement.	Noted
	Policy H3 – Housing Density & Design Principles			
5.0 Economy and Employment	5.1 Supporting The Local Economy	Comm. 6	Broadly in agreement. Proposals that incentivise the growth of new businesses and prevent loss of employment should be implemented and supported.	Noted
	Policy EE1- Supporting The Local Economy	Comm. 6	<b>Broadly in agreement - especially to avoid the noise and adverse impact that heavy goods vehicles will have on the countryside.</b>	Noted
		SDNPA	<b>See Appendix 5</b> Amend the wording for circumstances where development was proposed within the National Park part of the Parish, to include the purposes for which the protected landscape was designated. Amend the policy as follows: Second sentence, "...appendix C in the emerging CDC Local Plan, 2021-2039, or the marketing guidance in the South Downs Local Plan as appropriate." Last sentence, "...which would impact adversely on the countryside or result in the loss of agriculture, and in the South Downs National Park demonstrate how the proposal conserves and enhances the landscape."	Amended
	5.7 Retail Shop Premises	Comm. 4.	5.8 Add ' <i>resulting in the</i> ' after 'Any future planning applications'	Updated.

**Regulation 14 Plaistow and Ifold Neighbourhood Plan 2023-2039 Comments & Responses Table**

		Comm. 6	Broadly in agreement to protect and ensure that the three local retail shops are protected.	Noted
	<b>Policy EE2 – Retail Shop Premises</b>	Comm. 6	Broadly in agreement.	Noted
	<b>Policy EE3- Brownfield Sites</b>	<b>SDNPA</b>	Add another criterion for circumstances where development was proposed within the National Park part of the Parish, to include the purposes for which the protected landscape was designated. Add new criterion (e) as follows: “Where the proposed development is within the South Downs National Park part of the Parish, demonstrate how the proposal conserves and enhances the landscape.”	Updated.
	5.11 Brownfield Sites	Comm. 6	Broadly in agreement.	Noted
	<b>Policy EE3 – Brownfield Sites</b>	<b>Comm. 6</b>	Agree with the need for considerable planning for the development of mixed-use grounds but broadly in favour of the proposed usage of brownfield sites.	Noted
6.0 Community Assets and Recreation	6.1 Designated & Non-Designated Heritage Assets			
	<b>AIM CAR1 – Designated Heritage Assets</b>			
	<b>AIM CAR 2 - Non-Designated Heritage Assets</b>	<b>Comm. 1.</b>	The objection comments I outlined earlier in this process remain as yet unanswered by the Parish Council whom appear to be utterly intransigent in their approach, in that they appear completely unwilling to enter into any meaningful discussion with the householder. They had completed their assessment without any consultation and prior to the householder being informed their property was under consideration. The Parish council member(s) have no formal qualifications enabling them to complete this assessment and we the householders Object to being so designated. The assessment	The PC do not agree that the comments previously made invalidate their scoring of the Non-Designated Heritage Assets and inclusion in this AIM. Comments have not been ignored, and three meetings have been held with the property owner regarding this together with interaction via

## Regulation 14 Plaistow and Ifold Neighbourhood Plan 2023-2039 Comments & Responses Table

			made by the Paris Council is based on supposition, and in places does not appear to include any evidence of Fact. It was certainly completed without any input whatsoever from the householder. Indeed when challenged the points raised by the householder were ignored as evidenced by the minutes of the council meeting. The Property in question is The Lodge, The Drive, Ifold.	correspondence. A formal qualification is not required to score the properties via the CDC matrix and put forward to CDC for inclusion on the formal CDC NDHA list.
		<b>Comm 3.</b>	<p>The Wey and Arun Canal Trust (<i>'the Trust'</i>) was formed in 1973 to restore the Wey &amp; Arun Canal (<i>'the Canal'</i>) between the River Wey Navigation at Shalford, Surrey, and the River Arun Navigation near Pulborough, Sussex. A small section of the Canal around Southlands Lock to the northeast of Ifold runs along the Plaistow &amp; Ifold – Loxwood parish boundary, and a further section to the north is wholly within Plaistow &amp; Ifold parish. The Trust considers the Canal to be multi-functional; an historic asset of current and future relevance promoting recreation, heath, connectivity and biodiversity. The Trust welcomes the opportunity to comment on the Parish Council's draft Neighbourhood Plan ('the Plan') in relation to its proposals for the continued restoration of the Canal.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Heritage Issues</b></p> <p>AIM CAR2, Non-Designated Heritage Assets, identifies the Canal and Southlands Lock as a historical asset<sup>1</sup> to be recognised and protected. The Trust support's the Parish's approach but considers that, in accordance with Policy NE10 of the Chichester Local Plan<sup>2</sup>, AIM CAR2 should seek to enhance, as well as to protect, such assets.</p> <p>The Plan's Appendix D is an assessment of non-designated Heritage Sites. The Council's analysis of such sites, under the heading '<i>Heritage Reference</i>'<sup>3</sup>, considers the Canal and Southlands Lock<sup>4</sup> to have good heritage value, scoring 10/15. This analysis is supported by the Trust, including the recreational benefits of restoration identified by the Council.</p>	
		<b>Comm. 6</b>	In agreement to protect the non-designated heritage assets as per the long list and ensure they are protected.	<b>Noted</b>
	6.3 Community Buildings	<b>Comm. 6</b>	Factual details, no comment - I agree with the plan and assertion that community buildings remain the focal point for the community and should be retained as such.	<b>Noted</b>

The word "enhance" in AIM CAR 2 (**Now Policy NDHA 1**). Now included.

Noted

<sup>1</sup> Ref I10 and I8 respectively.

<sup>2</sup> Adopted 2025

<sup>3</sup> The middle column

<sup>4</sup> Reference I10 and I8 respectively.

