

# Emsworth Neighbourhood Plan

Consultation Statement  
March 2019







This statement provides a record of the neighbourhood plan consultation process and shows how the plan was revised as a result of the responses received



The Emsworth Neighbourhood Plan has been prepared by the Emsworth Forum, the qualifying body responsible for plan preparation. Contact for further information:

- Chair: Stephanie Elsy | [stephanie@stephelsy.net](mailto:stephanie@stephelsy.net)
- Secretary: Mike Bateman | [mikebateman20@gmail.com](mailto:mikebateman20@gmail.com)
- The Emsworth Forum, c/o The Community Centre, North Street, Emsworth, PO10 7DD.



The qualifying body has received technical support during the preparation of this plan from Feria Urbanism, a planning and design studio that specialises in urban design, urban planning, neighbourhood strategies and community engagement. Contact for further information:

- Richard Eastham
- [richard@feria-urbanism.eu](mailto:richard@feria-urbanism.eu) | [www.feria-urbanism.eu](http://www.feria-urbanism.eu)
- 07816 299 909 | 01202 548 676

Document reference 166\_Q\_190321\_Consultation-Statement\_FINAL

All maps within this document are reproduced from the Ordnance Survey mapping with the permission of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office © Crown copyright and database rights. Unauthorised reproduction infringes crown copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings.

*The Emsworth Forum would like to thank all the many Emsworth residents and organisations who donated time and resources to make this consultation happen.  
Emsworth Neighbourhood Forum c/o The Emsworth Community Centre, North Street, Emsworth PO10 7DD [www.emsworthforum.com](http://www.emsworthforum.com)*

## **CONTENTS**

04	Introduction
04	Aims of the Consultation
04	Background to our Consultation
05	Timeline of Neighbourhood Forum Activity
06	Approach to Communications
07	Communications during the Regulation 14 Consultation period
10	Response to the Most Frequently Made Comments and Questions
23	Responses received via the online questionnaire
120	Responses received by email or letter
182	Responses received by email and letter from statutory consultees
228	Quantitative support for the Policies in the Pre-Submission Plan

## **Introduction**

This Consultation Statement has been prepared to fulfil the legal obligations of the Neighbourhood Planning Regulations 2012 Section 15(2).

It contains details of the persons and bodies that were consulted about the proposed neighbourhood development plan; explains how they were consulted; summarises the main issues and concerns raised by the persons consulted; and describes how these issues and concerns have been considered and, where relevant, addressed in the proposed neighbourhood development plan.

## **Aims of Our Consultation**

From the start of developing our Neighbourhood Plan, the Emsworth Forum has aimed to do the following:

- To involve as much of the community as possible throughout all consultation stages of Plan development so that the Plan was informed by the views of local people and other stakeholders from the start of the Neighbourhood Planning process;
- To ensure that consultation events took place at critical points in the process where decisions needed to be taken;
- To engage with as wide a range of people as possible, using a variety of approaches and communication and consultation techniques; and
- To ensure that results of consultation were fed back to local people and available to read through as many communication channels and as soon as possible after all our consultation activities.

## **Background to our Consultation**

The idea to develop a Neighbourhood Plan came from the Emsworth Residents Association (the ERA) in July 2013. The ERA had produced a Village Design Statement in 2008 but was concerned that it was not always being used by planners and developers in the way that was intended. Given the growing number of developments in the Emsworth area they wanted the town to benefit from the neighbourhood planning powers in the Localism Act to give the principles in the Emsworth Design Statement more weight. The ERA Committee asked a number of volunteers with relevant experience to establish a steering group to set up a Neighbourhood Forum.

## Timeline of Activity

- October 2013. First Steering Group meeting took place. The steering group consisted of volunteers and representatives from the three main community organisations in the town: the Emsworth Residents Association (the ERA), the Emsworth Business Association (the EBA) and the Emsworth Community Association (the ECA). The steering group was supported by the local ward Councillors.
- On 3<sup>rd</sup> February 2014 an application for designation of the Emsworth Forum and the Forum area was submitted to Havant Borough Council (HBC).
- At the end February 2014, in order to engage the local community at the outset, the steering group launched the Forum website and promoted the HBC public consultation that commenced also at that time.
- On 31<sup>st</sup> May 2014 The Forum held its first Open Day and AGM. In order to promote this event and to encourage residents, businesses and other organisations to join our membership and to get involved, a leaflet was distributed to every property in the town. A children's art competition was held with the two local primary schools where the children were invited to depict what they liked about Emsworth. At the open day, an exercise took place where participants were invited to answer a series of open questions about the town by placing their views and ideas on post it notes. These contributions were used by the Forum Committee to shape the development of the Draft Neighbourhood Plan.
- On 23<sup>rd</sup> July 2014 HBC approved the designation of the Emsworth Forum and Forum area
- On November 2014 the first Forum online survey was launched online.
- During June 2015 series of public meetings on key topics
- On July 21<sup>st</sup> 2015 the second AGM was held and a Visioning workshop took place taking into account the results of the survey and public meetings.
- In September 2015 the 'North Street Design Report' was produced by Aecom for the Forum as economic and environmental issues in this area had been raised in the earlier consultations. The ideas from this report fed into the policies in the Pre-Submission Draft and the Submission Draft regarding the Community Hub and Civic Space.
- During Dec 2015 – Jan 2016 an online and paper survey was conducted regarding the future use of the Emsworth Victoria Cottage Hospital site – a key site in the centre of the town.
- During Feb – June 2016 Aecom produced a Housing Needs Assessment Report for the Forum.
- During the summer of 2016 HBC published and consulted on a Housing Statement. The Forum considered extending Neighbourhood Area to include the Southleigh Strategic site but this suggestion was declined by HBC in favour of a separate masterplanning exercise in which the Neighbourhood Forum participated. The HBC Housing Statement was approved in Dec 2016

- In early 2017 the Forum appointed consultants Feria Urbanism to assist with completion of drafting the Plan
- Drafting of the Plan took place over the summer and autumn of 2017

## **Approach to Communications**

The Forum's Communications Strategy has endeavoured to use all appropriate communication channels to reach out to the local community:

- Website: this was launched in February 2014 and has been the primary 'noticeboard' for our activities, reports and the Draft Plan and evidence base. Interested parties are invited to join the Forum membership via the website and details of how to get in touch with the Chair and Secretary are available. At the time of the Reg 14 Consultation we had over 500 residents, businesses and organisations in our membership.
- Emails: throughout the development of the Neighbourhood Plan we have kept those who have signed up to receive emails regular updates of our activities. We have sent out over 150 in total.
- Social media: we have actively promoted the Forum's work (and other business and community activities in Emsworth) through social media. We have over 1500 followers on Twitter and have sent over 2500 tweets. On Facebook we have 567 followers.
- Local Press. Since the start of the Forum we have promoted our activities via all available local printed and online media. We have had coverage in the Portsmouth News, the Chichester Observer, the Ems Valley Gazette and the Ems (the quarterly newspaper of the ERA which is delivered to all households).
- Printed materials. Throughout our work we have publicised our meetings with leaflets and posters throughout the town. The whole town was leafletted when the Forum was launched to advertise the inaugural AGM. Most of the town has been leafletted on other occasions since.



## Communications during the Regulation 14 Consultation Period



The Pre-Submission Draft of the Emsworth Neighbourhood Plan was published on the Emsworth Forum website for consultation on 6<sup>th</sup> November 2017. Several copies of the Draft Plan were left in the Library and the Emsworth Community Centre and by popular demand people were allowed to take them overnight. An online and printed questionnaire was produced to assist with giving feedback. This was all entered into a Monkeysurvey database. The consultation closed on 19<sup>th</sup> December.

Activities to promote the consultation included

- Over 200 posters were placed on every street in the town and on various noticeboards
- 2000 leaflets were distributed to many households and in key locations and premises around the town
- 16 posts on Facebook including videos
- Over 30 Twitter posts in the run up to and during the consultation period including videos
- 36 emails were sent out by the Forum to our membership of over 500 residents and organisations.

- Emails were also sent out by member organisations (the ERA, the EBA, the ECA and Wemsfest).
- A presentation and Q&A sessions was made at the quarterly ERA meeting on 30<sup>th</sup> October date in front of 120 residents
- A further presentation and Q&A of the draft plan was given at the Forum AGM on 16<sup>th</sup> December
- A stall was held at the Hampshire Farmers Market in Emsworth town square on 18<sup>th</sup> November
- A press release was sent to over 30 media contacts and the consultation was covered in the local press including the Portsmouth News and the Chichester Observer

*Letters were sent to the following statutory and local consultees as advised by HBC*

British Marine Federation  
 British Telecom  
 Brook Meadow Conservation Group  
 Cable and Wireless  
 Chichester District Council  
 Chichester Harbour Conservancy  
 Civil Aviation Authority  
 Denmead Parish Council  
 Department of Health  
 Dept for Transport  
 Design Council  
 East Hampshire District Council  
 Emsworth & District Services  
 Emsworth Baptist Church  
 Emsworth Business Association  
 Emsworth Community Association  
 Emsworth Horticultural Society  
 Emsworth in Bloom  
 Emsworth Residents' Association  
 Emsworth Stroke Club  
 Emsworth Surgery

Emsworth Surgery patients Participation Group  
 Emsworth Tree Wardens  
 English Heritage  
 Environment Agency  
 First Hampshire and Dorset Ltd  
 Friends of Emsworth Community Health  
 Friends of Hampshire Farm Meadows  
 Friends of Nore Barn Woods  
 Fujitsu Telecommunications  
 Hampshire & Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust  
 Hampshire Constabulary (Havant Area)  
 Hampshire County Council  
 Hampshire Fire & Rescue Service  
 Havant Borough Design Panel  
 Havant Civic Society  
 Havant Conservative Association  
 Havant District Council  
 Havant Youth Team  
 Hayling Residents Association  
 Health & Safety Executive  
 Healthwatch Hampshire

Highways England  
Historic England  
Home Builders Federation  
Homes & Communities Agency  
Horndean Parish Council  
Isle of Wight Council  
Langstone Harbour Board  
Local MP  
Marine Management Organisation  
McCarthy & Stone  
Methodist Church & Pastoral Centre  
National Grid  
Natural England  
Network Rail Infrastructure Ltd  
New Life Christian Church  
NHS Property Services Ltd  
NHS South East Hampshire CCG  
Open Spaces Society  
Portsmouth City Council Planning Policy  
Portsmouth Water  
Rowlands Castle Parish Council  
Royal Mail Group Ltd  
Scotia Gas Networks  
Scottish & Southern Energy PLC

Slipper Mill Pond Preservation Association  
South Central Ambulance Service  
Southbourne Parish Council  
Southbourne Surgery  
Southern Gas Networks  
Southern Water PLC  
Southwick and Widley Parish Council  
Sport England  
SSA Planning  
St James' Church of England  
St Thomas' Catholic Church  
Stagecoach Coastline Buses  
Stoughton Parish Council  
Sustrans  
The Homes & Communities Agency  
The Planning Inspectorate  
The Theatres Trust  
Virgin Media  
Warblington & Denvilles Residents Association  
West Sussex County Council  
West Thorney Parish Council  
Westbourne Parish Council  
Winchester City Council

## Response to The Pre-Submission Consultation

Over 200 residents responded in detail to the consultation and there were also comments from statutory bodies, developers and land owners, and from community organisations. In total there were over 1200 individual comments. The response was very positive and supportive and the Forum is extremely grateful to everyone who took the time and trouble to give their views.

The response to the policies in the draft Plan was very positive. In the quantitative survey, the average level of support was 84% across all of the draft Plan policies with a range between 67% and 94%. In general, where the level of support fell, it was because people did not know rather than because they objected. The highest objection level was 10 -11 % in relation to only 4 out of the 32 policies in the Plan.

In the responses we received there were a number of issues that were raised frequently. These are summarised below with the Forum's response.

### Most Frequently Made Comments & Questions

*Q1. Why doesn't the Neighbourhood Plan allocate sites for development?*

When the Emsworth Forum was founded we decided not to allocate sites for housing because Havant Borough Council had just completed its site allocations in the current adopted Local Plan. Since then, HBC has adopted a Housing Statement and has consulted on new sites for its proposed new Draft Local Plan. We have responded to the recent consultation and decided that there was no need for us to duplicate their work.

*Q2. Is the 40% allocation of affordable housing realistic or needed?*

The figure of 40% was arrived at and recommended by the Government's approved Neighbourhood Planning Consultants, Aecom, in their Emsworth Housing Needs Assessment report. This was based on a technical evaluation of the needs in Emsworth. Their report is part of our evidence base for the Neighbourhood Plan. We believe that this level of affordable housing is needed and can be achieved in Emsworth if there is sufficient commitment to deliver it.

*Q3. The Neighbourhood Plan Policies regarding the Civic Space and Community Hub are aspirational. There is no body able to carry the concept through to fruition. How will they be delivered? Where will the funding come from?*

Neighbourhood Plans are intended to be permissive, visionary policy documents and are not intended to detail exactly how the policies or vision will be implemented – although they do need to be potentially viable. All of the Community Hub sites mentioned are owned by the State and are in public and

community use currently (apart from the Hospital which is closed). The intention in this policy is to ensure that whoever owns and develops these sites in the future is encouraged to continue to use them for some public or community purpose. If the community supports this policy (which our consultation shows it does) then a legal vehicle can be established or identified to deliver it and funding sought. In order to assist with the delivery of this vision, the Emsworth Forum initiated and supported the creation of the new Emsworth Community Land Trust specifically for this purpose. Funding for community hub projects could be derived from a variety of sources: the community, the public sector, commercial and not-for profit partners and the inherent value of the site itself. Having policies such as these in our Neighbourhood Plan with the support of the community expressed at Referendum will help obtain such public funding. All of these policies in the Draft Emsworth Neighbourhood Plan are ones that Emsworth Forum believes are achievable and have been implemented elsewhere in the UK.

*Q4. Ems Valley Green Space*

We had numerous representations supporting the designation of this area as green space. We agree. In our response to the Council's consultation of their Draft Local Plan, the Emsworth Forum asked Havant Borough Council to remove this site allocation as we believe it is not needed to meet their housing target and should be green space. We were therefore please to see this site removed from the Submission Draft of HBC's Local Plan.

*Q5. The Government, HBC and the Planning system do not support what local people want*

Neighbourhood Planning is government policy and was introduced to improve the ability of local communities to influence how they wish to see their area developed. The policies in the Neighbourhood Plan once adopted will form part of the statutory planning guidance that landowners and developers must comply with. This is why the Emsworth Neighbourhood Forum was established so that we could better reflect the wishes of the local community and businesses in how Emsworth is developed in the future. Planning regulation is designed to balance the interest of landowners with the wider public interest. It favours landowners' rights, which is why some planning decisions may appear to go against community wishes. This is why it is so important to have Local and Neighbourhood Planning policies that can be used to support community interest. Our work has been supported by Government grants. Havant Borough Council Officers and our local Councillors have been and are supportive of the Emsworth Forum and the Neighbourhood Planning work we have been doing.

