Oving Neighbourhood Plan Consultation Statement

Persons and bodies consulted

- Residents of Oving parish
- The public at large
- Five adjacent parishes
- 45 statutory consultees
- 10 landowners

How they were consulted

Consultation period October 28, 2024 to January 20, 2025. The consultation period was extended on three occasions: the first because of an error in one the maps, the second and third to provide additional evidence in support of the policies. Updates were made to the website and addendum sheets were provided for hard copies of the plan and published on parish noticeboards.

Residents of Oving parish

Two public meetings: a Saturday morning in Oving village, a Wednesday evening in the new Shopwyke area developments.
A feedback leaflet delivered by a commercial distributor to all residents and businesses in the parish with a prize draw to encourage response
Copy of the PreSubmission plan placed in Chichester public library, reference section, Gribble Public House, Flip Out sports centre, Oving telephone kiosk. The clerk had further copies to despatch on request.
Press release to Sussex World on October 28, 2024
Publication of the PreSubmission plan with feedback form on the parish website

Adjacent parishes, statutory consultees and landowners

By email letter directing them to the parish website

Issues raised

by residents

Policy OV1: Employment

Like

That it will not be harming wildlife

No loss of existing business

More opportunities for physically disabled do a desk job/ work remotely

Create jobs for locals, essential part of NP

Well considered for fitting for the parish

Using existing business locations to increase density of employment

Dislike

If building more business parks, do something about traffic and speed

Lack of opportunities for the less able bodied

Big corporations

Very little public transport

Economic benefit should never outweigh importance of environment or wildlife

More employment would lead to more traffic on narrow roads

Light pollution from Bartholomew business park

Access by pedestrians and cyclists needs to be addressed

Policy OV2 New Local Services

Like

A village shop if viable combined with meeting hub

Keep the cowshed, use village hall for selling groceries and as a meeting hub

Dislike

No new facilities as yet in Shopwyke Lakes

No allotments in Shopwyke Lakes

Need safe pedestrian/ cycle path access to Chichester

Policy OV3 Community Facilities

Dislike

Waiting for the building by the sports field and the units under the flats opposite the sports field in Shopwyke to open

Lack of central point to know about local information.

Policy OV4 Green Infrastructure network

Dislke

Lack of insect highways in Shopwyke estate

Lack of traffic management in Marsh Lane, no footpaths

Threat from flooding and climate change

Electrical charging points should be away from residential areas

Policy OV5 Local Green Spaces

Dislike

No enforcement of dog ownership laws

Who will pay to safeguard green spaces

Visitors to play area/ pump track have nowhere to park

Not enough trees on recreation ground

Policy OV6 Agricultural land

Like

Essential for UK food sustainability, local employment and village character

Land here is perfect for farming and must not be lost for development

I support the policy

Policy OV8 Dark Skies

Dislike

Orange light that dominates the sky at Merston

Policy OV9 Active and Sustainable Travel Network

Like

Well served by buses

Support the policy

Top priority for connectivity

How do you plan to keep Merston connected to Oving

Need bus shelters

Enhancing bus links reduces car usage

Need regular bus service in Oving village

Policy OV10: High quality housing design

Like

Need more housing but traffic needs sorting

New developments all seem well planned and of good quality

Good but shouldn't interfere with old and traditional

Adhere to the Oving Design Code

In Merston changes need to contribute to/ not detract from the environment

Needs to be in keeping with the area

High quality design needs energy efficiency/ renewable energy

Dislike

Not having infrastructure completed when houses are ready

High quality needs to blend with surroundings

Not ultra modern

Need to appreciate the aesthetic quality of period buildings in the hamlet

Focus on the identity of the village

Policy OV11 Conservation area

Dislike

Heavy traffic shaking the buildings

Policy OV12 Local Heritage Assets

Like

Support for the policy

Dislike

Bartholomew's crop research facility

Policy OV13 Tall buildings

Dislike

Bartholomew’s crop research facility

Policy OV14 Affordable housing

Like

Need for more parking on adjacent roads

Need rules for taking care of properties and gardens

Need for continued use by existing local families

Affordable housing should be in locations where there are amenities, schools, safe footpaths, shops with affordable food.

Mix affordable and privately owned side by side

Dislike

Shopwyke Lakes: Don’t build next to more expensive houses

Needs to be more rentals especially for younger people

Social landlords need to maintain properties to a good standard. Many don’t

General

Dislike

Parking in Highfield Lane

General comment

From Network Rail:

Proposals that increase or encourage the use of the level crossing at Drayton Lane should be resisted unless a suitable means of crossing the railway is proposed. Full consideration shall be given to this in conjunction with Network Rail.

by statutory consultees

Savills on behalf of the Church Commissioners (December 20, 2024) who own land within the designated Neighbourhood Plan area, object to Policy OV6 in relation to agricultural land. They argue that the policy as it stands is overly restrictive of development and propose some amendments to the wording to make it less so and align better with the NPPF.(National Planning Policy Framework)

West Sussex County Council (January 20, 2025). No concerns about the transport impacts of the Oving Neighbourhood Plan. In respect of the proposal to build 22 homes, it would need to be tested and refined through the Development Management process that itself would have to take account of the county Mineral and Waste plan. Reference should be made to this in the section on planning policy context. Suggested additional wording for two policies.