**Regulation 14 Plaistow and Ifold Neighbourhood Plan 2023-2039 Comments & Responses Table**

	<b>AIM CAR3 – Community Buildings</b>			
	6.6 Assets of Community Value	Comm. 6	Broadly in agreement.	Noted
	<b>AIM CAR4 – Assets of Community Value</b>	<b>Comm. 4.</b>	This sentence is very difficult to understand	Updated. To <b>AIM CAR4- ASSETS OF COMMUNITY VALUE (Now CAR 3)</b> The Parish Council will consult, identify and apply to the District Council for the listing of assets of community value. Buildings and other community facilities identified as important to the community will be put forward on an ongoing process. <b>From</b> The Parish Council will consult, identify and apply to the District Council for the listing as assets of community value, buildings and other community facilities identified as important to the community. This will be carried out as an ongoing process.
		<b>Comm. 6</b>	Broadly in agreement.	Noted
		<b>Comm. 7</b>	Loxwoodhills Pond could be included as an Asset of Community Value in view of its considerable significance to Ifold Settlement. This would give the community the opportunity to possibly secure the lake and immediately adjoining land ( excluding the adjoining residence) in the future for the benefit of the community and provide much needed recreational space, should the property be sold. There is a public right of way to facilitate access.	For an application to be successful there must be evidence of community use and social value of an asset. It is difficult to evidence this of a view.

## Regulation 14 Plaistow and Ifold Neighbourhood Plan 2023-2039 Comments & Responses Table

	<b>SDNPA</b>	See Appendix 5 Add wording in the opening paragraphs of Sections 6 & 8 to clarify that the following AIMS are community aspirations rather than policies.	NP updated.
6.7 Public Open Spaces & Recreation	Comm. 3.	Whilst Ifold is the largest settlement in the parish, it is acknowledged in Aim CAR5 to lack sufficient public green spaces <sup>5</sup> . This is confirmed within Policy LGS1, Local Green Spaces ('LGS's'), which identifies just two LGS's serving the village; a Landmark Oak Tree (LGSi1) and the PROW <sup>6</sup> to Loxwood Hills Pond (LGS i2). Whilst the oak is clearly an important tree in Ifold, it provides limited opportunities for active recreation. Appendix E contains the Council's assessment of its LGS recreational sites against the NPPF's criteria <sup>7</sup> . It clarifies that LGS i2 is the 4.69ha Loxwood Hills Pond (and garden). The public right of way itself, footpath 624_1, runs across the northern boundary of Loxwood Hills Pond. The path is recognised to be important as a means of access to Loxwood Hills Pond itself and beyond to an historic bridge over the River Lox to the Canal.	Noted.
	Comm. 4.	Comma after 'playing fields'	Updated.
	Comm. 6	It is important to protect our public open spaces and recreation within the neighbourhood plan formal consultation area.	Noted
	Comm. 7	6.11 The provision of public open space should be stronger than an aspiration for Ifold. This needs to be strengthened to a stronger policy statement. If Ifold accepts more housing than 5 units, this should contribute directly to the provision of public open space. It is entirely unacceptable that a settlement of Ifold's size has no public open space. It is not acceptable that residents must drive 2+ miles to access such space in Plaistow or Loxwood. It should be within reasonable walking distance. The small allocation at Kelsey Hall is not adequate serving toddler children only.	This is outside the control of the PC and therefore can only be an aspiration.
	<b>AIM CAR5 – Public Open</b>	<b>Comm. 6</b>	Broadly in agreement especially to create in Ifold a children's playground

<sup>5</sup> Reiterated in Appendix D, page 4.

<sup>6</sup> Public right of way.

<sup>7</sup> Identified in the Plan at paragraph 107. HC2 of the revised draft of the NPPF, December 2025, retains these criteria.

**Regulation 14 Plaistow and Ifold Neighbourhood Plan 2023-2039 Comments & Responses Table**

	<b>Space &amp; Recreation</b>	<b>Comm. 7</b>	See comments at 6.11	Comm 7 above
7.0 Water	7.1 Flood Risk & Foul Drainage	Comm. 6	Strongly in support - we must ensure that any new development does not damage and does not increase the problem towards flood risk and foul drainage.	Noted
		Environmental Agency	The paragraph states that promoting SuDS is an objective – it may be helpful to directly state that SuDS are preferable within Policy FR1.	See also EA & CDC comments and rewording suggestion of Policy FR1. This Policy has now been amended to include more local background detail.
		Southern Water	<p>As a Statutory Wastewater and Water Service Provider for the Parish, Southern Water welcomes this Section on Water, and the Policy FR1 for FLOOD RISK AND FOUL DRAINAGE. We fully support the Objectives of addressing potential flood risk and sewerage problems, improving water efficiency, and promoting Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) to help reduce the risk of flooding. We would welcome additional Policy Requirements that promotes the use of sustainable drainage systems for all new development, takes account of flood risk and existing drainage features, and ensures that surface water does not either discharge or run off into the foul sewer system. As such, we recommend the following additional Policy Requirements for inclusion in Policy FR1 FLOOD RISK AND FOUL DRAINAGE New Development should: take account of flood risk through their location and design, existing flow routes and drainage features within the site should be identified and preserved eg ditches, seasonally dry watercourses, historic ponds. integrate sustainable drainage systems, to minimise and control surface water run-off, provide flood storage capacity and improve habitats and species migration. SuDS should be in conformity with the National Design Standards and measures should include source control components such as rainwater re-use/harvesting, green roofs, rain gardens, trees, permeable paving. Multi-functional SuDS features should be used to meet several planning policy requirements within the same area of the site eg biodiversity, amenity, green infrastructure, flood risk, drainage. minimise the risk of sewer flooding and protect water quality, by not discharging surface water to the foul sewer network.</p> <p>We recommend the following amendments to the Policy Requirements below in Policy FR1 FLOOD RISK AND FOUL DRAINAGE (existing wording lined through, new wording underlined) <u>Foul waste connections should be phased in line with infrastructure capabilities.</u></p>	<p>The PC consider the distinct local capacity problems evidenced by development in Loxwood create the circumstances for the Policy requirements as written.</p> <p>CDC suggested in the Teams meeting on 9<sup>th</sup> April 2026 that more detail be included regarding local capacity problems. Policy FR1To be reworded.</p>