*Q6. Why do we not campaign to reinstate the Banks and retaining the Emsworth Surgery in the town centre*

We agree that it would be better for the social and economic sustainability of Emsworth Town Centre for the Banks and the Surgery to remain in the town centre. However, decisions to close or move such premises are commercial ones to be made by the relevant business and landowners and cannot be changed by the Emsworth Forum or the Neighbourhood Plan. In the case of the surgery, the recent 'Emsworth Unite' campaign to prevent the sale of the Hospital site on the open market was actively supported by the Forum and we are hopeful that the current plans of the Emsworth Medical Practice and the South East Hampshire Clinical Commissioning Group to use EVCH site for the new surgery will succeed.

*Q7. There are too many charity shops, estate agents, cafes and restaurants*

We agree there are too many charity shops and estate agents. We have considered how we may be able to address with this in the Neighbourhood Plan but, unfortunately, planning regulations do not allow specific restrictions of this kind of retail outlet. With regard to cafes and restaurants, they fall under class A3 and A4 and we cannot restrict those uses in the retail centre of the town. Furthermore, given the challenges facing the retail sector it would not help the economic viability of the town centre.

*Q8. There is too much emphasis on the town centre.*

Most policies in the Neighbourhood Plan apply to the whole of Emsworth. However, the Town Centre is critical to the social, economic and environmental success of the town and significant planning issues need to be addressed such as the hard barrier the A259 creates between the north and south and the future of the Emsworth Victoria Cottage Hospital (EVCH) site and historic buildings in that area. Addressing these matters will help Emsworth stay the attractive place that it is and will be beneficial to everyone in the town, wherever they live.

*Q9. How does the Emsworth Design Statement relate to the Draft Neighbourhood Plan?*

The EDS is of 'material consideration' in considering planning applications but can be ignored because it is not Planning Policy. The Draft Neighbourhood Plan referred to the Emsworth Design Statement but Havant Council and our consultants advised us that design policies would be more effective if they were incorporated into the revised Draft Neighbourhood Plan. We are grateful that the ERA has kindly allowed us to 'translate' the EDS into the revised Neighbourhood Plan. This means that the design policies in the Neighbourhood Plan will be stronger and reflect the intentions of the EDS.

*Q10. Maps*

Many individuals pointed out inaccuracies in the various maps. The maps have been revised and checked in the Submission Draft.

*Q11. Traffic increases, speeding, cycle safety and parking.*

We agree that traffic growth in recent years as a result of housing development in Emsworth and along the A259 is a major issue for Emsworth. Improving traffic flow and other modes of transport is the only way forward to cope with the rising population. There are policies and projects on this in the draft Plan including projects to improve public transport and encourage the development of cycle ways and cycle facilities throughout the town. The requirement for off-road car-parking for new residential development is covered in the plan.

## Responses to the Online Questionnaire

Thank you to everyone that took the time to respond to the consultation for all helpful feedback and support you have given. In the following sections we only respond to issues, questions and suggestions that are not covered in the Frequently Made Comments and Questions above.

Which parts of the plan do you most like and why? (Online Survey answers to question 2.)	
Summary of Comments received	Response from Emsworth Forum
Satisfied with plan	
Areas dedicated as green space giving natural breaks in the development.	
An impressive well thought out thorough plan in all respects. Well done	
like the idea of a re-doing central roundabout to promote traffic calming	
Thank you for creating a Neighbourhood plan that has been easy to access. Particularly the creative themes that made it easier for me to access and understand. And In turn means I have taken time to read and respond. I particularly liked the intelligent use of understanding communities. especially increasing the dwell time in Emsworth centre and the avoidance of settlement coalescence	
Good aspirations, too little too late. Campaign to reinstate Bank and retain surgery would do more to sustain viability of centre	
better cycle lanes, removing north/south divide, safeguarding access to waterfront	
Thorough approach and inclusiveness	
Support for people to provide housing	
Integrating North and South	
coastal path	

New 'Civic Square'	
Shared space	
I think the plan is well-considered and comprehensive. I like the emphasis on retaining and enhancing the character and community aspects of Emsworth life.	
I think the plan at this stage of preparation is a good document and I particularly like the approach adopted to capturing/describing all the character and individual fine characteristics of present day Emsworth	
Clear and articulate	
I particularly like Policy M1 regarding the re-design of the roundabout as per the Poynton scheme. I also agree with Policy H3 regarding the need to maintain historic buildings such as the fire station etc. I also like policy P1 regarding Pop-Up Shops, a Hopper Bus and a Centre Manager	
The General Housing Policy, with emphasis on having a mix of types and tenures	
Plans for business. Trying to encourage use of facilities	
A considerable amount of work has gone in to its production and we do congratulate you. However it was not exactly what I was expecting to read - I thought there might be plans regarding the positioning of the development	
The public services hub. It will support a vibrant town centre.	
The Emsworth Neighbourhood plan sets out clearly the objectives and reason for the plan and the current facilities available together with a vision for the future.	
Roundabout & North St easier access. Waterfront & green area protection is important. Development of different types of building. Flats, bungalows, smaller houses etc.	



P63 neighbourhood projects. Really positive achievable objectives	
Emsworth today - learnt things. Vision seemed suitable for Emsworth	
All of it	
All of it. It has been well thought out and is extremely comprehensive.	
It's all broadly fine	
Community	
Vision Statement, especially the bridging of the North/South divide	
The print is legible - well laid out - diagrams and photos are supportive of the text	
Land and Partners Ltd is promoting land north of Long Copse Lane in Emsworth proposed as an allocation in the Draft Havant Local Plan 2036. The site is known as UE76 in the adopted Local Plan Housing Statement and Land and Partners will be bringing forward a planning application on the site. The Pre-Submission Neighbourhood Plan's aim to conform to the emerging Havant Local Plan 2036 is supported. In particular, Policy L1a which aligns the Neighbourhood Plan with the emerging Havant Local Plan is supported as this is a sound strategy to support sustainable development. We look forward to engaging further with the Emsworth Forum as the Plan progresses.	
Civic Space. As a resident of North Emsworth would welcome new pedestrian area and ease of access to shops.	
Town centre - fostering sense of community	
The public services and community hub. It centralises resources, minimises travel and parking, and provides a social hub which	

helps blend north and south.	
1. Living and 2. Community. Particular comments made re L2, L3, L4, L5, C1, C2 and C5	
Its thoroughness and addressing preservation of green spaces, town centre activity and heritage issue, because these are areas which are particularly important in retaining Emsworth's attractiveness.	
Cottage Hospital development into surgery	
C1 Community services very important to village life. C5 Green spaces must be maintained. L5 To maintain their character, settlements should not be allowed to coalesce. WF1 The waterfront asset must be protected. H3 Historical buildings should be retained wherever possible.	
My goodness me, it is quite some plan! I hope you do get a good number of replies. It has taken a fair bit of time to digest	
Good overview of the town, photos useful. Assessments of both visual and social aspects of Emsworth are important.	
General Housing policy 2 - 40% of new dwellings will be affordable. I like this so it would prevent many new buildings being bought by retired wealthy incomers who may not contribute to town life, and rather expect it to remain the same without putting any effort into voluntarily supporting local activities e.g. Emsworth Show. Also agree housing mix should include more flats and bungalows. Also L5 settlement coalescence. Also Policy W3 - necessary to keep industrial units for employment	
Roundabout	

The redesign of the roundabout to bring the town together, protection of key assets and the protection of green spaces.	
Excellent	
Generally well rounded. Like emphasis on mix of retail units and trying to get our Banks back	
It is essential that the designated green spaces are safeguarded particularly Nore Barn Woods and the Chichester Harbour AONB	
It's all good, but the proposals for A259 - North Street junction, as in Poynton, are superb. More generally, the emphasis on improving facilities for pedestrians and cyclists is very welcome. Long overdue. These facilities are woefully lacking up to now.	
W2	
Thorough. yet simply worded and clear	
Clarity of presentation	
proposals for the roundabout area policy M1 and M2 pedestrian areas	
the clear set of objectives	
The objectives of the plan are things I largely agree with. Unfortunately unless/until we get a Government and local councillor who will support these views, these aspirations will be difficult to achieve	
Policy C1. An interesting aspirational idea which would be a great asset providing all community groups work together for the common good. Finding an innovative and workable solution to the roundabout through the development of a civic space so as to unite north and south Emsworth again and give pedestrians a shared space with vehicles would make a huge difference. I watched the Poynton roundabout video clip with interest. Pity it did not say how the £4m cost of this was funded. I would be	

interested to know how a development such as this might be financed.	
Proposal for new roundabout. To better unite North and South parts of the town	
Town centre enhancements are long overdue. An ability to retain the charm and character, whilst manage growth and traffic is what we need to see developed.	
The roundabout would transform Emsworth	
I like the long term overview and the projected importance of identity.	
Much of it reads as very desirable but theoretical without clear examples of how policies will be implemented	
Which parts of the plan could be improved and why? (Q 3)	
Summary of Comments received	Response from Emsworth Forum
Drainage assessment needs carefully looking at due to the extent of historical issues.	EF agrees that this is an important issue for Emsworth. It is our judgment that the existing Havant Borough Local Plan (HBLP) and the emerging HBLP are sufficient to address this issue.
Cycle lanes. There are specific junctions that are dangerous. Also need to work out cycle lanes based on complete journeys that connect the centre of Emsworth to the centre of each of the surrounding towns: Havant, Southbourne, Westbourne, and Hayling. It isn't simply that the cycle lanes are narrow, unsafe and badly maintained. It is more that they don't exist at all or come to an end after a short stretch. Why can't I cycle to the centre of each of the neighbouring towns on cycle lanes?	We agree that safe and convenient cycle lanes are important in Emsworth and we believe policy M3 (a) supports this. Policy M1 would also address the safety issues at the junction of the Havant Road with North Street. However we would also support a specific project to review the existing cycle lane infrastructure and propose improvements and will add this to policy P1.
This is a difficult question to answer so I have left it blank	
The plan would be more readily understood if the language had been simplified and the sentences shortened.	We have addressed this.

Found document confusing and long. 38 items	We regret that you found the document confusing. We acknowledge that it was long and that 38 questions is a lot to answer. Unfortunately Neighbourhood Plans and public consultations have to follow a prescribed format.
Good aspirations, too little too late. Campaign to reinstate Bank and retain surgery would do more to sustain viability of centre. Need project management plan to oppose further decline and encourage growth	We agree that the development of a more detailed economic strategy for the town centre is a good idea and we have added this to the Project List in Section P1 of the NP.
Your maps show Lumley and Hermitage without making it clear they are part of Southbourne Parish. Lack of clarity here could lead to problems in the future. The boundary is clearly defined and should be on your maps, perhaps as a dotted line. Your intro says that the eastern boundary is "less clear". That is not accurate.	We agree and this has been addressed in the Submission Draft
Section re. Policy C5 excludes border path area	
Consideration for green sites	
More clarity on where it is expected to provide more housing of the right size for elderly residents nearer the town centre.	The new Local Plan provides this.
Redevelopment of the roundabout into shared space.	
There isn't really much substance to the plan. I can't see any areas that actually identify areas to build which is the contentious piece of the Havant Local Plan. It just feels like a lot of filler rather than a targeted plan of what to do.	

<p>Suggest you state that “on street” parking is free and more extensive [119 spaces] and for longer periods than elsewhere in the borough. This encourages “minor shopping trips” and of great value to the business community. Points 1 and 5 and points 6 and 7 could be unified. Most of these are already contained in the emerging HBC Local Plan. No mention of the evening economy which is thankfully “vibrant” a new restaurant in North Street has recently added to this. In summary there is much duplication with the Local Plan that if eliminated would make the document more readable I see very few of the ideas/ideals listed as policy as being attainable. And maybe this draft plan has come along too late to make a lasting impression given that housing allocations/sites and the consequent effect on our infrastructure, schools roads etc. will impact on Emsworth and its residents. However I support the idea of a meaningful NP and finally ask how the Plan once approved will be monitored and updated. Will this responsibility fall locally to the Forum or the ERA?</p>	<p>1. Re parking whilst we agree that the current parking policies are important to the economic vitality of Emsworth we do not want to refer to this when that situation may change in the future and render the comment obsolete. 2. We assume you are referring to the NP Objectives. Objective 1 deals with character, 5 with the environment which are two separate matters. Objective 6 deals with materials and housing design whilst 7 deals with a range of matters such as tenure. All of these are important planning considerations and merit being addressed separately. 3. It is correct that these topics are included in the existing and emerging HBLP but it is appropriate to duplicate them and refer to Emsworth specific aspects as they are of great importance to future development in Emsworth. 4. We agree that the Emsworth evening economy is vibrant and is now mentioned in the narrative. 5. Refer to frequently made comments and questions... 6. Once approved and adopted it is the responsibility of the Planning Authority to enforce it in making planning decisions. The NP has been deliberately drafted to ensure that its policies will stand the test of time (one of the advantages of not allocating sites). The Emsworth Forum has been approved by the Planning Authority as a body empowered to draft a Neighbourhood Plan. No decision has been taken at this time about whether the Emsworth Forum will continue after this NP has been adopted.</p>
<p>I believe the aspirations for a future Emsworth overall are fine, but I think the Plan should contain more realism in terms of the influence of NPPGs/local plans/Appeal inspector's decisions/The limit on HBC controls and the effect of the changing economic business world</p>	
<p>Some parts seem a bit passive when 'stronger' language could be used.</p>	<p>The language used in planning documents can sometimes appear passive but it is based on the legal and technical language required in planning documents.</p>

<p>I don't agree with Policy L1. 40% social/affordable homes are too much and a figure of 20% would be acceptable. In Policy L2, sufficient parking spaces should be provided for at least two cars per house. The tasteful development of Spring Gardens, King's Terrace and Pelham Terrace is ruined by cars being parked in the road, restricting access and making the whole area look unattractive. I cannot see how Policy WF1 can work. How can you give public access to, say, the new houses being built in the field to the south of Lumley Cottage? It is private land.</p>	<p>Re parking, the level of car parking will be determined on a case by case basis depending on what is appropriate at the location at planning application stage. Re policy WF1 it is correct that public access cannot be given to the waterfront where the waterfront is currently on private land. However should any new development occur in the future then WF1 (a) will come into effect.</p>
<p>Structurally, I found the different levels of objectives hard to take in, e.g. on p.21 we have Plan Objectives and on p.22 Policy Objectives - these don't seem to form a hierarchy or 'nesting' of one set within another - could the logic of this be spelled out?</p>	<p>The structure of the NP follows the format used in Planning Documents.</p>
<p>Planning of movement. Omissions and not coherent</p>	<p>The meaning of this comment is not clear to us</p>
<p>Emphasis throughout is on the area of town south of the inner bypass. Little has been mentioned on transport. With new development started on western Southleigh road within Emsworth traffic on the junction with Horndean Road will increase once these residents realise the delays already experienced at Warblington level crossing. This will probably add to traffic on Horndean road &amp; north street as communities head towards the west and traffic on Southleigh road (east) towards Westbourne with its narrow roads and parking problems for those to Chichester etc.</p>	<p>We accept traffic will grow as a result of housing development in and around Emsworth. Our Policies M1, M2, M3 support alternative modes of transport to the car, and why we have a Policy in P1 in support of local buses.</p>
<p>Please see individual comments</p>	
<p>The presumption in favour of development. It will lead to coalescence of built up areas and destroy the very identity that this plan seeks to protect.</p>	<p>We agree that coalescence can be damaging to the identity of places like Emsworth which is why we have included policy L5 on this subject. Such a policy is allowable as it derives from the National Planning Policy Framework.</p>

The document details the vision of what is required in the future but much of it is not "SMART", the objectives should be able to be measured wherever possible. Increase x by y% in z time	This is a spatial Planning document not a business plan. It follows a prescribed legal format and language.
Policy M1. I have viewed the Poynton video. Agree the need to improve N/S flow to integrate North Street. Not sure that Poynton example is the right solution. No ideas.	The Poynton example is one of many similar schemes that have been successfully implemented in the UK and overseas. A detailed technical study would need to be done on the North Street roundabout to design a scheme appropriate for our situation.
maps and text should be consistent e.g. Hollybank Woods and Southleigh Forest page 11 & 12 and between maps	
Perhaps more on infrastructure, roads and sewers especially. Make developers do more for the money they will be making. In addition we need well thought out bus services, a regular one to Oak Park and we may need one if the surgery moves up to Redlands Grange/Hampshire Farm.	On infrastructure, we agree that these are issues for Emsworth. HBC have strong policies in this area in the existing and emerging Local Plan and we do not believe we can improve on those. We agree that there is a need for improved local bus services, which is why we have included this as a project in policy P1
Protected environments. Map on page 12 does not show Brook Meadow as such nor complete River Ems flow	
I think it could be more ambitious, especially in fintech to replace banks; cycling infrastructure; broadband speed	We agree and these are included in projects
Recognition of churches and their social activities need to be recognised e.g. the pastoral centre in St Peter's Sq. is often well used from 10.00 - 4.00pm daily. So also the Hewitt's centre in South St providing meals.	We agree and this is mentioned in the narrative
1. Plan is not clear on how addition commercial & private traffic arising from projected development growth will be accommodated to avoid congestion and provide adequate parking.	