Suggestions for clarification of wording of the Objectives statement. Recommends a glossary of key terms.

OV1 Employment. Allow part of the former fuel site for use as a waste site.

OV4 Green Infrastructure Network. May need revision in light of Policy A8

O8 Dark Skies WSCC supports Dark Skies. Cannot always be supported for highways safety reasons,

OV9 Active and Sustainable Network.
P27 A Last sentence may need to be reconsidered as the two types of route are not indicated on the Policies map.
P28 D Clarify 'defined shared transport active travel route'

Obsidian Strategic Asset Management on behalf of landowners DC Heaver and Eurequity Limited (December 18, 2024) promoters of the land A8 East of Chichester with a planning application for 370 homes.

The ONP is in conflict with the NPPF in that it should support the strategic policies of the Local Plan, not undermine them.

Policy OV4 Green Infrastructure network would hamper the site's development potential. Its requirement for biodiversity net gain (BNG) doesn't sufficiently allow for a mix of on site and off site provision.

Policy OV4 D. The requirement for a medium distinctiveness multiplier in relation to BNG is out of line with Defra's metric.

Policy OV6 Agricultural land doesn't take account of the impact of gravel extraction on the quality of the land.

Policy OV8. Dark Skies. Insufficient evidence to justify the policy.

Policy OV9 Active and Sustainable Travel Network. Proposals for footpaths and cycles pass across wildlife corridor. Public access through the wildlife corridor resisted because of lack of safe movement along Drayton Lane.

Policy OV13 Tall buildings: change 9 metres to 12.

AL8 with 600 homes should be amended to A8 with 680 homes

Changes proposed to a number of other policies.

Conclusion

As it stands ONP contains policy conflicts that may hinder the deliverability of CDC's strategic objectives.

Historic England (November 5, 2024)

No need to be directly involved in developing the strategy. Notes that the historic environment features throughout the draft.
Need for positive strategy for locally important heritage assets.
A glossary of historic environment terminology contained in the NPPF.
Advice on sources of information on how the character of an area may be protected: evidence gathering, design advice, policy writing.
\use of CIL funds to facilitate conservation of the historic environment, heritage assets and their setting.
NP offers opportunity to identify assets of community value {ACV) which offers additional level of control: eg public houses, libraries, museums, open green spaces.

New development needs to make a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.
A neighbourhood plan provides an opportunity to develop a positive strategy for assets not recognised at a national level.

Plan could include a list of non designated heritage assets (NDHA): historic buildings, sites, views, places of importance, setting out what factors make them special. A policy can give them a level of protection.
Source of guidance on local heritage listing: Historic England Advice Note 7 (2nd edition)

HE can provide advice on conservation area appraisal, designation and management.
HE can provide exemplar NPs, and links to some of these documents.

South Downs National Park Authority (January 14, 2025)

Supports OV7.B. Views to and from SDNP
Supports OV8 Prevention of light pollution
Supports Landscape Capacity Study's recognition of long views to and from SDNP

Chichester District Council (December 20, 2024)

Review of factual accuracy, textual clarity, map clarity and content organisation, compliance with new Local Plan.
Policy on Agricultural land. Recommend removal in favour of protection provided by Local Plan.
Policy on landscape gaps. Recommend substantial revision of policy and supporting evidence with focus on local gaps.
Policy on Active and Sustainable travel contains cycling infrastructure at variance with A8 masterplan and wildlife corridor
Policy on Housing Design. Recommend up date Oving design codes and guidelines to take account of updated wildlife corridors.
Redefine Local Heritage Assets as non-heritage designated assets and have all buildings on the list assessed as such.
OV14 Policy on affordable house. Rewrite to comply with Local Plan and be less prescriptive. At some stage need for new housing needs survey

Southern Water

Comment from Ryan Lownds, Strategic Planning Lead, Southern Water.

'Southern Water is the statutory waste water service provider for Oving. As such we would be grateful for more granular detail in the paragraph in Section 2 under 'Planning issues outside the scope of the plan'. We would welcome detail in regards to which treatment works, what the issues are and the name of the site being tested against the improvements to the treatment works. This would allow us to provide commentary/ updates as required.'

.

Describe how those issues and concerns have been considered and where relevant addressed in the proposed neighbourhood development plan.
To come

SQ March 28, 2025