**Regulation 14 Plaistow and Ifold Neighbourhood Plan 2023-2039 Comments & Responses Table**

			<p>Unless it can be demonstrated that there is sufficient capacity within the existing sewerage and drainage network, a Grampian condition should be imposed on any planning permission for new development requiring that new wastewater infrastructure enabling sufficient capacity is put in place to accommodate the new development prior to occupation.</p> <p><u>In order to assess available network capacity, the wastewater a water infrastructure provider will be consulted on planning applications as early as possible to review the development proposals and work with the developer on the intended delivery programme, this will assist with identifying any potential network reinforcement requirements. Where there is a capacity constraint, the Local Planning Authority will, where appropriate, apply phasing conditions to any approval to ensure that any necessary infrastructure upgrades are delivered ahead of the occupation of the relevant phase of development.</u></p> <p>In relation to the objective of Improving Water Efficiency, we recommend a Policy Requirement that is in conformity with the Chichester District Local Plan, which advises the following –          “Water Efficiency - All new residential proposals must demonstrate that a maximum water consumption of 110 litres per person per day including external water use will be achieved, and lower water use will be encouraged.”</p>	
	<b>Policy FR1 – Flood Risk &amp; Foul Drainage</b>	<b>Comm. 6</b>	<b>Fully in agreement with Policy FR1.</b>	<b>Noted</b>
		<b>Environmental Agency</b>	<p>The policy is directed towards surface water flood risk/run-off, rather than other flood risk sources (fluvial, tidal, groundwater, reservoir etc). It would be helpful to clarify that within the policy.</p> <p>The Environment Agency is comfortable that Policy NE16 within Chichester District Council’s Local Plan 2021 – 2039 adequately covers all sources of flood risk, and any</p>	<b>Policy to be reworded with more local detail following advice in the 9<sup>th</sup> April 2026 Teams meeting with CDC.</b>

**Regulation 14 Plaistow and Ifold Neighbourhood Plan 2023-2039 Comments & Responses Table**

			<p>development coming forward within the neighbourhood plan area would need to comply with that policy.</p> <p>We are supportive of the principle of phasing development to align with wastewater infrastructure provision as necessary.</p>	
		<b>WSCC</b>	<p><b>POLICY FR 1 – FLOOD RISK AND FOUL DRAINAGE</b> As the Lead Local Flood Authority, the County Council recommend addressing the matters on surface water drainage and foul drainage in two separate policies to ensure clarity, because surface water drainage and foul drainage are separate systems in new developments that serve different purposes. The Parish Council may wish to have a policy on foul drainage, and another policy on flood risk and Sustainable Drainage Systems. The Parish Council may wish to make reference to the standards and principles set out in the National Standards for Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) published by the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs in the policy on Sustainable Drainage Systems.</p>	<b>As above.</b>
8.0 Environment and Community Connectivity	8.1 Biodiversity & Community Connectivity	Comm. 4.	8.22 Tricky to understand. The word parish does not need a capital - just like the word town.	Updated to  to”8.22 To improve links to public transport in the parish and between the principal settlements within the parish as well as to adjoining towns, parishes, and train services. “
		British Horse Society	<p><i>“8.3 The Parish settlement areas are not interconnected for active travel. Verges along the lanes to and from each settlement area are either too overgrown or narrow to use for <b>pedestrians</b> and the roads too narrow for safe <b>cycling</b> for families. <b>Footpaths</b> across fields have become over grown and poorly maintained and do not offer a route between settlements for the most part of the year.”</i></p> <p>All the above equally affects horse riders (who also have a right to use the verge – see above) and carriage drivers.</p>	Noted- Amended to - .3 <i>The Parish settlement areas are not interconnected for active travel. Verges along the lanes to and from each settlement area are either too overgrown or narrow to use for <b>pedestrians</b> and the roads too narrow for safe <b>cycling</b> for families <b>and horse riding. Footpaths</b> across fields have become over grown and poorly maintained and do not offer a route</i>

**Regulation 14 Plaistow and Ifold Neighbourhood Plan 2023-2039 Comments & Responses Table**

				<i>between settlements for the most part of the year.”</i>
AIM ECC1 - Biodiversity	British Horse Society	<p>“AIM ECC 1 BIODIVERSITY The Parish Council will support and facilitate community working groups to develop and undertake projects to help protect and increase biodiversity with the Parish. The Parish Council will support the provision of green corridors between settlements within the Parish and across Parish boundaries. All new development should have regard to the green network measures set out in the Design Guidelines and Codes document 2.4 <b>where possible creating green corridors along the verge, cycle and path network.</b> “</p> <p>Please see our comments on the Design Guidelines and codes.</p>		Not necessary as the NP already mentions the green network.
	Comm. 6	Broadly in agreement in the creation of increasing biodiversity within the Parish.		Noted
AIM ECC2 – Community Connectivity	British Horse Society	<p>“AIM ECC 2 COMMUNITY CONNECTIVITY The Parish Council will work with landowners, WSCC and CDC to promote and support the provision of a <b>cycle network</b> between the settlement areas within the Parish [...]. The Parish Council will work with WSCC, CDC and landowners to improve and enhance the existing verges of the lanes to facilitate <b>pedestrian</b> use for connectivity within the Parish.”</p> <p>New provision for walkers and cyclists should be made by adding <b>bridleways</b>, if not restricted byways, which includes horse riders by default and provides the best value for money for the tax payer as well as helping to keep all vulnerable road users safer. Please see comments above in respect of highway verges.</p>		Adding bridleways is beyond this requirement for this AIM.
	Comm. 6	In agreement with all plans and proposals to improve the connectivity between the parish locations.		Noted
8.7 Ensuring Highway Safety	Comm 2.	<p>As a non-driver I walk and cycle every day around the neighbourhood. Cycle paths seem an impractical proposition but surely something could be done to make it less dangerous to walk between Ifold and Plaistow, and elsewhere?</p> <p>Vegetation overhangs the road on a number of blind bends.</p> <p>I believe clearing this would be more cost effective and useful than cycle paths. I have no difficulties cycling around the parish, but walking is hazardous.</p>		Safety considerations need to be reported to WSCC Highways. This is a long-term ambition of the Parish Council to improve the connectivity between settlements. AIM ECC2