<p>Absence of population records. Today / Future? Private v affordable housed? Eastern boundary - River Ems - lack of information of green spaces / wildlife corridor (E.D.S). PUSH figures should be included and fully explained re quantity</p>	<p>We agree that some population statistic would be useful in the narrative and have included this in the Submission Draft. Policy L1, which is based on the Emsworth Housing Need Assessment by experts Aecom (on our website), refers to the mix of tenures. There is a policy on designated green spaces (C5). A number of respondents have asked us to include the Ems Valley corridor and this is now included. We have not included PUSH figures as to do so would risk the Plan becoming obsolete at a later date if those figures change.</p>
<p>The ambition of the plan to ensure a high quality of design is supported. However, there appears to be a degree of overlap between some of the design policies. These could potentially be covered by one policy requiring a high level of design quality to be demonstrated by a number of criteria. We are curious about the consultation process on the Plan to get to the current stage, as we have not previously been consulted on the Plan before this point and there is no up-to-date reference to the Plan on the Havant Council website. On page 9 it states that each stage of the process, the Emsworth Neighbourhood Plan has sought to extend the amount of common ground between stakeholders, narrowing down various options through a transparent and open process. We are not aware of these previous stages and it would be helpful for the plan to set these out.</p>	<p>We have made changes to this section which will hopefully address your concerns. With regard to the consultation process this is described at the front of the Consultation Statement.</p>
<p>More emphasis on North Emsworth and new retail units and facilities. Most of new development is in this area but no supporting shops apart from Co op</p>	<p>We are aware that the masterplan for the proposed Southleigh Development includes new retail facilities and amenities. However most of this site falls outside the area of the NP. Policy L3 addresses the issue of shops being within walking distance of new developments.</p>
<p>Show housing allocations. Include summary.</p>	<p>Not possible at this time as the new Local Plan has not been adopted.</p>

Design Check list. Sustainability should be achieved but not "as providing for birds and bats ... into new buildings". Discretion should require off road parking to be mandatory in developments.	
Little is said about the need for social housing for young people with limited incomes, yet we need them to stay in the town; they will supply essential services that attract minimum salaries. At present most care providers and shop assistants I meet do not live in Emsworth because they cannot afford to do so.	Policy L1b addresses the issue of affordable and social housing which should help young people.
The neighbourhood plan as proposed is full of detail and platitudes but with few specific recommendations. As a resident for many years I would like to see proposals for the following; 1. Development plans for a) Victoria Hospital b) rundown Industrial estate on South side of railway line next to station. 2. Protected cycle routes. 3. Speed restriction to Queen St and High St with maximum speed marked on road surface (20 mph). 4. Provision of more cash dispensers in centre of Town to help boost trade and visitors	We agree with the project ideas and included 1), 2) and 3) in P1. Local Councillors and the Business Association are actioning provision of more cash dispensers.
Speed restrictions through the town	The policy regarding the Civic Square would assist with traffic speeds. However we agree that measures are needed to tackle traffic speeds in other areas and this has been addressed in Section P1.
Design Check list. Do not think it sensible to allow provision for birds and bats in new building design. Off road parking to be mandatory in new developments.	HBC, national and international regulations must be complied with re habitats of certain birds and mammals.

<p>Overall: There is no mention of a body tasked to carry “strategies” through, no accountability, i.e. not future proofed. How will “strategies” be monitored and reviewed? Poor level of evidence, feasibility studies or costings. Lacking consultation with Hampshire Highways, Southern Water, special interest groups in the NP area: e.g. no contact with Tree Wardens re TPOs, or various Friends of Groups, Friends of Emsworth Waysides etc.</p>	<p>Where we have stipulated detailed policies there is technical evidence to support that e.g. housing policies in section L. All of the policies have come from the public consultations we have conducted. It is not the role of a Neighbourhood Plan to produce detailed costings etc. for projects that are suggested. That work flows from the Plan once it has been adopted. Hampshire CC, Southern Water and all statutory bodies have been consulted on this draft Plan. Many Community organizations have also been consulted and some have responded. The Emsworth Forum has publicised its activities and all local organisations have had the opportunity to engage with us should they wish to do so. This consultation provided another opportunity for them to do so.</p>
<p>An impossible question to answer because you have had to cover such a wide spectrum of issues. However, if you asked me the same question about this box for replying online I would MUCH prefer to be able to easily read what I have written instead of having to continually scroll back with my cursor to re-read what I have written</p>	
<p>More about economic threats and opportunities (SWOT/PEST analysis?) How to retain existing businesses and attract new ones? Not just about old and young, but those in-between. Stronger point about relocating GP services outside the town.</p>	
<p>This form is a bit misleading to complete, as perhaps there should be a warning on the front page to turn over and see the extent of details laid out.</p>	
<p>Stop putting cheap looking, meaningless items such as the large anchor and small flower filled boats around Emsworth. I know it’s meant to be part of a nautical theme but it looks very cheap. Try something a little more sophisticated.</p>	

<p>There should be greater emphasis on the adverse effect of having the Doctor's surgery outside the Town centre while the majority of the patients are elderly</p>	
<p>An omission not to include green corridor between Brook Meadow and Westbourne county boundary path as a green space</p>	
<p>1. The most important part of the plan relate to the future of the Hospital site and adjoining properties. It is unlikely that the aspirations for the site can be achieved and this is a fundamental failing of the neighbourhood plan. 2. When safeguarding the Green spaces there should be greater emphasis on protecting the land for surface water to run off and to assist with minimising flooding</p>	<p>The criteria for green spaces does not include flooding issues: that is covered by policies relating to flooding which are strong in the NPPF and the Havant Local Plan</p>
<p>Is there enough emphasis on flood protection / Management inland and coastal?</p>	<p>HBC's flood management policies are stronger than the national guidelines and we do not believe they need further emphasis in the NP.</p>
<p>Open spaces - areas not included</p>	
<p>Design section could encourage more creative thinking</p>	
<p>I do not believe the proposal for more small 1 and 2 bed units is wise. The demographic of Emsworth is becoming increasingly old and I think this needs to be balance by encouraging more families with younger children into the town. I live in the centre and the past few years has started to feel like an old people's home! I am not age-gist (I am getting older myself and my mother who lives in the centre is 83, but balance is needed. Older people in central/south Emsworth are not realistically going to downsize to 1 or 2 bed units in the town and young couples starting up can't afford south Emsworth prices. There is nowhere to build affordable housing in the south/central area, so we should be actively encouraging young family accommodation</p>	<p>The proposal to encourage more smaller units is to enable older people in large houses to 'downsize' and to free up those properties for families. At the other end of the age spectrum young people also need to be able to join the housing market by having access to smaller units. The smaller units will be included in all new developments. Our policies in this area have been informed by the Aecom Housing Needs assessment which forms part of our evidence base.</p>

when it is built or property is converted in this part of Emsworth.	
essentially it is a sound plan	
Points 7,13, 19, 26	
My main concern is in not including the Emsworth Medical Practice in the Community and Public Services hub as it seems counterproductive to have a vision statement which claims to want to encourage 'accessibility to health and social services for all residents, while both public and private health services across the town will be maintained and enhanced". We know from current consultation with EMP that is patently what they are moving away from, presumably to fulfil their own business interests rather than wishing to be an integral part of the socio-economic life of the town.	Decisions by the banks and the GPs are not within the control of local residents or the Emsworth Forum. EF believes that a Neighbourhood Plan can help to protect and promote the local social and economic infrastructure of Emsworth in the future.
Acoustics - the whole of Emsworth is damaged hugely by the impact of the main roads, namely the A27 and Main Road. When these roads were built, no consideration was given to protect the town and the residents. A long-term plan for acoustic fencing along the A27 would substantially enhance the lives of everyone in the town, benefit the Schools located along here, and make Emsworth a cleaner, less stressful and more desirable/prosperous location. This needs to happen to the existing side (Railway/Victoria Road side) as well as the opposite side when any future development happens. Everything possible should be done to ensure that previous, ill-considered planning and development approvals that didn't require this acoustic protection are rectified. This could be via S106, CIL, developer contributions, other funding etc. etc.	We agree acoustic measures should be extended along the A27 and this has been added as a project in Section P1.
The presentation and particularly the photos too focused on the old town. How about a school and a cricket pitch for example	Noted.

The plan needs more detail. The inter-bridge areas are in a terrible state, the hospital is boarded up, for at least two years North and South Emsworth have been partially cut off by the wall issue and restaurant build. A possible failure in the planning system has created a divided Emsworth in terms of communications.	
Comments made on relevant sections	
Have you any comments on the Emsworth Today section starting on page 10? (Q4)	
Summary of Comments received	Response from Emsworth Forum
Your opening para should recognise Emsworth's importance as a retirement area and show an age profile of the town. Although it would be unhelpful to be branded as such, retired people have special needs when it comes to local services and facilities. e.g. the opportunity to remain active by the provision of safe cycling routes	
I concur with the including slipper and peter pond as they make up part of the attractiveness of Emsworth and the major impact on the north south travel for pedestrians across he A259	
OK as far as went. Needed more emphasis on serious impact that loss of banks is having. Also the importance of having a variety of proposer shops	
There is no reference to St James' school being full and is unable to be expanded	Both Primary Schools are indeed full and this has been mentioned in the narrative. However, this is a matter for HCC Education services not the Neighbourhood Plan.
Would be of benefit if the statements made in this section were backed by factual evidence and figures.	
See comment 3.	

Protected environments should include Hampshire Farm Meadow and Nore Barn woods. Retail & Commercial Uses - Business to North of A259 is now quite vibrant. Car Parking 119 "on street" & regulated parking bays - free. Mostly 45 mins and a minority 2 hours	We agree. Hampshire Farm Meadow and Nore Barn Woods have been added as designated Green space. The management of car parking is outside the scope of the NP.
I think the section on pages 10-17 is a good summary of Emsworth	
There could be more emphasis on the variety of independent shops e.g. wine merchants and newsagents are not mentioned. The town has enough estate agents, charity shops and take-aways.	We agree regarding independent shops. However we cannot restrict estate agents, charity shops and takeaways.
The whole AONB area should be shown on a map so people can see the extent of it.	
Re p.16, the north-south split is not just a matter of the 259. The section of New Brighton Rd from the railway to the Horndean Rd junction is another barrier -very unfriendly, even intimidating, with noise from traffic (often speeding) echoing from the A27 bridge.	
The northern boundary of Hollybank Woods could/should be upgraded to protect the area together with such elements of Southleigh Forest as fall within boundary not already covered. Map on p12 does not make clear the HW area already covered by SINC	This comment is not understood.
This is clearly the result of a great deal of work, love and thought!	
There should be mention of the existing Conservation Area. There should be mention of the considerable difficulty exiting side roads onto the A259 due to the volume of traffic on the A259.	The Conservation area is mentioned in the Design and Housing sections.

Excellent - I would just make sure any maps show the names of everything that is mentioned in the text	
Little has been said about the development or future of the Doctor's surgery. Your statement shows the current surgery to be inadequate. Old, cramped etc.	
Good and accurate section	
see above	
You say the town is 'vibrant retail' but a lot of the businesses do struggle to keep going.	
The "vibrant retail centre" will need support shops everywhere to service 2000 extra homes. Town centre cannot accommodate more cars from new developments. Where will additional employment units be placed? Schools and surgeries must be built early in large developments	The new housing developments should help to ensure the sustainability of the retail town centre. With regards to the new Southleigh development, there are plans for an additional school and amenities.
Car Parking: In the plan page 16 you mention Bridge Street! It is Bridge Road.	
Traffic congestion on the A259 is getting worse, and we need to have a strategy to handle projected increase in population. Also the Town Mill Pond is designated a SINC, and increasingly used by walkers and tourists, there is no clear policy in terms of maintenance. It has fallen into neglect and is an eyesore. If we want to attract people to the town, we need to make the best of our assets, not take them for granted and neglect them. The uncertainty of where the GP Surgery will relocate raises the ongoing problem of transport for patients both to the surgery and to medical appointments at hospital or Havant medical centre. Volunteer patient transport services are almost non-existent, so we need a public transport policy to cover this need.	Refer to frequently made comments and questions re traffic congestion. We also agree that maintenance of the Mill Pond is important and the Mill Pond Volunteer Group manages this, working with HBC and the Environment Agency.



<p>Confusing nomenclature: Brook Meadow apparently also referred to as Lumley Meadow, and Horse Fields as Brook Farm. Are these the same, or different?                  No mention of significant historic features, or public spaces (including important street trees).                  No mention of constraints such as flooding.                  Apparent assumption that levels of protection through special conservation designations are adequate as stand-alones in relation to development pressures, and therefore no pre-emptive strategies proposed.</p>	
<p>Retail and Commercial Uses: The range of restaurants should be wider. Access &amp; Movement: Additional developments should be opposed and avoided - this would increase all movements and make it impossible to improve the existing flow within Emsworth and areas fed by routes via Emsworth. Impacts of Through Traffic: No Policy M5 shown?</p>	<p>Planning regulation does not allow promotion of specific types of restaurants. It is not the role of the Neighbourhood Plan to prevent development. The Plan does however address issues of traffic flow in Policy M1</p>
<p>Access movement - it would be nice if this could be addressed but any increased building around the town centre will make any chance impossible due to increased traffic movements. In addition there is a new proposed junction with the A27</p>	<p>Policy M1 addresses traffic flow</p>
<p>My personal concerns are to protect the natural environment, to provide MUCH improved, safe and sensible cycle paths, maintain a lively yet sympathetic town centre that reflects its residents and makes it inviting for visitors. If the amount of non-Emsworth through-traffic could be alleviated along the A259 that would be an enormous benefit to all who live in and around Emsworth</p>	<p>We agree. All the policies address these issues. However, traffic along the A259 will increase with new developments. Policy M1 should help alleviate the impact of this.</p>
<p>Good overview. Very valid point about A259 through-traffic problem and North-South divide. Both will become worse with latest housing developments east of the town along the A259 and future developments to the west. Important point about lack</p>	

of bus to Oak Park Health Centre.	
Very well laid out. Not sure if Nore Barn woods is included. Is Warblington Church, St Thomas A Becket excluded? Presumably in Havant.	Nore Barn woods is included. The Plan only covers the Emsworth electoral ward.
Add reference to the intention of Doctors to move to a new surgery located in North Emsworth	
Factual summary however it misses green corridor between Brook Meadow and Westbourne county boundary path as a green space	
P12 the map and text do not correspond in that things in text are not on map and different names are used for same place i.e. Hollybank Woods / Southleigh Forest. The Horses' field?	
There are too many charity shops and it is very sad that the betting shop has arrived. I do not believe the latter is well supported or wanted in the south of Emsworth as it detracts from the atmosphere here	
This a good section - however the text and maps are not quite in sync: there's reference to the railway - but it's not shown on the map; similarly Hollybank Woods, Brook Meadow and Horse field are not on the maps in this section. Further the section on education makes ref to the connectivity to the FE College in Chichester - but not the fact that the University of Chichester is equally easily accessible. Also ref is made to Havant College and Southdowns College and they have merged to become HSDC.	

<p>This talks about the loss of the banks and relocation of the GP surgery which seems to indicate that like the bank move, the surgery is a 'done deal', yet the section goes on to say 'health services or associated support services may well play a key part of a unified town strategy'. It doesn't look that way just now and I wonder whether this could not have been amplified and examples given.</p>	
<p>well described and comprehensive</p>	
<p>Noise. Why isn't this raised as one of today's biggest issues in Emsworth?</p>	<p>We agree it is an issue. A long-term plan will be developed to combat noise add acoustic fencing to address A27 noise issues. This is contained in P1.</p>
<p>Bus services needs to be more critical: frequent buses E-W, but not linking north to south, and no bus to QA</p>	<p>We agree. Hence the project on this in P1</p>
<p>This provides a good contextual overview.</p>	
<p>Mention should be made of protecting the River Ems surrounds up to and including Southleigh Road to maintain the nature corridor. Also tree lined roads and TPOs plus rural footpaths. I think there are more than 4 hairdressers. Settlements east of Emsworth on A259 are already expanding.</p>	<p>Refer to frequently made comments and questions. TPOs is a project in policy P1. Planning policy does not allow restriction of retail outlets.</p>
<p>Have you any comments on the Vision Statement on page 18? (Q5)</p>	
<p>Summary of Comments received</p>	<p>Response from Emsworth Forum</p>
<p>An awareness of the increasing threat of sea-level rises associated with global warming. The need for forward planning in terms of "soft" and "hard sea defences</p>	<p>We agree this is an issue. We have included a new policy to support measures to strengthen the shoreline boundary, including the town mill pond wall.</p>
<p>Yes. If you want to bridge the north/south divide, you need a cycle lane that connect the two that doesn't involve getting off your bike, waiting for a gap in the traffic and walking across a road (as it does at present) or risking your life getting knocked off by a car under the two bridges. It needs a dedicated cycle</p>	<p>Policy M1 will make it safe for cyclists to travel across the A259</p>

underpass, whatever the cost.	
I like the statements	
Need to include high street with a variety of useful shops, ability to access cash and parking.	See Policy W3.
Is this vision or common sense?	Both. Visions have to be realistic and achievable.
I really like the idea of more provision for younger people	
Very difficult to see how Emsworth's character will be maintained once they've concreted over the Havant Gap. No confidence that infrastructure will cope.	The NP is intended to protect the character of Emsworth as it develops and to ensure that there is adequate infrastructure to support the development.
Don't think there is N/S divide in town. Threat to vision is increase of 2nd homes in centre and South of Town. One of the reasons the town centre is in decline [apart from banks etc. decamping] is the number of second homes around the centre. At the last count there were more than 100 with one or two roads in the central area with hardly a permanent resident.	Your view of the North/South divide is not supported by the evidence from public feedback or the advice from our planning experts. There is a significant number of second homes in Emsworth and this does have an impact on the retail economy, but it is not the only factor in the pressures faced by high streets. This is a national issue arising from changes in shopping patterns: large shopping malls, online shopping etc.
A sound set of aspiration statements for Emsworth is on page 19	
I agree with all of that.	
I think the housing mix should be explicitly included here	It is not possible to mention every aspect of the planning policy in the Vision Statement. See Section L2 re housing mix.
Fine	
Sets out the basic plan but gives no indication of expanding facilities in north in the way of promoting shops, Doctors (promised but failed to materialise previously) now that there seems to be lack of interest in the Hospital site	It would be very difficult to sustain new facilities in the north of Emsworth. As can be seen from the town centre it is hard for retailers to be sustainable even where they are clustered together.
The presumption of growth should be challenged.	The NP cannot prevent development. Unless the economy changes there will be new development in Emsworth. The NP is intended to ensure such development is sustainable.
The detail is there but make it "SMART"	This is a spatial planning document not an action plan
Agree with all of it. Re north/south divide - access is key and is	

currently only via a narrow busy road. More house will put even more pressure on it. If it had to be closed for a reason it would cut off north and south.	
Good Vision Statement.	
More thought required re the traffic movement from Horndean & New Brighton roads towards "2 bridges bottleneck". A27 junction to be added to divert through traffic onto A259 - East of Emsworth. Keep and develop recreational areas and facilities	There are various policies addressing improving mobility across Emsworth in the NP. The idea of adding a further junction to the east of Emsworth has been mooted, but is outside the scope of the NP.
The vision of sustainable growth is supported	
Totally agree with this but doubt it will be achievable if the developments to increase the number of properties in Emsworth and surrounding areas goes ahead.	The NP will address the impacts of new development
Not really confident that all objections will be addressed	Only objections based on planning grounds can be addressed
The vision is sound if it can all be achieved. Building should be limited to maintain the character of the village.	Development cannot be prevented but it must conform to the policies in the Local Plan and the NP which should protect the character of the town
As I said before, not just challenge of older population but also need to retain and attract younger working people to ensure a good mixed community.	
Agreed	
Excellent	
Any chance of achieving the commendable aims will require a co-ordinated community effort probably with a Town Centre Manager needing a sustainable source of funding	We agree. The policies in the NP support that.
No. I agree with the vision statement.	
Should we mention encouragement of increased employment opportunities to complement new growth? This would link with W policies	It is not possible to mention every aspect of the planning policy in the Vision Statement. See Section W re employment policies.
please be careful not to turn the town into an old people's home	We have to recognise that Emsworth has an aging population but it is healthy to have a diverse community and new development will support

	that.
It's sound	
Again I cannot criticise the Vision statement but think it will only be achievable if we have Government support & local councillors who are able to support it	
I agree with the vision for Emsworth	
Noise improvements should be part of the town's long-term Vision. Even if this is part of the North/South divide vision statement.	See P1.
Excellent	
This is very general	Vision statements tend to be general. The policies are more specific.
No clear reference to environmental problems of density and speed of traffic. current levels and projected levels say 5/10 years	It is not possible to mention every aspect of the planning policy in the Vision Statement. See Sections M and P.
Have you any comments on the Neighbourhood Plan Objectives on page 20? (Q6)	
Summary of Comments received	Response from Emsworth Forum
Satisfied	
No	
Maintaining and strengthening a vibrant and attractive town centre is crucial	
Difficult to argue with these objectives, but unlikely to be implemented given the planning processes we have at present. Dolphin Quay is a prime example of it not working.	
obviously some of the statements will compete and edge with each other but overall I concur with the objectives	
I would have thought that objective 8 outside control of council are other organisations going to take any notice?	Yes they will be required to do so by the Planning Authority. The NP is part of the statutory guidance. This is why we are doing the NP.

Point 7 needs to be applied sensitively.	
Point 1&5 and 6&7 could be combined	We do not agree. They make separate and important points.
I particularly support items 6,7,10	
A sound set of aspiration statements for Emsworth is on page 19, except for (7). How will the neighbourhood Plan ensure land made available for development will improve the quality of life for existing residents?	New developments can be positive in a number of ways: new residents contribute to the local economy and will make the town centre and other local facilities that are struggling more economically viable. Incoming residents tend to be younger and can support the older population, filling local jobs and contributing to the vitality of the town. The developments themselves can be attractive and add to the character of the place.
I agree with all of that	
Very good - I would like to see some mention of bus services on the north-south axis, which for many older people are crucial to (e.g.) the Independent Living objective	We agree. This is a project in P1
Fine	
Wish to enhance maritime character. Develop tourist flyers etc. for zone. Additional trade potential for south ems shops/pubs. no mention of industry for "newcomers" to reduce travel problems, carbon footprint etc. do not want this to be a dormitory town for Chi/Ports/S'ton/Guildford/London	We agree. Maritime character is Objective 1. Objective 2 refers to jobs & policies W2, W3, W\$ & W5 support jobs. Policy D6 relates to carbon footprint.
Support the objectives. However the issue of traffic both East-West and North-South will become much greater with the proposed developments. Other solutions will be required such as an additional junction on the A27 further to the East.	Whilst the EF agree that another junction off the A27 east of the town may be needed, the Neighbourhood Plan cannot comment on matters outside the area of the plan which covers the electoral ward only.
All very important but some are a bit woolly	
More mention of development. But should we be concerned at loss of agricultural land	Under present government policy, with the current levels of housing need, land for housing will take precedence over the need to have agricultural land.
vision and plan overlap	
Support all.	

Agreed	
Very positive and ambitious objectives	
The objective of sustainable, liveable and mixed communities is supported	
Wholeheartedly agree.	
Generally aspirational rather than specific or measurable. No mention of CIL No objective regarding wildlife and local biodiversity, both marine and land based.	Refer to frequently made comments and questions. The NP is not intended to cover CIL - although the projects in P1 provide potential uses for CIL funds. Objective 5 refers to the rich natural environment.
The objectives are sound if they can be achieved, particularly point No 7 "ensure .... Improve people's quality of life, for both new and existing residents". I will have concerns about noise, no Bank, traffic etc. etc.	
They seem to be well thought out.	
Not really confident that this will really benefit the local residents	
The plan objectives are sound if they can be achieved. The North/South divide is not going to be helped by the proposed additional junction on the A27	
Include a statement to provide better pedestrian and cycle paths in and around Emsworth	Objective 3 refers to this. Support for cycling is mentioned in the moving and projects sections
Good point about mixed communities, but can young families afford to live in the town?	The policies in the Living section attempt to address this
All included and well-constructed	
Excellent	
These objectives are the issues the Town Centre Manager will need to address	
I agree with the plan objectives.	
Excellent	
See point (5)	



No comments	
agree	
This page starts "issues that are of concern to local residents and businesses" ... but there is no mention of Noise issues from the A27 and Main Roads?	Agreed. See P1.
Does not match the vision statement, or the objectives in the later sections. Does history make us an outward looking cohesive community? Is this page necessary at all?	The NP objectives are designed to build on the Vision Statement and the policy objectives build on those in turn. NPs follow a proscribed format.
And so I was not sure what some of the statements means e.g. public destination potential. The intentions are good though.	
Policy C1 (page 25):What are your views on Policy C1 Community and Public Services Hub? (Q7)	
Summary of Comments received	Response from Emsworth Forum
Expedite health & social care facilities on Victoria Hospital site	Policy C1 supports this.
It would not benefit the town if the Cottage hospital site was developed solely for residential use	We agree. Policy C1 supports this.
Seems like a good idea.	
Yes undoubtedly support for the development of health or social care facilities on the former site of Victoria cottage hospital and a proposed public services hub. Integration will mean that Emsworth will be at the cutting edge of Social and community provision	
Have you forgotten the centre of the Emsworth area is approx. the Recreation ground/Horndean Rd and more houses coming?	Town centre refers to where amenities are not the geographic centre.
Health provision must be retained on EVCH site. Museum not on map	
No reference to housing, yet now there's talk of incorporating 15 dwellings - overtaken by events?	No. This policy aligns with the allocation HBC have made in their Draft Local Plan, which we support. We anticipated that residential use would be necessary on the upper floors to pay for community facilities if the site is not

	used for a new surgery.
Hope library can be relocated in old Nat West building when it moves. C1 good idea, but events seem to have overtaken - Doctors seem determined to go to Redlands Grange and Hospital site sold for development. Point C. Are you saying that if the library were to move to a location not in the “proposed public service hub” it would not receive NP support? For example if the library moved to say the old Nat West Bank building. The public service hub is a nice idea, but unlikely to become a reality. Please also see point 7 on feedback form.	No. We do not know where the Library will be in the future. Mention of the library is illustrative of the kind of uses in the Hub. HCC has expressed interest in the idea but it is too early to say where it will go. The EF & NP supports the retention of a Library in Emsworth whether it goes to this site or elsewhere. At time of writing there are plans for the Hospital site to be used for the new surgery. However if that does not eventuate, we need a policy that would address the possibility that the site will eventually be re-developed. This policy is designed to ensure that at least part of the site is used for community purposes on the ground floor. Upper floors could be residential in order to support any redevelopment. The EF intends to work with relevant partners to ensure that any re-development reflects the aspirations of the local community. We believe this is achievable.
If the NHS Property services sell the Victoria Cottage Hospital site to the highest bidder and say it is a residential developer then what will the Emsworth Form do?	
There could be the prospect of the Cottage Hospital being purchased by Emsworth as a community asset.	
Must keep the hospital, fire station etc.	
I don't feel very optimistic about this, given that the hospital site belongs to NHS Property, but we ought to try	
Parking and access insufficient for some suggested usage. However access to information museum and services that do not generate intensifying of traffic. Expand M1 and access becomes a nightmare.	There is a car park next to the site and in Palmers Road. This part of Emsworth is also well served by public transport.