## Regulation 14 Plaistow and Ifold Neighbourhood Plan 2023-2039 Comments & Responses Table

		<p>Comm. 4.</p> <p>I think it is important to talk about the extensive areas of ‘Common land’ within our parish and to provide a map of these areas, making sure that we resolve to protect them from development. I know of two areas currently which have been ignored in planning and not enforced.</p> <p>On a similar vein, we must protect and guard against damage to any of the large areas of National Trust land, which for me also serve as areas of important green space. Perhaps a map of this would also be helpful.</p> <p>8.12 add ‘the’ before PROW</p>	<p>Common Land is dealt with under separate legislation Commons Act 2006 and this is not within the remit of the NP however a reference to the Magic Map detailing common areas an all-inclusive map will be made on the PC website NT land is already protected by that ownership however a map of NT land will be included on the website.</p>
		<p>Comm. 6</p> <p>Broadly in agreement to avoid the development of any future on-street parking</p>	<p>Noted</p>
Policy EHS1 – Ensuring Highway Safety	British Horse Society	<p><i>“POLICY EHS 1 – ENSURING HIGHWAY SAFETY To maintain the rural character of the Parish, ensure highway safety and to reflect the poor accessibility to public transport:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>appropriate levels of off-street parking should be provided for all new developments in accordance with the current WSCC car parking standards. These standards should be considered a minimum provision within the Parish and all new development should have regard to the Plaistow and Ifold Design Guidelines and Codes. To ensure that safe and appropriate access is provided:</i></li> <li>• <i>particular attention should be paid to the design of the width of roads and access points to allow waste, emergency and delivery vehicles to access and egress in a forward motion and provide good visibility and measures to manage traffic speeds.”</i></li> </ul> <p>We welcome this</p>	<p>Noted</p>
	Comm. 6	<p>Fully in agreement with Policy EHS1.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
	SDNPA	<p><b>See Appendix 5</b> Add a second bullet point for circumstances where development is proposed within the South Downs National Park part of the Parish: “in the South Downs National Park part of the Parish appropriate levels of parking should be provided for any new developments in accordance with the parking standards in the South Downs</p>	<p>Amended</p>

## Regulation 14 Plaistow and Ifold Neighbourhood Plan 2023-2039 Comments & Responses Table

		National Park Authority Parking Supplementary Planning Document or any future version of those standards.”	
8.11 Public Rights of Way	Comm. 6	Fully in agreement with the need to protect the rural character of the parish, whilst ensuring highway safety, and ensuring that there is a safe and appropriate access provided	Noted
	Comm. 7	I think it is important to talk about the extensive areas of “Common Land” within our parish and to provide a map of these areas, making sure that we resolve to protect them from development. I know of two areas currently which have been ignored in planning and not enforced. On a similar vein, we must protect and guard against damage to any of the large areas of National Trust land, which for me also serve as areas of important green space. Perhaps a map of this would be helpful. 8.12 add “the” before PROW	See comments on this above. Comm. 4.  Updated.
AIM ECC3 – Public Rights of Way	Comm. 3.	Comm. 3 <b>Cross Boundary Issues</b> Whilst much of the Canal and towpath is outside the parish boundary, the heritage value of it is explicitly recognised in the Plan. Moreover, the Trust notes that the continued use and restoration of the Canal accords with other aims of the Plan which also explicitly recognise cross boundary issues (e.g., Ifold and Loxwood). ECC1 seeks to increase biodiversity along green corridors between settlements within ‘and across’ the Parish boundary. ECC 2 promotes and supports the provision of a cycle network between settlements to reduce emissions and promote pedestrian connectivity. ECC3 proposes connectivity improvements ‘within and outside’ the Parish. ECC 4 aims to improve movement between the principal settlements within the Parish ‘and adjoining Parishes’.	Noted
	British Horse Society	“AIM ECC3 – PUBLIC RIGHTS OF WAY The Parish Council will engage and work with the Highways Authority, WSCC Rights of Way Committee and individual landowners to improve:  • public footpaths,  • bridleways,  and other rights of way, to improve connectivity within and outside the Parish.”  We welcome this	Noted

**Regulation 14 Plaistow and Ifold Neighbourhood Plan 2023-2039 Comments & Responses Table**

		Comm. 6	Broadly in agreement.	Noted
8.15 Cycle Routes	British Horse Society		<p><i>"8.15 Cycle Routes</i></p> <p><i>8.16 There is a need to encourage alternative and active modes of travel other than the private car in order to improve sustainability and to promote the public health and recreational advantages."</i></p> <p>Provision for cyclists should be made by adding <b>bridleways</b>, if not restricted byways, which includes horse riders by default and provides the best value for money for the tax payer as well as helping to keep all vulnerable road users safer. Where routes are road-side, they can be provided as multi use routes to include equestrians utilising</p>  <p>sign NP956.1</p>	<p>Amended as shown:</p> <p><b>AIM ECC 4 – CYCLE &amp; HORSE RIDING ROUTES</b></p> <p>The Parish Council will work with the Highway Authority, to establish the potential for providing cycle and horse riding routes in and around the parish, to improve movement between the principal settlements within the parish and adjoining parishes.</p>
		Comm. 6	Broadly in agreement.	Noted
<b>AIM ECC4 – Cycle Routes</b>	<b>British Horse Society</b>		<p><i>"AIM ECC 4 – CYCLE ROUTES The Parish Council will work with the Highway Authority, to establish the potential for providing cycle routes in and around the Parish, to improve movement between the principal settlements within the Parish and adjoining Parishes."</i></p> <p>See the response to 8.15/8.16 above</p>	See 8.15 above
8.19 Public Transport		Comm. 6	There is little public transport available within the parish and improving and enhancing that is a priority.	Noted

**Regulation 14 Plaistow and Ifold Neighbourhood Plan 2023-2039 Comments & Responses Table**

	Comm. 7	8.22 Tricky to understand. The word parish does not need a capital- just like the word town.	Updated. To 8.22 To improve links to public transport in the parish and between the principal settlements within the parish as well as to adjoining towns, parishes, and train services.
<b>AIM ECC5 – Public Transport</b>	Comm. 6	Broadly in agreement with ECC5 public transport and the need to achieve more regular and frequent services within the settlements and outside this parish.	Noted
8.23 Traffic Calming For Adopted Highways	British Horse Society	<p><i>“8.25 Objective</i></p> <p><i>8.26 To improve safety for pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians by ensuring appropriate speed through the Parish.”</i></p> <p>We welcome this</p>	Noted
	Comm. 6	Broadly in agreement to improve the safety for pedestrian, cyclists, and equestrians, as well as looking after the network for the car driver.	Noted
	WSCC	<p>Comments on the transport impacts associated with Neighbourhood Plan for Plaistow and Ifold In considering the Neighbourhood Plan for Plaistow and Ifold, the size and location of proposed site allocations have been taken into account when considering if further transport evidence is required at this stage. The overall level of development proposed in the Plaistow and Ifold Neighbourhood Plan is in accordance with the forecast estimate of background traffic growth assumed in the Local Plan evidence base. The Local Plan evidence base indicates that there will be no severe impacts on the transport network that cannot be mitigated to a satisfactory level. The County Council considers that this provides sufficient evidence to justify the overall level of development proposed in the Plaistow and Ifold Neighbourhood Plan. Therefore, it is not necessary to produce further transport evidence before allocating the sites proposed in the Neighbourhood Plan for Plaistow and Ifold. As part of considerations for development proposals, paragraphs 115 and 117 of the National Planning Policy Framework December 2024 (NPPF) highlight the need to prioritise sustainable transport modes over and above highway improvements and traffic control. The County Council will continue to work with the Local Planning Authority to ensure that the transport</p>	Noted but no action requested.

**Regulation 14 Plaistow and Ifold Neighbourhood Plan 2023-2039 Comments & Responses Table**

		<p>implications of the Local Plan can be mitigated through a range of sustainable transport measures that will need to come forward as development takes place. Further information on the transport evidence base for the Chichester Local Plan The evidence base for the Chichester Local Plan, adopted in August 2025, tested the cumulative impact of strategic development proposed within Chichester District using the Chichester Area Transport Model (CATM). The evidence base identified the additional travel demand as a result of planned development, over and above development already committed plus background growth. This was used to help identify a package of mitigation measures, including junction improvements on the A27 Chichester Bypass and a range of sustainable transport schemes on corridors leading into and within the City. Mitigation measures have then been included in an Infrastructure Delivery Plan. Page 3 of 4 WSCC Services Officer Level Comments Mitigation measures are expected to be developed and implemented as development takes place as part of a 'monitor and manage' approach (i.e. monitoring the impacts of development to inform decisions on investment in mitigation measures). Mitigation measures are expected to be delivered directly by developers or by transport authorities and providers (e.g. bus operators). The monitor and manage approach is being overseen by a Transport Infrastructure Management Group (TIMG) including representatives of the local authorities and National Highways, along with neighbouring transport and planning authorities as required. Site-specific transport assessments Whilst the County Council supports the proactive approach undertaken to allocate sites in the Neighbourhood Plan, we are unable to comment on site specific matters at this stage. In considering site-specific matters, please refer to the attached Development Management Guidance. The Local Plan evidence base indicates that over the plan period, traffic conditions in some locations are likely to worsen due to the effects of background traffic growth. A detailed site-specific assessment will need to be undertaken at the planning application stage (or as part of a consultation for a Community Right to Build Order) to assess the impacts of development on the local highway network, the need for improvements and/ or proportionate financial contributions to be secured towards the delivery of these improvements. Developers can seek site-specific advice at the pre-application stage through the County Council's highways and transport pre-application advice service, which is available to developers for a fee. Please find further information on our charging procedure through the following link:  <a href="http://www.westsussex.gov.uk/leisure/getting_around_west_sussex/roads_and_">http://www.westsussex.gov.uk/leisure/getting_around_west_sussex/roads_and_</a></p>	
--	--	--	--