Move some facilities to North Emsworth e.g. community centre releasing land for other use. Lack of facilities in this area means loss of interest to unique qualities of harbour area & one of few areas with 'local shops' needing support	Moving some of these facilities to North Emsworth is not likely to be economically sustainable. It is already challenging to ensure the economic sustainability of the amenities in the town centre.
It will help to ensure a vibrant town centre and feeling of community.	
We know that the Doctor's surgery is very unlikely to move to here and I am not convinced that a library would be well used. So ideally the site should be used for the Community - village hall, Doctor's surgery, library etc. But if it can't then maybe it should be sold and the funds received used to benefit all the community. This requires discussion which I have not been party to	We understand from HCC that the Emsworth Library is well used. We agree that the site should be used for community purposes and this policy is designed to ensure that at least part of it will be.
It doesn't actually mention Doctor's surgery, they are surely a major part of Health and Social care facilities	
I would fully support new development on EVH site but only if it comprises a ground floor social care facility with small residential above	
limited support must be self-sustaining and not a financial burden	
It would be disastrous for patients and the viability of the businesses in the town centre if the Doctor's surgery moved out of the Town centre	
Must make sure that the old hospital site is used soon not allowed to fall into further disrepair.	
But Doctors have given up using Victoria Hospital and are now planning a new surgery with ancillary services in the Redwood area. This raises transport issues. Hospital site could be used for social services e.g. dementia care	

<p>Given the size of projected development, is there a case to consider for additional distributed health care units. E.g. Westbourne HC is useful for Northern Residents.</p>	<p>Any development of the site will explore its potential for a range of services</p>
<p>Both Support and Object. Support New Public service hub with underground car parking and lifts. Object to use of existing buildings - poor use of central land location. Without sufficient support from Havant Council the hospital was closed, without due support for future public service in this area. This problem will continue with limited surgery facilities and poor nursing coverage for an ever increasing population.</p>	
<p>Page 26 Church Place this is Church Path</p>	
<p>There is no common ownership of the various sites proposed in a Community &amp; Public Services Hub. There is also no feasibility study, demographic evidence or proposal(s) offered, and no strategy likely to attract necessary funding for such a policy to succeed.</p> <p>There is also no body able to carry the concept through to fruition. As such, it is passively aspirational at best, and at worst, likely to set up conflicts – e.g. put obstacles in the way of siting a new Emsworth Library elsewhere outside of the proposed Hub.</p>	
<p>Ensure parking is retained to support access to these services</p>	
<p>There is a space in North Street which could be better used, that would attract people north of the A259 and which will become even less used if the Post Office moves out completely as has been suggested.</p>	
<p>Parking is required if services are to be addressed</p>	

<p>We need a centrally-based health centre. If this is re-located out of town it will increase car journeys and reduce footfall (further threatening the viability of local shops, especially the two pharmacies). It's OK to leave the PO where it is in the Coop.</p>	
<p>Add FECH garden to map showing key buildings. A re-ordered Friends garden would help provide the 'quality of life' retreat as an integral part of the public services hub.</p>	
<p>I support policy C1a which is fundamental to the success of the plan and future vibrancy of the Town Centre this will not be achieved because of the failings of the various Health sector department and local Government which has resulted in the local GP practice now intending to move elsewhere contrary to the objective of this draft plan. 2. Also policy 1b and 1c will not be achieved without significant public/Government investment. This aspiration is probably unrealistic</p>	
<p>This zone should be consolidated and rest of area sold off for housing development.</p>	
<p>I am v. concerned about the gradual relocation of key services outside the village centre e.g. no bank, proposed surgery move to outskirts of Westbourne. I think the diagram on page 24 very powerfully demonstrates the danger of these sorts of relocations which can ultimately lead to fewer people coming to the village and other small businesses eventually becoming unviable. In relation to the Surgery being moved outside of the village centre I think this will create huge problems for elderly &amp; vulnerable people</p>	
<p>I'd like to have seen more on how charitable enterprise could have been included in the mix and the value these organisations can bring in terms of new sources of income and expertise.</p>	
<p>Important to retain the hospital site as a public amenity</p>	

A Community & Public Services Hub should be retained in the heart of the town - and certainly not located in an out-of-town development. This would weaken the core and character of the town, both physically, in facilities and in identity.	
Strongly!	
Difficult to answer as not clear who implements the policy or is it just an item of a 'wish list' and nice to have. May be better to spread the services suggested in both north and south Emsworth using old Doctors surgery and perhaps NatWest building	
Policy C2 (page 26):What are your views on Policy C2 Retail, High Street & Food & Drink Uses? (Q8)	
Summary of Comments received	Response from Emsworth Forum
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Keep a distinct balance between catering and retail shopping.</li> <li>2. Get a decision on future of Fire Station / Museum and Post Office.</li> </ol>	
Don't understand what land use classes A1 to A4 are.	<p>A1 Shops - Shops, retail warehouses, hairdressers, undertakers, travel and ticket agencies, post offices, pet shops, sandwich bars, showrooms, domestic hire shops, dry cleaners, funeral directors and internet cafes.</p> <p>A2 Financial and professional services - Financial services such as banks and building societies, professional services (other than health and medical services) and including estate and employment agencies. It does not include betting offices or pay day loan shops - these are now classed as “sui generis” uses (see below).</p> <p>A3 Restaurants and cafés - For the sale of food and drink for consumption on the premises - restaurants, snack bars and cafes.</p> <p>A4 Drinking establishments - Public houses, wine bars or other drinking establishments (but not night clubs) including drinking establishments with expanded food provision.</p> <p>A5 Hot food takeaways - For the sale of hot food for consumption off the premises</p>

There are enough cafes, pubs & restaurants. It is real shops that bring the local community into the centre	
Have you forgotten the centre of the Emsworth area is approx. the Recreation ground/Horndean Rd and more houses coming?	Town centre refers to where the economic centre and amenities are, not the geographic centre.
Believe that cafes and food and drink premises are already far too dominant in the town. Far too many charity shops taking up prime retail space in the town.	
Support broad objectives - include West St too Quay at S end of South St is under used as car park, should be place to sit & relax with drink from Flintstones. I am not sure that this is a "policy" What land use classes would the NP object to? If an application is lawful it is impossible to object although I think the EBA and the Forum objected to the betting shop and Costa coffee house. On what basis can you object to lawful applications? We also have successful retail outlets in West Street	We agree and West Street has been included in the NP. The car park at the end of South Street is owned by Slipper Sailing Club and the Quay-side car park is owned by HBC and needs to be kept clear to enable boats to be lifted. Decisions by HBC on Planning Applications are a matter of judgment using planning law and policies, balancing the rights of the applicant with the wider public interest. In that respect, a planning application may be lawful, but still refused if there were sound Planning grounds to do so.
This section could emphasise more a plan to encourage independent retail outlets.	Planning regulation does not permit this in planning policy although we can signpost that independent retail outlets are valued by residents.
No cheap takeaways south of the A259	There have to be genuine planning reasons to object to A5 uses in a town centre. E.g. noise and smell in a residential area.
Emsworth does need its own heartbeat so public services need to be retained and encouraged but again with no pubs or other facilities in north it is more attractive to go to Westbourne (or once in the car to Havant/Chichester etc.	It is inevitable that residents will travel to a variety of centres for recreational purposes. It is unlikely that any pubs or other amenities would survive in the North at the present time.
Ideally independent retailers, rather than large chains which might "undercut" and therefore in time exclude small businesses.	Planning regulation does not permit this.
In principle I agree with this	
The map is wrong. Not Church place but Church Path. Why no museum shown? Do we really need more food/drink outlets?	As the plan is revised maps and named will be checked
Attempt to control estate agents/charity shops/betting shops in town centre. Encourage independent shops instead of chains.	

But retail is likely to continue to decline, so need a stronger vision about alternative uses	See P1.
We have enough restaurants, pubs, charity shops, coffee shops	
Have traffic considerations been considered?	Yes. See Policy M1, M2 & M3
Over-emphasis on A3, 4 & 5 uses. I do not support change of use applications to allow for more Food & Drink uses at the cost of balanced provision of other necessary Retail and High Street uses. The policy is light in demographic evidence for its proposals. It should be improved to provide strategies for future changes in High Streets likely due to internet shopping (a la Mary Portas) and it should also reflect the existing evening and seasonal activities that enhances Emsworth's social vibrancy and attractiveness.	We agree and it has been added to P1 in the NP.
We need this to help maintain a "village" centre	
There are already so many cafes that I would resist the introduction of more.	
Not too many restaurants and cafes. Emsworth already has far too many- especially expensive ones.	
Reduce the number of charity shops and encourage more service shops by reducing the ground rent and cap rent charge	It is not possible to force landlords to reduce or cap their rents.
We have enough cafes, bars etc. and certainly do not need another takeaway! The Map on P26 does not appear to relate to the copy.	
Need to include diversity of shops. We have lost Banks and have too many charity shops, hairdressers. Need to keep High St vibrant	
A2 & A4 should not be permitted in High St, St Peter Sq., South St and Queen St	



Food & drink uses should not overwhelm retail uses. A greater variety of retail outfits should be encouraged. No more charity shops & estate agents	
Ideally, all retail, food & drink should be consolidated around the town square and not “leak out” along North Street	North Street is part of the town centre.
The ref to Land use classes A1 - A4 was not clear	
These proposals are only truly sustainable if there are regulated rents, reasonable business rates and a commitment to help small entrepreneur shopkeepers and other businesses to thrive. Brighton appears to have a workable model.	Business rates are not a planning matter.
This should be supported - but not to allow take-away overload. Each use should have to clearly demonstrate that they really do meet the local needs, not just a Planning-Use Class.	
Should you mention betting shops as undesirable, as well perhaps junk food outlets? Community meeting places should be encouraged e.g. Hewitt’s and the Methodist Church.	Community uses are encouraged in C1
with the inclusion of event street	
Policy C3 (Page 27):What are your views on Policy C3 Public Realm Design? (Q9)	
Summary of Comments received	Response from Emsworth Forum
Not enough practical info provided	
I am after better cycle lanes even if this means giving priority to cycles and pedestrians over that of cars.	Policies M1, M3 & M4 support this. M1 talks about shared space where cars, cycles and pedestrians can use the space equally. See Frequently made comments and questions
Creative innovation with this regard would be very welcome	we agree
Have you forgotten the centre of the Emsworth area is approx. the Recreation ground/Horndean Rd and more houses coming?	

Scope for developing more cycle routes around Town is limited - Public transport is v good and HBC have done well to improve cycle routes and facilities. Again I am not sure that this is a "policy" How can building a new house or shop for example improve "pedestrian connectivity"? Or "cycling". And if it didn't would you object to the development?	This is addressed in the section on moving and projects. The point of this policy is that new developments will be supported where they improve connectivity.
Expand on "buffer zone" northwards (as well as on south of Southleigh Road and road to Westbourne) of Redlands Grange to edge of Southleigh Forest on the top road to act as protection to the inevitable migration of planning permission up Mays Hill (see new houses in Westbourne at end of Long Copse Lane in West Sussex)	Policy L5 addresses coalescence of development.
Absolutely agree	
I think it is right to protect the character of Emsworth but balance this with a need for innovation & creativity not just endless pastiche architecture.	
Need for cycle routes	We agree see Policies M1-4 and P1
When existing surgery has been closed, move Westbound bus stop away from the square and nearer to the public service hub. Improve traffic flow and pedestrian movement	see policies M1-4
This policy is supported as it seeks to achieve a high level of connectivity and high quality public space for all users.	
No mention of Important Views or specifics about local distinctiveness, or of Heritage Assets and Conservation Area. No mention of Local Gaps policy, or "inter Gaps". No mention of small areas of green tranquillity to be protected, e.g. footpaths, wide verges, cobbled areas.	These matters are dealt with elsewhere in the NP

Vital to ensure the townspeople feel safe within the environment - nowhere is mention made of the Police	Policing is not a planning matter. However, the policies supporting design and local economy in the town encourage more people which in turn makes the place safer.
No strong connection between Redlands open spaces and the County border path to Town Centre	
Improved pedestrian and cycle routes a priority	See M1-4 and P1 and Frequently made comments and questions
North Street though to the Catholic Church needs a design rethink as part of this policy.	
It's all obvious but what more is there to do? Trees and hedges could be specifically mentioned and reducing speed of traffic	Trees and traffic speeds have been added to P1. M1 addresses speed of traffic.
Policy C4 (page 27):What are your views on Policy C4 Leisure & Recreational Facilities? (Q10)	
Summary of Comments received	Response from Emsworth Forum
Depends on your age and money available	
Agreed but no facilities S of A27T. Should consider beach play area for toddlers near the pontoon on harbour wall	See P1.
See #9 more relevant here	
Ensure public toilet facilities remain in place in the Recreation ground and are open at suitable times. Also include Town Centre as there was some talk of closing it.	Provision of public toilet facilities has been added to Section P1.
Whilst the Hospital garden is not a POS it is vital to protect it and to ensure it is not ever incorporated into EVCH development	The EVCH Garden is the property of the Friends of Emsworth Community Health. Its future will depend on them and any future developer of the EVCH site. In order to protect it we intend to designate it a green space.
Leisure should include walking and footpath network which needs safeguarding and improving	We agree. Hence policies M1-4

<p>Hampshire Farm recreation meadow is a benefit and will be greater when 200 houses are built in Long Copse lane area and North Westbourne. It must not be damaged by the deletion of a green gap towards the river Ems by the development of further housing in the existing two fields. Keep wildlife corridor.</p>	<p>We agree that the Ems Valley should be designated Green Space and we have included that.</p>
<p>I would support only on inclusion of full list of Local Green Space Designations below;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 3 Allotment sites (Warblington Road, Washington Road, Redlands Grange)</li> <li>• Nore Barn Woods (including recent extensions into reed beds and watercress field).</li> <li>• The Old Hospital Garden</li> <li>• Brook Meadow</li> <li>• Hampshire Farm Meadow</li> <li>• Eastern section of Strategic Site 2 (Horndean Road section)</li> <li>• East Hampshire Strip/Sussex Border Path (field east of Westbourne Avenue)</li> <li>• “Horse Fields” (opposite Brookfield Hotel)</li> <li>• 2 Recreation Grounds (Horndean Road &amp; Southleigh Road)</li> </ul> <p>Do not support any upgrading of footpaths in a way that will increase footfall at the cost of eroding the precarious balance of biodiversity in Chichester Harbour. e.g. Solent Way Upgrade Project (Nore Barn Wood), or footpath from Queen St to King St as both may impact on protected salt marsh feeding grounds of Nore Rithe</p>	<p>We agree with this list of potential DGSs and have included all of those sites in the NP which meet the DGS criteria. Improvements to footpaths seek to protect biodiversity. There is support for the footpath upgrades mentioned.</p>
<p>Yes, most definitely, these should be protected</p>	

But if we are to benefit from the Creative Industries, more needs to be made of non-sporting cultural activities such as Wemsfest etc. and the benefit of the Baptist Church for holding concerts etc. Though it is an ugly building, it certainly has improved the entertainment offering in the town.	We agree, and have amended the Emsworth Today section to reflect the rich cultural activities in Emsworth.
P28d I do not understand the reference to Emsworth Park and St James Primary School neither of which are indicated on adjacent map	We agree, and the Section has been changed.
Current Leisure and Recreation facilities in Emsworth are, at best, very poor.	We do not agree. People are attracted to Emsworth because of its many natural and enhanced leisure facilities.
Emphasise needs of all age groups not just playgrounds and walking. Support for sports pitches and clubs, all weather facilities, swimming, bowls etc. No rugby club, hockey et al.	
Include the cottage hospital garden. There are no playgrounds south of the railway line. important to ensure good facilities at last west of Selangor avenue development	
Policy C5 (page 29):What are your views on Policy C5 Designated Green Spaces? (Q11)	
Summary of Comments received	Response from Emsworth Forum
The AONB is protected already.	AONB does not protect space from development. DGS does.
Most already covered by planning or bylaws	That is not the case. DGS gives strong protection
Maps on p28, 30, 31 are confusing	
- With the proviso that land adjacent to River Ems & Border path needs to be included.	We have added this to the DGS.
Area at the bottom of Westwood Close not included as a designated green space. This area used for peoples' wellbeing by a green space to walk in. Views of Westbourne Church give a feeling of tranquillity when walking this route. It is a lovely walk to Emsworth boat yard. It a good habitat for wild life with	We have added this to the DGS.

woodpeckers and owls regularly heard.	
No mention of the green space of the existing Havant Gap	This forms part of the Strategic Site in the HBC Housing Statement and their draft Local Plan. We cannot undo what has already been decided.
Add Old Hospital Garden and Harbour Farm Meadow. Remove Slipper Mill pond as it is in West Sussex. Again I am not sure this can be described as is policy. It needs to be written more precisely. Slipper Mill Pond is in West Sussex not Hampshire so is outside the area of the plan. Chichester harbour already is overloaded with protection so additional measures not required. Add. Hampshire Farm Meadow and the Old Hospital Garden. We should also designate the River Ems corridor between Westbourne and Emsworth and the eastern edge of the strategic development site [Denvilles/Emsworth] Should we also have a record of the Trees in Emsworth that are subject to Tree Preservation Orders? This might be especially important in the Conservation Area.	DGS gives stronger protection. We agree with the additional sites mentioned. TPOs are mentioned in Policy P1
An explanation would be helpful of why only 'part of' Peter's Pond.	Not all of it is in Emsworth ward.
As said before, the whole AONB map should be shown	The AONB is a much larger area than is covered in the NP
Facilities and programme of SYRCH need to be developed AND PUBLICISED! Improve footpaths for walkers but NOT cyclists to encourage visitors	We agree that footpaths need to be improved but do not agree that more cycle routes are not needed.
A new green space should be created between Emsworth and Denvilles.	Most of this area is outside the NP area

<p>Green spaces could be created in new developments (Village Green) to create safe places for children to play &amp; communities to develop. We should not just rely on garden (private) space. These tend to be smaller in current building projects. We shouldn't need to walk/cycle distances to play and sit and chat outside</p>	<p>We agree but only part of the Southleigh site is included within the boundary of the Emsworth NP area.</p>
<p>maps areas name not consistent with earlier maps</p>	
<p>Map p 30 does not show both Southern sections of River Ems which divides at the Constance Spring sluice. Nor does it indicate ownership of Brook meadow i.e. HBC + footpath it links to. More attention needed to footpath in Emsworth and their correct signage</p>	<p>Southern sections of the River Ems are outside the NP area (they are in West Sussex). The purpose of this map is not to indicate ownership of land.</p>
<p>Beauty/Recreation/Tranquillity/Wildlife (Ref EDS). No recognition of the area to the East end of Westbourne Av along the river Ems between Hampshire bridge and the A27. No recognition of the existence of the Sussex Border footpath, a national route from Thorney Island and North of the South Downs Park. A busy route for ramblers and locals between Westbourne and Emsworth.</p>	

<p>We support the designation of Local Green Spaces and Hollybank Woods being designated as such. However, with reference to Section 8 of the NPPF; ‘Promoting healthy communities’ (Paragraphs 76 to 77) we note that it states that the Local Green Space designation will not be appropriate for most green areas or open space. The designation should only be used: • where the green space is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves; • where the green area is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty, historic significance, recreational value (including as a playing field), tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and • where the green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land. We question whether Hollybank Woods are local in character and not an extensive tract of land. It is described on page 11 of the Plan as being 61 hectares in area and a significant recreational resource, creating a natural barrier to significant northward extension of the settlement.</p>	<p>We believe Hollybank woods is local in character and the area within the boundary of the NP is not an extensive tract of land. It is in close proximity to the Emsworth community; it is of local significance because of its beauty, recreational value, tranquillity and wildlife. Friends of Hollybank Woods have for many years maintained and conserved the paths, kept records of endangered species, e.g., bats, and promote its use and sustainability to the wider community. It forms part of the ancient Forest of Bere, and as such, has international historical as well as ecological value.</p>
<p>Whilst I support all the Green Spaces mentioned, one has been missed off of the plan - the East Hampshire Strip/Sussex Border (land east of Westwood Close/Westbourne Avenue) which contains the Sussex Border path. This should be recognised as a Local Green Space. North Emsworth is already losing some of its green space with the development off of the Horndean Road and north of Long Copse Lane.</p>	
<p>The land west of C5(7) Chichester AONB should also be protected lest it be swallowed up in future</p>	<p>We can only protect areas within the boundary of the NP area - the electoral ward of Emsworth</p>
<p>The preservation of our green spaces is essential, particularly in preventing the joining of Emsworth to Denvilles/Warblington by continuous development.</p>	<p>We agree. See Policy L5 on coalescence</p>



As a regular volunteer and member of Friends of Nore Barn Woods, I am strongly of the view the Designated Green Spaces must be protected both for the natural environment and habitats and ANY plan to change this must never be allowed	
The Hospital garden could be an additional green space - a pleasure garden	
Brook Meadow green space should be extended North to create a green corridor extending to Westbourne and following county boundary path. It is well used and should be recognised	
The importance of these areas for dealing with surface water runoff and to mitigate flooding should be emphasised	
P31 Query inclusion of C5 (7) last map, has this public use? Is it included to block building development & using designated green space to achieve that?	No, but it doesn't need to meet all the criteria for DGS
No mention of meadow alongside river backing on to Westbourne Avenue. FULL of wildlife	
Beauty is very important to me	
I would like to see the maintenance / protection of the allotments (Warblington Rd & Victoria Rd, as well as the ones to the North of Emsworth) included in C5	We agree. This has now been included.

<p>Emsworth Millpond is very much a defining feature of Emsworth and a place where many people from outside the area visit to walk round. Unlike the other spaces, the responsibility appears to be shared between HBC and the EA with neither doing anywhere near a decent job. Less wildlife than even three years ago, dirty, smelly, lots of litter, frankly a disgrace. The other spaces have active Friends' Groups which is probably what is needed here to take back control of this asset and remove interference from the 'dead hand' of statutory services, other than to ensure flood prevention/public safety. Emsworth in Bloom is another example of how private local enterprise can transform an environment and in its case, shamed HBC in supporting its endeavours. So a greater emphasis on the value of community groups in areas of 'special' interest in order to improve and maintain the environment.</p>	<p>While we agree in the value and importance of community volunteer groups, it is not possible to create a planning policy relating to it. Maintenance of the Mill Pond is important and the Mill Pond Volunteer Group manages this, working with HBC and the Environment Agency.</p>
<p>Can) Horndean Road Recreation Ground not be included as 'Green Space'?</p>	<p>Yes, it has been added.</p>
<p>Include Friends Garden?</p>	
<p>Could the allotments be moved to the edge of the town to provide an 'urban agriculture' green belt around Emsworth and the land released be used for housing?</p>	<p>We have not consulted on this suggestion and it is not clear if it would have community support.</p>
<p>Include cottage hospital garden. land alongside river Ems and footpath up to Southleigh road</p>	
<p>Policy L1 (page 33):What are your views on Policy L1 General Housing Policy? (Q12)</p>	
<p>Summary of Comments received</p>	<p>Response from Emsworth Forum</p>
<p>New Development should have 60% affordable housing with larger footprints than at present built</p>	<p>Whilst we agree that affordable housing is needed in Emsworth, we have to evidence in the NP that our policy is needed and viable.</p>

Depends on the scale of housing. Not sure if there is anything in the Havant local plan that addresses the traffic and capacity issues of all that extra housing will cause. Are they building or expanding any main roads? Are they increasing the collections of dog mess from the bins on the foreshore walks? Are they providing any extra car-parking spaces in the centre of Emsworth? Are they doing anything on cycle lanes outside the immediate development where the housing is being built?	HBC is addressing the transport implications of the future housing development in the area in its Infrastructure Plan. In the EF view we should improve public and other non-car modes of transport. Dog waste is not a planning issue. There is little space for more car parking in Emsworth.
Most Emsworth people who have a home here, sadly object to anyone else having the same	There is no evidence to support that assertion and indeed our public consultations have demonstrated the opposite
Given that HBC already has robust policies how did the development of Dolphin Quay get approval. Would the same happen with these policies/plans	
Support, but with the need to enforce green space use.	
Disappointed that NP does not say where housing should go - understand numbers left to local plan. L2 in local plan states 40% affordable although 30% more realistic	
Important to ensure good build quality.	We agree. See Policy D1-6
There seems to be an implicit agreement that any development proposed by HBC would be accepted. This seems to be rather a passive stance.	That is not the case. The EF and other community organisations can and will object if we feel HBC have chosen poor sites.
Too many social/affordable homes. Reduce to 20%	We disagree. There is a need for affordable housing as evidenced in the Aecom Housing Need Assessment.
If affordable with social housing is to be encouraged then there must be adequate facilities including public transport in the area as by inference the occupiers may not have cars/motor bike to travel to doctors/schools/recreational facilities etc.	We agree and the NP supports improvements to public transport, cycling and walking. See M1-4 Refer to frequently made comments and questions

<p>Although I agree with the sentiments regarding affordable &amp; social housing, I am not sure the reality is sound. People who have paid or mortgaged a property for £400k are unlikely to be happy to be adjacent to social housing. Unfortunately properties are now investments not homes</p>	<p>It is common planning policy across the country to have affordable and social housing (although not enough has been made available).</p>
<p>This has come too late for Dolphin Quay Be very wary of HBC Planning Dept who disregard this objective and the views of local residents</p>	<p>We do not agree. HBC planners can only enforce planning policy and regulation as it stands. They cannot afford to turn down applications that will succeed on appeal.</p>
<p>Encourage Right to Build sites. Such buildings are usually highly eco-friendly and use latest sustainable materials and equipment. Can be useful infills between housing and add to total housing (in a small way).</p>	<p>We agree that Right to Build is a potentially valuable source of new housing. Given that this is already Government Policy and widely supported, the NP would not add to the existing powers.</p>
<p>40% affordable is too high. 30% may be acceptable. Higher concentration areas of affordable houses creates better social interchange within the locality. Designs of new housing developments should consider local views and not to interrupt the views and natural attributes of the area</p>	<p>The Design Section of the NP addresses the issue of interruption of views.</p>
<p>It is important to build houses and rental properties that are affordable as there is a basic right for everyone to have a permanent place to live.</p>	
<p>40% affordable homes is too high. 30% would be better, but with Emsworth land values being so high, I question whether this would be attractive to developers.</p>	
<p>I cannot support these sections in their current format. "Policies" typified by significant acquiescence to HBC's Housing Statement. No proposals made regarding Windfall sites, or future possible sites (as yet either unidentified, or considered 'unsuitable' in 2013 assessment. Little supporting evidence e.g. demographics re. Housing Mix.</p>	<p>HBC's Housing Statement has been decided. HBC is currently consulting on its new Local Plan and EF will be responding, including on sites. Refer to frequently made comments and questions on site allocation. The Housing Needs Assessment was done by Aecom, a reputable firm of planners. See the document for how it was produced and the demographic evidence it considered.</p>

How was the Forum's Housing Needs Assessment 2016 produced?	
All depends on the proposed infrastructure being made in relationship to the proposed development	
The provision of housing for every strata is important but planning must be 100% sympathetic to the dynamics of Emsworth	
Will "within walking distance of shops" include the petrol stations' retail offering, which are a lifeline to some people?	Yes
I agree with 40% of new development being affordable, with social housing being encouraged. Otherwise wealthy London escapees will buy up more expensive new property if there is a lot of it, to the detriment of local young people who work in the area	
Too many additional homes planned. I don't like the idea of Emsworth being joined to Havant and Leigh Park by green space development.	See Policy L5 on coalescence
The Housing policy in the Havant local Plan, Local Plan Housing Statement 2016 and PUSH are flawed.	We have seen no evidence to support that assertion
I agree the mix and % affordable	

<p>As previously stated I believe families should be encouraged into the central/south part of Emsworth as the demographic is becoming too old and unbalanced. Therefore there should not be an emphasis on 1 and 2 bed units in this area, but more family size units. Property prices are too high for young working couples in this part of the town and small units would encourage more older people from outside Emsworth in. I do not think it is realistic to think that older people in this area of Emsworth will downsize to these small units. Furthermore smaller units means more traffic in the area as the proportion of cars per individual/couple (1 or 2 per housing unit 1/2 people) is higher than for families (1 or 2 per housing unit 4/5 people)</p>	<p>The EF does not believe it is realistic to build family homes in the central south area of Emsworth where the prices are highest.</p>
<p>I strongly agree with the 40% affordable housing</p>	
<p>I would prefer to see a split of 60/40 for more affordable housing. I have lost count of the amount of people - young and middle-aged - who tell me they would love to live in Emsworth but are priced out of the market.</p>	
<p>Objective of 40% affordable housing may be difficult to achieve</p>	
<p>Fully support point c and d.</p>	
<p>Should new housing be greener? Good insulation solar panels, charging points for electric vehicles etc. Should being a Green Community be one of our objectives?</p>	<p>We agree. Policy D2 supports solar panels and P1 refers to charging points and Objective 4 relates to moving towards carbon neutrality.</p>
<p>We seem to be dominated by the Housing policies of Havant BC - it is important that we see the results of the CIL in improving infra-structure design.</p>	<p>The Neighbourhood Plan must conform to the National Planning Policy Framework and the Havant Local Plan. It therefore reflects those policies. However we have also ensured that Emsworth specific infrastructure needs are addressed, some of which could be funded by CIL.</p>
<p>40% affordable housing plus social housing is unrealistic although desirable</p>	
<p>Policy L2 (page 34):What are your views on Policy L2 Housing</p>	

Mix? (Q13)	
Summary of Comments received	Response from Emsworth Forum
Agree to provision of downsizing bungalows. Need more space in 2 floor properties. Avoid building 3 floor properties	
I agree with the need for more small dwellings however I have reservations about the building of large areas of high density, cheap flats and terraced houses. It would not enhance the appearance or social cohesion of the town	Policy L2 does not support the 'building of high density, cheap flats and terraced houses'
This is essential	
Most Emsworth people who have a home here, sadly object to anyone else having the same	On the contrary this public consultation shows a high level of support for the need for new housing.
I have not seen the layout, to know the impact on existing residents.	
Important to provide avenues for older people to downsize and vacate homes that are too large for them	
Policy already in HBC local plan. Older people need apartment type dwellings which seem in short supply. Less a policy than a wish list. This is already the case in the emerging HBC Local Plan and planning law, unnecessary repetition. Please also see point 13 on feedback form. Specialist housing. Where do you suggest this can be built? It's an interesting point that many "over 60s" are the fittest in our community.	This policy derives from the Emsworth Housing Need Assessment and public consultation which clearly shows the difference between Emsworth and the rest of the Havant housing market and the expressed aspirations of local residents.
As said before, car parking spaces are essential to prevent on-street parking.	
It's not clear what '10 or more houses' would mean in the context of a block of flats.	This change has been made.
community both as groups (ERA, Forum) and individuals and press must badger and harangue HBC to conform not allow the	

slippage as in the Oak Tree Drive developments to happen	
I disagree with favouring 1 and 2 bed homes. 3 and 4 bed homes family homes are important to maintain a vibrant community of all ages.	3-4 bed homes are important but there is a shortage of smaller dwellings in Emsworth.
Unless we act quickly the gaps will be filled with the type of houses currently filling them	
The neighbourhood plan does not include a breakdown of PUSH figures and an explanation how Emsworth's share has been determined. What will the proportion of new houses be to existing homes? Private to affordable homes?	We have not done this as the PUSH figures could become obsolete. This plan should last until 2036 at least.
The mix should meet the needs of local older downsizers who are unable to sell large family-size homes for want of well-designed space with spacious living area with one/two bedrooms and well-fitted en-suite facilities and small gardens.	
I cannot support these sections in their current format. "Policies" typified by significant acquiescence to HBC's Housing Statement. No proposals made regarding Windfall sites, or future possible sites (as yet either unidentified, or considered 'unsuitable' in 2013 assessment. Little supporting evidence e.g. demographics re. Housing Mix. How was the Forum's Housing Needs Assessment 2016 produced?	HBC's Housing Statement has been decided. HBC is currently consulting on its new Local Plan and EF has responded, including on sites. The Housing Needs Assessment was done by Aecom, a reputable firm of planners. See the document for how it was produced and the demographic evidence it considered.
To support this policy, Permissions to extend/rebuild existing bungalows (ideal for the elderly as mentioned) into 4/5 bedroom mansions should be stopped	Planning law does not prevent redevelopment of existing sites, provided they meet the design criteria as has been included in the NP. This plan does, however, encourage development of specialist housing for the elderly.
I want to see more social housing rather than housing which will be bought as buy-to-rent property, since this is likely to cause	Policy L1b supports social housing. It is not possible in planning law to prevent the purchase of private property to rent.