**Regulation 14 Plaistow and Ifold Neighbourhood Plan 2023-2039 Comments & Responses Table**

			pathways/plans_and_projects/development_control_for_roads/pre application_charging_guide.aspx	
	<b>AIM ECC6 – Traffic Calming For Protected Highways</b>	British Horse Society	<i>“AIM ECC 6- TRAFFIC CALMING FOR ADOPTED HIGHWAYS The Parish Council will engage with the Highway Authority and other agencies to identify areas of the local adopted highway network which may need traffic calming measures”</i>  We welcome this	Noted
		Comm. 6	Broadly in agreement.	Noted
	8.27 School Transport	Comm. 6	School transport is important. Agree with this policy.	Noted
	<b>AIM ECC7 – School Transport</b>			
	8.31 Local Green Space	Comm. 4.	8.36 Swap colon for full stop after ‘Spaces.’ Is the word ‘Attractiveness’ needed?	Updated.
		Southern Water	Southern Water welcomes and supports the following Paragraph in the Local Green Spaces section of the Plan. 8.33 The NPPF allows for these areas to be protected, and sets out that, local policies for managing development within a Local Green Space should be consistent with the NPPF Green Belt policy (NPPF 24 Chapter 13), to rule out new development other than in very special circumstances.  Further explanation: We consider that should the need arise, special circumstances exist in relation to the provision of essential water or wastewater infrastructure (e.g a new pumping station) required to serve new and existing customers. This is because there can be limited options available with regard to location, as the infrastructure would need to connect into existing networks. The National Planning Practice Guidance	Noted

### Regulation 14 Plaistow and Ifold Neighbourhood Plan 2023-2039 Comments & Responses Table

			recognises this scenario and states that ‘it is important to recognise that water and wastewater infrastructure can have specific locational needs (and often consists of engineering works rather than new buildings). This means exceptionally otherwise protected areas may have to be considered, where this is consistent with their designation.’ It is also worth mentioning that wastewater and water utility infrastructure can already run beneath some of the local green spaces in a neighbourhood area.	
	Policy LGS11- Local Green Space	Comm. 7	LGSi2 Loxwoodhills Lake. The area designated should include the land surrounding the lake, its setting within former park land of the Landed Estate and is not just the lake margins. It is not the PROW or the view but the lake itself and its setting that should form the LGS. This is the historic green space important to the local community and the history of the settlement. Retaining the view from the PROW ie ensuring the hedge line is retained at approx 1.2 m is an important objective, through negotiation with the property owner, so that the community can continue to retain a visual connection to this historic feature.	The lake itself would not be visible unless the view from the PROW is protected and the lake is included in the area currently. The 1.2 hedgerow will be dealt with informally it is not possible to write Policy for this in the NP realm.
		SDNPA	See Appendix 5 Clarify whether Local Green Space, LGS S1: Shillinglee Road Junction Traffic Island is within or part within the South Downs National Park. Amend the related map to show the boundary of the South Downs National Park. Contact the Planning Policy officer at the South Downs National Park Authority to confirm whether this Local Green Space is part within or wholly within the South Downs National Park. Amend the related map to show the boundary of the South Downs National Park.	Updated.
<b>3.0 Vision &amp; Objectives</b>	3.1 Vision	Comm. 6	Broadly in agreement	Noted
	3.2 Objectives	Comm. 4.	3.5 Remove first two commas. Add comma after Plaistow. Swap colon for full stop after ‘setting’.	Updated.
		Comm. 6	In agreement with the objectives of 3.2 and the vision objectives to ensure housing maintains the Settlement Boundary; there is avoidance of the loss of employment and the impact on the economy; maintaining community assets and recreation in terms of buildings and a focal part of the community.  Very strongly believe that we must ensure that development within our parishes should evolve naturally and sympathetically, blending new with old.	Noted

## Regulation 14 Plaistow and Ifold Neighbourhood Plan 2023-2039 Comments & Responses Table

		Comm. 7	'respect the absence of a settlement boundary for Plaistow' Is this short sighted ? This places Plaistow in the countryside where CDC policies severely restrict development particularly new housing. In order for a village to thrive there is a need for some development. The village needs younger people and housing suitable to meet the housing need. Is this consistent with the identified housing need for the Parish. Plaistow has good village facilities able to support new development.	This should require housing to be allocated in a NP or Local Plan rather than speculatively which would then be development in open countryside.
		SDNPA	See Appendix 5 Para 3.3 Amend the wording to clarify that part of the Parish is within the South Downs National Park as well as the Parish having an impact on the setting of the protected landscape.  Amend the last sentence as follows: "...and with recognition of the importance of this that part of the Parish is within the South Downs National Park; as well as the importance of the Parish in contributing to the setting of the South Downs National Park protected landscape."	Amended
<b>9.0 Deliverin g The Plan</b>		WSCC	Section 9.5 Delivering the Plan In Table 1, the Parish Council may wish to include "West Sussex County Council", or the "Lead Local Flood Authority", as one of the agencies to be engaged with in the delivery mechanism and management for Policy FR1 Flood Risk and Foul Drainage. As the Lead Local Flood Authority, WSCC are the statutory consultee Page 2 of 4 WSCC Services Officer Level Comments for major development with surface water drainage. Therefore, the County Council are also one of the key stakeholders in ensuring new developments are sustainably drained.	Updated.
		SDNPA	See Appendix 5 Para 9.3 Remove the wording relating to the South Downs National Park Authority (SDNPA) as the secondary authority. The wording is misleading in the context of this paragraph. SDNPA are the secondary authority for the Neighbourhood Plan process only with Chichester District Council as the lead authority. That is CDC are the lead authority in providing advice and guiding the Parish Council in developing the Neighbourhood Plan or any future review. For planning decision making once the Neighbourhood Plan is 'made' (adopted), the key point is the location of the development, as either CDC or SDNPA will be the local planning authority as appropriate.  Amend first sentence, "...and the emerging South Downs Local Plan (SDNPA as the secondary authority)."	Amended