house prices to rise.	
Any proposed development to be limited to double height i.e. bungalows or one up and one down homes, terrace and semi-detached or single dwellings	We agree that new development should take account of the surrounding context but such a blanket policy would severely reduce the space available for new housing units. However policy D2c restricts the height of developments to 3-4 storeys.
But downsizers will compete with families for smaller (3-bed) houses, thereby potentially increasing prices.	This is already the case hence the need to encourage more smaller properties
Agree with supplying flats & bungalows for retired people. Also smaller terraced houses. If possible, these latter should have room for a shed in the back garden as I have noticed when delivering leaflets on Redland Farm Estate that much clutter is left in the front garden, as cheaper properties have no garage	We agree that adequate storage is important. Policy M4 refers to the provision of cycle storage.
Add importance of units available at affordable rents	Policy L1 (B) addresses social housing.
Street only	
Need emphasis on affordable housing especially for younger generation who are struggling to get on housing ladder.	
40% social or affordable housing seems very high and rather 'politically correct'. Emsworth operates well with the balance of housing as it is which does include some social housing. Social housing is more than well provided for in nearby Havant. New housing developments could contain some 'affordable housing' but be careful not to upset the fine balance and change the atmosphere of the town.	
I also think it is important to ensure that the most desirable (e.g. seafront) land is not all occupied by very large expensive properties. A good example of this is Creek End which has a large number of small bungalows on the sea front which presumably could not be extended excessively as this would block the view from the opposite side of the road	We agree that it is important to have a mix of tenures and property sizes.

How about a more creative use of brown field sites and encouraging living above shops, making these areas both 'lived-in but also safer outside regular shopping hours as is often seen on the Continent. Providing incentives for landlords of these properties to rent space to young people.	We agree that use of brown field sites and living above shops is part of the solution to meet housing need. It's not within the powers of NP to dictate to whom these properties are rented, or offer incentives.
Strongly	
Policy L3 (page 35):What are your views on Policy L3 Walking Distances? (Q14)	
Summary of Comments received	Response from Emsworth Forum
No mention of mobility vehicles which are increasing in numbers. These vehicles need housing in new build	We agree that storage space for such vehicles is important in housing.
Again, give priority to cyclists and pedestrians over cars. An example would be zebra crossings rather than traffic light controlled pelican crossings across roads (and equivalent cycle ways) that have priority over cars when crossing a road. You shouldn't have to wait for a traffic light to cross, but the cars should be slowed to a point where they must just stop and give way to pedestrians.	Refer to frequently made comments and questions
Sites that are still available for development are inevitably further out and not in walking distance of the "strong hub" so policy could well be irrelevant.	We agree that much development will ebb away from the town centre - which is why this policy is needed.
This depends on your health, cost of transport, weather etc.	
Strongly support - though 800m seems a bit conservative	

<p>Most sites in Emsworth are level and convenient, and if Town is too far from N Emsworth then people can walk to Westbourne.                  [A] what are the other” area wide policies contained within this neighbourhood plan?”                  [b] 40% affordable whilst desirable is not attainable, HBC struggle to get 30% affordable.                  [c] Again an imprecise wording, whilst homeowners have an ancient right to light there is no inherent right to a view.                  I am very disappointed that the Forum did not have a say in the housing allocation from HBC, not necessarily the numbers but the locations... All the potential and future housing sites in Emsworth are within a “convenient” walking distance to a shop. So why is this “policy” necessary?</p>	<p>The purpose of the policy is to ensure that there are amenities available for residents in new developments</p>
<p>Aspirational but in reality some new houses will be built further away from shops</p>	
<p>Yes what shops facilities north of railway and A27 bridge exist? only Westbourne and 1 outlet in Southleigh Road and nothing on the new development west of Horndean road</p>	
<p>Subject to L1 (d)</p>	
<p>We need clearer evidence on how such a policy can be implemented. E.g. the re-opening of the convenience store in Southleigh road causes severe disturbance (parked cars) to adjacent neighbours. Walking etc. cannot be made compulsory. Is this policy of walking distances in conflict with the objective of maintaining quality of living for new and existing residents?</p>	<p>By having such a policy developers will have to show how their plans support residents being able to access local amenities. It is common for planning bodies to have such a policy. This will enhance the sustainability of local shops for current and future residents.</p>
<p>Centre of new development will be 1km+ walk to centre of Emsworth through A27 tunnel</p>	<p>We understand that it is intended that the Southleigh development will have some local amenities.</p>

<p>I cannot support these sections in their current format. "Policies" typified by significant acquiescence to HBC's Housing Statement. No proposals made regarding Windfall sites, or future possible sites (as yet either unidentified, or considered 'unsuitable' in 2013 assessment. Little supporting evidence e.g. demographics re. Housing Mix. How was the Forum's Housing Needs Assessment 2016 produced?</p>	
<p>This will encourage building into the "village" centre which other policies do not support</p>	<p>On the contrary it will make amenities in the north of Emsworth more sustainable.</p>
<p>How will this work in North Emsworth with its single shop and no other facilities and how can it apply to accessing the doctors surgery which is now more than a mile from North Emsworth and in the future is likely to be more than a mile from the town centre. Is there an are in between which could be made available to the doctors?</p>	
<p>Limits building to Emsworth centre only</p>	<p>On the contrary it will make amenities in the north of Emsworth more sustainable.</p>
<p>Improving pavements and cycle paths to encourage the townspeople to walk or cycle rather use their cars and clog up the town centre has to be a major priority</p>	
<p>Depends on how old and how fit you are - or carrying a child/shopping bags! An example of 800m - e.g. is it from the Square to the Station?</p>	<p>This will support those who are mobile and able to walk</p>
<p>But only a small proportion of residents live or will live within 800m of shops</p>	<p>The intention is to support existing and future shops</p>
<p>Supported as an aspiration only</p>	
<p>Again any loss to the River pathway and its meadows will be a serious loss to the joining of North (Redlands etc.) to South - Lumley/Town Centre</p>	
<p>Excellent</p>	

Policy L4 (page 36):What are your views on Policy L4 Independent Living? (Q15)	
Summary of Comments received	Response from Emsworth Forum
L5. Building on the flood plain North of the railway between Denvilles & Emsworth should be avoided	
There is a need for this close to the centre provision	
Nice idea but how many sites available central Emsworth for such developments	There are a number of brownfield sites that could be used for this purpose: e.g. Emsworth Victoria Cottage Hospital and the former gas holder site
There are still shops you can't get in, because of steps etc. What are the churches doing to help	We agree that access is a problem for people with disabilities in some of the amenities in Emsworth. Policy P1 addresses this.
Lovely idea - but where?	There are a number of brownfield sites that could be used for this purpose: e.g. Emsworth Victoria Cottage Hospital and the former gas holder site
Where in centre of Emsworth can specialist housing for independent living be located. Where in the centre of Emsworth could housing for independent living go? Dolphin Quay Boatyard has gone without much of a fight. So again this is more of a "wish" than a policy.	There are a number of brownfield sites that could be used for this purpose: e.g. Emsworth Victoria Cottage Hospital and the former gas holder site
An important issue now and in the future.	
This is where current facilities are. Move Community Centre to provide more land for building this type of housing if Hospital site is not forthcoming	It is not the role of the EF to facilitate the Community Centre to move and such an idea is unlikely in our view to have community support.
This is most important bearing in mind the current thoughts on "loneliness" and how it affects health.	
Vital.	
Where are the spaces to build new - old houses will have to be modified or rebuilt	

<p>I cannot support these sections in their current format. "Policies" typified by significant acquiescence to HBC's Housing Statement.                  No proposals made regarding Windfall sites, or future possible sites (as yet either unidentified, or considered 'unsuitable' in 2013 assessment.                  Little supporting evidence e.g. demographics re. Housing Mix.                  How was the Forum's Housing Needs Assessment 2016 produced?</p>	<p>The Emsworth Housing Needs Assessment on the Emsworth Forum website explains how it was produced.</p>
<p>Agree, but not a lot of McCarthy Stone / Churchill type (very expensive) type developments</p>	<p>Specialist housing tends to be built by specialist developers. The NP cannot restrict the organisations that develop these schemes.</p>
<p>I do support this Policy Statement whole-heartedly. I have one major gripe ... elderly people using their Disabled Badges to selfishly park on the double yellow lines in Emsworth (such as outside the greengrocer where the road is particularly narrow) and causing major constriction to the flow of traffic</p>	
<p>Can't think of where these could be built in the centre - not many available suitable sites left!</p>	<p>There are a number of brownfield sites that could be used for this purpose: e.g. Emsworth Victoria Cottage Hospital and the former gas holder site.</p>
<p>Policy L5 I understand the necessity of new housing between Denvilles and Emsworth</p>	
<p>Support strongly</p>	
<p>Please see previous comments about concern for the increasingly elderly demographic of the south Emsworth area. Where would you put this 'independent housing'?</p>	<p>There are a number of brownfield sites that could be used for this purpose: e.g. Emsworth Victoria Cottage Hospital and the former gas holder site.</p>
<p>Good access to all essential services will be key here. Again, access to EMP for the elderly and disabled springs to mind.</p>	<p>Refer to frequently made comments and questions</p>
<p>It is important to meet the needs of couples where on needs more care than the other. We should support any development that delivers this.</p>	
<p>Policy L5 (page 36):What are your views on Policy L5 Avoiding</p>	

Settlement Coalescence? (Q 16)	
Summary of Comments received	Response from Emsworth Forum
Expansion of housing between Emsworth and Denvilles is a worry. It will require very careful and sensitive planning. Will the developers be listening?	The developers will have to conform to the HBC Local Plan and the masterplan for this site.
It is too late already. Emsworth will merge with Havant under current plans.	This policy is intended to prevent this.
a well written statement	
I think that it is a lost cause round Emsworth we fought for the "Gaps" for years.	
Emsworth is already divided between North & South, the old conservation area (around South St car park & toilets) or by leisure facilities e.g. sailing	
The area provides a natural gap between Emsworth and Westbourne which adds to the sense of well-being and aesthetic beauty of Emsworth	
But the battle appears already lost	
Strategic site seems to drive coach and horses through this policy	This policy and the EF's involvement in the master planning for the Southleigh site has ensured that there is reduced coalescence arising from the proposed development.
Aspirational and unrealistic. To achieve new house build numbers some loss of gaps is likely to happen	This policy is intended to prevent this.
Strongly agree.	
Nice ambition but as HBC don't give a fig about this element I am not optimistic. Comments such as "influence through the ballot box" will not change inherent voting habits of current residents until we have "incomers"	
These are all very distinct communities and need to be kept so - not one long urban stretch	

Support. However the proposal in this document skirt around the issue and do not contain any concrete proposals to avoid settlement coalescence.	The NP is a policy document and does not include detailed proposals
Bit late on this one	We do not agree
Support in principle but surely it is almost too late to try to protect "strategic" gaps?	"Strategic gaps" no longer exist under planning regulation. However this policy is intended to prevent coalescence and this is supported in planning regulation.
"Do not impinge on current gaps" (EDS) particularly between Emsworth and the Westbourne community - the River Ems - the County boundary and Havant boundary. Denvilles and Southbourne boundaries have gone.	"Strategic gaps" no longer exist under planning regulation. However this policy is intended to prevent coalescence and this is supported in planning regulation.
Need to see housing allocation and have stronger powers to stop this	
I strongly support avoiding settlement coalescence but if the land east of Westwood Close/Westbourne Avenue is developed, we will lose the gap between Emsworth and Westbourne.	
Cannot support this section in its current format Unspecific as to "how" – a key concern in Emsworth deserves more robust strategies and leadership.	Once the NP is adopted, the onus will be on a developer to show that policies are not breached.
Without building more within town and losing tourist, local wellbeing etc. Please do everything possible to avoid the coalescence of Denville and Emsworth for multiple reasons: Green gap/flooding/traffic etc.	
This is of vital importance to avoid the merging of the towns along the A259 between Fishbourne and Havant into one ribbon of development in which each town or village loses its individual identity and character.	



Good Luck with this one! When reading about proposed housing development it seems to me that if the Havant Planners had their way every “gap” would be built on	
It's already happening eastwards. Need to prevent the same going west and north.	
Support strongly	
Of the areas mentioned, green gaps should be extended to include the green corridor North of Brook Meadow to Westbourne along county boundary path footpath	
However this is also why I object to the development of the strategic gap between Emsworth and Denvilles which is contrary to the policy objective	This policy does not apply to 'strategic sites'. The NP cannot contradict existing Local Plan policy.
Again the division of Emsworth from the river boundary, or any reduction in its efficiency as a simple pleasant walkway, would be highly detrimental to Emsworth interaction particularly for Seniors	
The quality of design of buildings and open spaces is more important than maintaining gaps. I don't have a problem with communities coalescing, as I think it could have a positive impact (socially, economically and infrastructure-wise)	All our public consultation has supported retaining gaps between Emsworth and other settlements.
It's probably too late and in any case where else could you put new housing if it's not on the outskirts of town?	
Strongly agree!	
Protecting the unique character and location of Emsworth should be the priority here.	
The ideal but too late now. west of Selangor avenue already breaches this	
Policy W1 (page 38):What are your views on Policy W1	

Employment Premises & Design Quality? (17)	
Summary of Comments received	Response from Emsworth Forum
Given that HBC already has robust policies, how did the development of Dolphin Quay get approval? Would the same happen with these policies/plans	The developer at Dolphin Quay was able to demonstrate they were unable to find tenants for the premises.
Could suggest pedestrian/cycle link from Emsworth/Cycle link from Emsworth train station and the services on A27T. Job opportunities for the young(ish). We are missing a golden opportunity here and whilst again the wording in these policies is imprecise there is one tangible improvement that would add employment [particularly among younger people] and that is a cycle/pedestrian link from Emsworth Train Station across the fields of the Inter Bridges site to the A27T fuel shop. Jobs in M&S and the fuel station. The NP is silent on the future of the Inter-bridges site [West] Why?	This is a good idea worth pursuing and it has been included in P1 as a potential project. The Inter-bridges site has already been designated for industrial/commercial/employment use in the current Local Plan. HBC do not propose changing this, therefore there is no need for us to comment.
Current businesses support maritime demand and should be encouraged but a more mixed economy is needed. Offices for service industries do not have high employment numbers and regrettably many of high number industries such as on New Lane in Havant are reducing their staff numbers	We agree that new industries and employment are needed as well and traditional ones. These policies support this.
In principle I agree but I think the wording here is somewhat negative towards future employment. All potential employment should not have to show how it relates to the wider Emsworth context. New employment in the area should be encouraged providing the work carried out does not impinge on all the positives that we have in Emsworth including any transport considerations.	We agree that new industries and employment is needed as well and traditional ones. These policies support this.
Where can small manufacturing premises be located? Otherwise employment of a service nature are main opportunity	In existing industrial sites