**Regulation 14 Plaistow and Ifold Neighbourhood Plan 2023-2039 Comments & Responses Table**

			<p>Para 9.4 Remove the wording at the end of the second sentence. The Basic Conditions that Neighbourhood Development Plans (NDPs) must meet have been changed through legislation in March 2026 enabling the commencement of section 99 of the Levelling Up and Regeneration Act 2023. The result is there is no longer a requirement in the Basic Conditions that an NDP be in conformity with the relevant Local Plan.</p> <p>Amend the second sentence as follows: "...undertake a formal review on a five yearly or other basis conforming with the CLPKP and the emerging South Downs National Park Local Plan."</p>	
<b>APPENDIX X</b>				
Appendix A Housing Needs Assessment March 24				
Appendix B Housing Design Guidelines and Codes December 25		British Horse Society	<p>37</p> <p><i>"All, although there is an extensive <b>footpath</b> network, there are issues of connectivity within, as well as between, villages."</i></p> <p>Footpaths should be upgraded to at least <b>bridleway</b> status where possible. New provision for walkers and cyclists should be made by adding bridleways, if not restricted byways, which includes horse riders by default (and carriage drivers for restricted byways) and provides the best value for money for the tax payer as well as helping to keep all vulnerable road users safer.</p> <p>40</p> <p><i>"Part 2. Additional design guidelines and codes for new development (above 3 houses) in the parish</i></p> <p><i>2.1 Accessible and attractive <b>footpath</b> network/access to the countryside."</i></p>	The PC does not consider it economically viable to upgrade footpaths to bridleways.

**Regulation 14 Plaistow and Ifold Neighbourhood Plan 2023-2039 Comments & Responses Table**

		<p>New provision for walkers and cyclists should be made by adding <b>bridleways</b>, if not restricted byways, which includes horse riders by default and provides the best value for money for the tax payer as well as helping to keep all vulnerable road users safer.</p> <p>45</p> <p><i>“1.3.4. Strategic signage could also be placed in the countryside to highlight local assets and destinations as well as encouraging <b>walking and cycling</b>, as shown in 8”</i></p> <p><b>Horse-riding/carriage driving</b> should also be encouraged for the reasons outlined after this table.</p> <p>47</p> <p><i>“1.4.2. [...] This can be accomplished by suggesting suitable density and design elements, incorporating features such as <b>footpaths</b> and green corridors.”</i></p> <p>New provision for walkers and cyclists should be made by adding <b>bridleways</b>, if not restricted byways, which includes horse riders by default and provides the best value for money for the tax payer as well as helping to keep all vulnerable road users safer.</p> <p>60</p> <p><i>2.1 Accessible and attractive <b>footpath</b> network/access to the countryside.</i></p> <p>Accessible <b>bridleway</b>/restricted byway network/access should be provided for the reasons explained above.</p> <p><i>“2.1.1. New developments should maintain or create direct and appealing <b>footpaths</b> connecting adjacent streets and nearby facilities. The creation of a strong pedestrian network can help achieve good connectivity and encourage <b>walking and cycling</b>.”</i></p> <p>A <b>bridleway</b> or restricted byway network can help encourage cycling. Cyclists may not use footpaths but, along with <b>horse riders</b>, may use bridleways.</p> <p><i>“2.1.3. <b>Footpath</b> networks should be in place before first occupation of houses. Both <b>walking and cycle</b> routes within new communities should be the primary network and first consideration for movement.</i></p>	
--	--	---	--

**Regulation 14 Plaistow and Ifold Neighbourhood Plan 2023-2039 Comments & Responses Table**

		<p><i>2.1.4. Pedestrian and cycle links within residential communities should always be overlooked by properties to create natural surveillance and sense of safety.”</i></p> <p>We support the concept of ensuring the <b>rights of way connectivity</b> is provided before the first occupation of houses but walking and cycling routes should be included as <b>bridleways</b>, if not restricted byways which encompass all vulnerable road users.</p> <p>61</p> <p><i>“2.2.1. Roads and driveways should adhere to technical highway standards, considering the requirements of <b>pedestrians, cyclists, and drivers</b>, adhering to the Manual for Streets.”</i></p> <p><b>Horse riders and carriage drivers</b> are legally, and by necessity, road users too and so their requirements must also be considered.</p> <p><i>“2.2.4. Traffic calming measures should be appropriate for the rural context. For example, ‘visual narrowing’ of a street with carriageway can encourage slower speeds.”</i></p> <p>We welcome this.</p> <p><i>“2.2.5. Lower speed limits within the villages make streets more comfortable for <b>pedestrian and cyclist use</b>. They should be indicated and enforced using appropriate signage for the village context”</i></p> <p>We welcome this as it also helps to make streets more comfortable for <b>horse riders and carriage drivers</b>.</p> <p><i>“2.2.8. Verges should be maintained as grass, any new development should seek to retain grass verges within the scheme. Formal pavements should only be provided where absolutely essential for safety or access.”</i></p> <p>We welcome this though it should be remembered that, where verges form part of the highway, these are for use by walkers and horse riders so their use must not be hindered. (Highways Act 1980 s96(6))<sup>i</sup></p>	
--	--	---	--

**Regulation 14 Plaistow and Ifold Neighbourhood Plan 2023-2039 Comments & Responses Table**

		<p>64</p> <p><i>“2.2.17. Edge lanes must be low-speed roads (20mph or less), typically single lane of traffic in either direction <b>shared with pedestrians and cyclists</b>, nominally 6 to 8m wide, with front houses with gardens on one side opposite open landscape.”</i></p> <p>We welcome this but these lanes will also be shared with <b>horse riders and carriage drivers</b></p> <p><i>“2.2.19. Edge lanes should connect to paths and other public rights of way, if possible.”</i></p> <p>We welcome this</p>	
		<p>65</p> <p><i>“Private Lane Lanes and private drives are the access-only types of streets that usually serve a small number of houses.</i></p> <p><i>2.2.21. Private lanes must be minimum 6m wide and serve all types of transport modes, <b>including walking and cycling</b>, and allow sufficient space for parking manoeuvre.”</i></p> <p>AND <b>horse riding and carriage driving</b> unless the lanes are for gated communities rather than privately maintained public roads.</p>	
		<p>66</p> <p><i>“2.3.1. On-plot parking should be sufficient to the local residents’ needs to avoid issues of parking overflow along the narrow rural lanes. The level of car parking provision should be in accordance with current West Sussex County Council guidance.”</i></p> <p>We welcome this.</p>	
		<p>70</p> <p><i>“2.4.3 New development should propose green links [...] to enhance the <b>pedestrian and cycle movement</b> within the village connecting new and existing residential</i></p>	

**Regulation 14 Plaistow and Ifold Neighbourhood Plan 2023-2039 Comments & Responses Table**

			<p><i>neighbourhoods to each other and with the village centre and other open space and green routes.”</i></p> <p>New provision for walkers and cyclists should be made by adding bridleways, if not restricted byways, which includes <b>horse riders</b> by default and provides the best value for money for the tax payer as well as helping to keep all vulnerable road users safer.</p>	
		Southern Water	<p>1.5 Housing Extensions &amp; Conversions</p> <p>We would welcome the following additional question in this Section of the Design Guide. <u>To minimise the risk of sewer flooding and protect water quality, rainwater drainage for the Extension will not be permitted to discharge to the foul sewer network.</u></p> <p>We would welcome the following additional question in this Section of the Design Guide.</p> <p><u>If the Extension is within three metres of a public sewer, a developer will need to submit a Build Over Application to Southern Water for approval, this is a mandatory requirement and ensures that the necessary precautions are in place to protect access to the sewer and its operation</u></p>	Covered by building regulations.
Appendix C Heritage Assets				
Appendix D Non-Designated Heritage Assets				
Appendix E Local Green Spaces		Comm. 3	<p><u>Reasonably close proximity to the community served</u></p> <p>The Council’s assessment in Appendix E recognises the close proximity of Loxwood Hills Pond and footpath 624_1 to the Ifold community ‘<i>being <u>only</u> 130m from the centre</i>’ (our emphasis). Such close proximity ‘<i>encourages residents to regularly access the lake footpath, which traverses this amenity and leads on to other Public Rights of Way</i>’. The Trust therefore considers that the Canal and its</p>	Third criteria is Local in <b>character and not an extensive tract...</b> which the canal does not adhere to.

## Regulation 14 Plaistow and Ifold Neighbourhood Plan 2023-2039 Comments & Responses Table

			<p>towpath are also in reasonably close proximity to the Ifold community and therefore in accordance with the first criterion of the Framework.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><u>Demonstrably special to a local community</u></p> <p>The path to and along the Canal is considered special to the community for several reasons.</p> <p>First it is beautiful. The assessment refers to the high <i>'visual amenity from the footpath ... to the views across the meadow and lake'</i> which, to the east, is complemented by beautiful views of the Canal, woodland and open countryside on the Gennets Bridge Lock walk<sup>8</sup>.</p> <p>Second its historical significance. The assessment notes that old maps show that there has been a footbridge along its route for centuries and the Canal also has a distinctive historical significance.</p> <p>Third, the route also has clear recreational value. The assessment recognises that <i>'one of the key benefits of Loxwood Hills green space 'is that it encourages residents to regularly access the ... footpath, which traverses this amenity and leads on to other Public Rights of Way'</i>. It is <i>'the main public right of way which is used by many Ifold residents to walk to the services and amenities located in Loxwood village'</i>, or for the 2¾ mile local circular Gennets Bridge Lock walk.</p> <p>Finally, the area clearly has a peaceful and ecologically diverse environment. The assessment refers to Loxwood Hills green space's <i>'serene and tranquil beauty with varied wildlife'</i> which increases further east along the Canal with its aquatic environment and woodland borders.</p> <p>Accordingly, the Canal meets the Framework's second test of being beautiful, historical significance, providing recreational value, tranquillity and having a richness of wildlife.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><u>Local in character</u></p> <p>Finally, in accordance with the last criterion of the Framework the Canal is local in character. The <i>'recreational opportunities ... active and passive enjoyment of the canal'</i> are extolled in Appendix D. The role of footpath 624_1 providing <i>'the main public right of way ... [for] many Ifold residents to walk to the services and amenities located in Loxwood village'</i> and encouraging <i>'regularly access ... to other Public Rights of Way'</i> attests to such local character.</p> <p>1. Despite the recreational value of the canal being recognised in Appendix D, as currently drafted Policy LGS1 excludes the Canal. The Trust considers this a mistake and urges the Parish to recognise the value of the Canal as a green space serving the Ifold community within Policy LGS1.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

### Regulation 14 Plaistow and Ifold Neighbourhood Plan 2023-2039 Comments & Responses Table

		Comm. 7	<p>LGSi2 the map is wrong and the description is wrong and the address . it does not match the NP. see comments above in Policy LGS The historic information accurately reflects the importance of this lake and its immediate setting to the settlement , it intrinsically reflects the history of the settlement and is in itself an important visual and environmental asset to the community. It is an important objective that the views of the lake are retained from the PROW through negotiation with the owner, so that the community can continue to retain a visual connection to this historic feature. For reference Ifold House was not a Manor House , there was no Manorial land holding in the Parish. Ifold House was just the principal residence of the landed Estate owner.</p>	<p>Description to be amended to “The area providing the view from the PROW 624 to and including Loxwoodhills Pond, Ifold”.</p> <p>Updated.</p>
MAPS				
MAP 1 Designated Plan Area	7.			
MAP 2 Ifold Settlement Boundary	8.			
MAP 3 Plaistow Conservation Area	8.			
MAP 4 Ifold Local Green Spaces	21.			

**Regulation 14 Plaistow and Ifold Neighbourhood Plan 2023-2039 Comments & Responses Table**

MAP 5 Plaistow Local Green Spaces	22.			
MAP 6 Shillinglee Local Green Space	23.			

---