Cannot support this section in its current format Unspecific – what are the criteria for design, scale & materials. How are proposed Design & Access Statements to be monitored & implemented?	See policies D1-6. The responsibility for monitoring the implementation of the NP lies with the Planning Authority.
I would add “so long as it does not impinge detrimentally (i.e. additional volume of traffic, lorries, and vans) on the town”	This would be subject to other planning policies that cover those issues.
But need consider premises that would help encourage creative and technology industries - e.g. small studios or "incubators".	Current planning policies support this.
Support strongly	
Need to support provision of fibre optic fast broadband	Agreed. See Policy W4.
Nice if you can realistically do it. Not sure how wishful thinking some of this is.	
The loss of Dolphin Quay and loss of potential to develop boat building/apprenticeship training/access to a slipway and destruction of a historic view from and to the old Mill is a huge waste. Instead wildly expensive houses will be built, a development of a non-strategic nature, has been permitted by HBC, which rather turns 'avoiding settlement coalescence' into a wish list rather than a plan to make a difference. See Policy L5 above. Is it really going to be possible to make the Policy's aspirations work?	All planning policies require enforcement by the Planning Authority. However, they can only enforce policies and decisions that will succeed at appeal.
Current employment sites in the town are terrible. The designs and locations, security and setting are completely out of character with the town and need to be overhauled.	Policy W1 is intended to address these issues in new developments.
Policy W2 (page 38):What are your views on Policy W2 Strong Economy & Youth Training? (Q18)	
Summary of Comments received	Response from Emsworth Forum
Difficult to object to these.	
This would be very welcome	

Most training is out of the area	
We should be making more of tourism potential	
Could suggest pedestrian/cycle link from Emsworth/Cycle link from Emsworth train station and the services on A27T. Job opportunities for the young(ish). Unemployment in Emsworth is incredible low and the point about young people having to move away isn't in relation to jobs it's the cost of housing both as owners or renters.	See previous reply
support projects in tourism to town, advertising and promotion on a regional basis the established industries so they retain or even increase with training, new staff (consider re-training mid-lifers made redundant elsewhere)	We agree. These are ideas that could be implemented by a Town Centre Manager and suggested in P1
The proposal by a charity to develop Dolphin Quay would have met these objectives	
I think there needs to be more ambition about becoming an early adopter for super-fast broad band & next generation connectivity.	Agreed. This is a project that has been added to P1
Cannot support this section in its current format Fails to place Emsworth within the bigger picture of educational and training links with Chichester, Portsmouth and Southampton. Also fails to mention and support strategies to promote marine, agricultural and rural industries and employment opportunities locally. Over-emphasis on service industries and tourism.	We have amended the NP to reflect this. The Emsworth Today Section describes the education system that children and young people access from Emsworth. This is a spatial planning document where policies are designed to encourage physical development of facilities for employment growth. It's correct the policies focus on service industries and service industry and tourism are seen to be its future. Traditional maritime and industrial base of the town has declined in favour of these sectors. Nothing in these policies, however, would prevent a resurgence of these traditional industries.
Providing apprenticeships and other training for young people, rather than University degree courses which don't necessarily result in work, as keeping young people in employment locally is of enormous benefit	The Neighbourhood Plan cannot address national Education policy issues
Agree but needs to dovetail with local training provision	

Agree we need to encourage businesses to set up, including Industrial, Production and services	
Support small units suitable for business start-ups - at flexible lease terms	Agreed. See Policy P1.
Again I can't think what these 'wider tourism' things would be. Anything that attracts young people into the centre should be encouraged	
Policy W3 (page 39):What are your views on Policy W3 Change of Use Applications? (19)	
Summary of Comments received	Response from Emsworth Forum
Not sure I understand what the policy is. What have you got against accountants and lawyers setting up shop in Emsworth? What have you got against pubs, restaurants and take-aways (apart from there already being dozens of them) They come and go so not sure why this is being resisted in point e	The policy has been revised. The intention is to protect small independent businesses and to restrict the number of estate agents in the town. However, we have been advised that this would prevent new financial services coming into Emsworth (including Banks, which we would support).
I think that this will keep the diversity of the shopping scene which is Emsworth's attraction	
Emsworth cannot accommodate any more cafes pub or restaurants	
Plenty of take away food outlets and lots of restaurants which only encourage evening use. Where are the non-tourist outlets? We have lots of charity shops, house agents, coffee shops. Where are the Banks?	
Given that HBC already has robust policies how the development of Dolphin Quay got approval. Would the same happen with these policies/plans	see previous reply
Haven't we enough cafes?	Cafes are an important part of the local economy, attracting visitors who will linger and use other services in the town centre.

Need to consider what use categories exist already in the town and in which numbers.	Under planning regulation we cannot restrict the numbers of a particular type of outlet
Should trust market over changes and HBC local plan also covers this. Include West St on list. Unfair to restrict estate agents and financial services. There are already restrictions in the HBC Local Plan in regard to change of use etc. and I would be minded to rely on these No additional policy necessary and to say further A2 {finance etc.] would be opposed is not lawful and should be deleted. I object to the idea that applications to join two units together will be opposed. High streets work best if they are left to the "market". Add. West Street. Why oppose estate agent businesses? They bring employment and are a sign of local prosperity.	This policy has been revised to protect and encourage small independent retail outlets.
Unrealistic in our changing economic and business world	
Keep as much industry in town as covered by this plan as possible. Consider possible contamination of site (e.g. old gasworks) Only object to combinations of two units on a case by case basis. Get a bank back in Emsworth.	
Could this be interpreted that Emsworth is against "growing" or "expanding" a business?	That is not our intention. We intend to support the economy that residents appreciate and protect the sustainability and character of the town.
I cannot Support in total as each case has to be taken on its own merits. Nor can we necessarily resist having more offices - for instance if the Bank were to be used as an office, especially small offices for multiple occupancy I would strongly support this	
generally support however change of use should be considered where land no used for long time	
Support a, d, e Object to b, c	This policy has been revised.
B) I do not see why in certain circumstances and if viable that two units cannot be combined.	The intention behind this policy is to support smaller independent businesses which is part of the attraction of the town centre.
W3(c) have all gone	This policy will be revised

See comment on Policy C2: I do not support Change of Use applications that cause over-provision of services such as cafes & restaurants, pubs & takeaways in place of the broad retail needs of the resident population.	This policy has been revised
Where there is no interest over an extended period in developing a site (such as Dolphin Quay) I would support change of use, because a site derelict for an extended period does not enhance the town.	
Whenever there is a change of use in Emsworth it is generally for the worse. Tattoo parlours, betting shops, coffee chain shop. Estate agents, loads of dentists- all replacing what were useful occupancies previously.	This policy has been revised.
This must be policed rigorously	
Depends on A2 use - certainly do not need more estate agents, but desperately need financial (bank/BS). Some professional services may be connected to marine industries - e.g. consultants, brokers etc. If conversions are made for housing, agree the result should be mixed use.	This policy will be revised.
Agree that Industrial sites should remain and not be converted into residential housing. We don't really need many more restaurants and cafes or they may compete/impinge too heavily on the current good cafes and the most recent restaurant in South St - Wooster's? Seems often empty?	This policy has been revised.
Future class A4 + A5 changes should be strongly resisted (In North St)	
And support R40	
However I would not like to see employment opportunities discouraged for lawyers, surveyors, accountants particularly as training places for new school/college leavers	This policy have been revised

I agree with trying to maintain a diverse retail offer but not convinced that the wording of this section is quite right to achieve this (too prescriptive?).	This policy have been revised
You have to be realistic. If a restaurant is the only applicant for a long standing empty property it is more desirable than an empty property. These things should be judged on an individual merit basis.	This policy have been revised
I was very disappointed about the change of use application for Dolphin Quay which is a very good example of "change of use" of land which has historically been used for business related to the maritime and trading history of Emsworth. It does seem that whatever views of local residents are, these will always be overridden by people/councillors who have their own agendas	
A Thai restaurant in town would be good	
Support this generally, but the B-Use Class retention should be greater than 50% to try to retain employment and commercial opportunities within the town.	This policy has been revised
This gives the impression that the N Plan can make these decisions. Surely this is HBC Planning responsibility. A wine bar would be an asset.	The NP sits alongside the Local Plan as Planning Regulation. It is the responsibility of the planning authority (HBC) to make decisions based on those policies.
Policy W4 (page 41):What are your views on Policy W4 Technology & Tourism? (Q20)	
Summary of Comments received	Response from Emsworth Forum
An Emsworth shop assistant didn't even know there was a harbour. Not everyone has a "find it" computer. Each outlook shop should have town maps etc.	We agree. We understand that the Emsworth Business Association has produced a town map for tourists.



<p>Emsworth should encourage visitors but not become a tourist destination. We don't have facilities for coaches etc. Need better use of harbour side quay (now a car park) Boardwalk between bottom of South St along the beach to King Street. [a] We missed an opportunity of protecting the marine industry when Dolphin Quay Boatyard was sold for [expensive!] housing. I am not sure that local people would appreciate a tourism industry starting here! B of W4 should be much more specific, as an example the location with the best view for relaxing and enjoyment in Emsworth is used exclusively as a car park. The Quay at the bottom of South Street should be a seating area for residents and visitors who can enjoy the views and local refreshments. Additionally consideration should be given in this policy of a boardwalk between South Street, along the beach to the bottom of King Street. A lovely place for people and links the two historic parts of the town...</p>	<p>Emsworth is already a tourist/visitor destination and the retail economy of the town depends on visitor footfall. See previous response on Dolphin Quay. The idea of opening up the foreshore more to residents and visitors is interesting but will depend on public support and the owners of the relevant land.</p>
<p>Tourism provides jobs. A flyer for distribution to tourist outlets across central southern England devoted purely to Emsworth</p>	
<p>Not everyone has access to online information. Essential that a central tourist information point is developed. Not the library as the present opening hours are too restricted</p>	<p>We agree that easy access to tourist information is important. This is an issue that could be addressed by the Town Centre Manager (see P1) working with the Library service.</p>
<p>a) Marine support industries will be concentrated in the marina area. Leisure is dependent on keeping recreational area - not developing more housing</p>	

<p>I do not support single-minded development of local Tourism. Emsworth is a small town, with limited capacity on its streets and pavements, and with limited parking capacity for domestic vehicles, let alone coaches.</p> <p>Tourism has a tendency to be destructive to the environment being visited: carefully thought-out strategies to protect the fragile ecological balance of the harbour and coastal walks are essential in any Neighbourhood Plan. Even PUSH recognises that there is insufficient recreational space locally, and proposes additional green recreational spaces as inland attractions as an alternative to coastal visits.</p>	<p>We do not agree. Local tourism is an essential part of the Emsworth economy sustaining local shops and businesses that would fail without it. The issue is to balance this with protecting the character and environment of the town - which this NP is intended to do.</p>
<p>This goes hand in hand with providing apprenticeships and training to keep young people in Emsworth - and similarly with Housing Mix giving them somewhere affordable to live</p>	
<p>Broadband is a priority. Re. Tourism, need to ensure capacity is there to accommodate more visitors - parking etc.</p>	<p>We agree broad band is a priority. It is mentioned in our vision statement on p19 and in policy W5</p>
<p>There is already a 'thriving marine industry right over the border in Emsworth yacht harbour</p>	<p>That is correct. However, we would like to keep the marine businesses we have and encourage more as it is part of Emsworth's history and character and is a valued source of employment.</p>
<p>encourage both</p>	
<p>I felt that reference to the digital economy and enhancing employment prospects and business growth could be strengthened, particularly as there's a need to draw in a young demographic to live and work in Emsworth.</p>	<p>A project to develop a next-generation broadband pilot has been added, see P1.</p>

<p>Some attention should be paid to including agreement to encourage HBC and Highways Agency to interact with utility providers in conservation areas before work is done to install equipment. With greater joined-up thinking these necessary developments could take place with less environmental destruction to both the area and the listed buildings within it. I am thinking specifically of the centre of Emsworth.</p>	<p>We agree that joined-up working between the various statutory and private sector agencies would be very beneficial but this is not something that the NP can dictate. What the NP can do however is require that infrastructure and utilities respect the design requirements in the town - especially in the conservation area.</p>
<p>Policy W5 (page 41):What are your views on Policy W5 Home Working? (Q21)</p>	
<p>Summary of Comments received</p>	<p>Response from Emsworth Forum</p>
<p>This is the future of Emsworth's economy with small business owners working from home and contributing to the economic and social development of the area</p>	
<p>Depends on neighbours and parking. Planning usually oversees</p>	<p>part a) covers this</p>
<p>Don't believe that home working should be covered by a policy.</p>	<p>This policy received significant support in the public consultation.</p>
<p>High speed broadband essential and a good mobile phone signal which is not available in the south of the town.</p>	
<p>Home working or even 'Fred in his shed' has significant benefits provided it has, as pointed out, sufficient broadband etc. and does not impact (noise/air quality etc.) on neighbours. But many working from home rather than in office will need a bedroom for office which impacts on starter units/social housing split</p>	
<p>Improved broadband speed would be a great advantage to everyone</p>	
<p>I would support increased provision of Hot Desking space in Emsworth, and Starter Facilities for young or newly qualified entrepreneurs. This section requires specific and funded strategies, and remains unexplored in this draft Neighbourhood Plan.</p>	

Small-scale this can be beneficial but planners need to consider impact on neighbours etc.	
See point 18	
Will need to be carefully controlled so as not to be detrimental to neighbours	
My business is home-based and I strongly support this policy. High speed broadband is absolutely essential.	
modern times	
Again - it's not just homeworking that becomes more feasible, but also high speed broadband would enable new business growth	
High speed broadband for existing properties as well	See the new project in P1.
needs careful vetting 'potential disturbance' such as parking not always obvious	
Policy M1 (page 43):What are your views on Policy M1 New Civic Space? (Q22)	
Summary of Comments received	Response from Emsworth Forum
But not to the detriment of Victoria Hospital	This policy supports the re-development of the Hospital.
Worth a try	
Strongly support this one! It could transform the town. I should be able to saunter across this area as a pedestrian or cyclist without feeling I am going to get run over.	
I would encourage looking at other areas- including in Europe where similar issues have been tackled very successfully	We agree. This is where this has been successfully applied.
The A259 with its heavy level of traffic that includes large lorries is a very different scenario to the one shown in your illustration	On the contrary, Poynton has more and heavier traffic.
Have you forgotten the centre of the Emsworth area is approx. the Recreation ground/Horndean Rd and more houses coming?	See previous response to this point.
Sounds fascinating	

<p>Don't believe that the shared space roundabout idea will work. I think it's an outdated idea. Other locations have tried this and failed miserably. We also have an underpass which is underused. Pedestrians should be prevented from crossing the road in the area of the roundabout using barriers and directed to the underpass. Emsworth has an older community of drivers who struggle to use the roadways which are clearly marked in accordance with the highway code. To introduced a shared space roundabout with unclear markings will create complete chaos in this area and will be very confusing to visitors. Some shared space areas which were developed ten years ago have now gone back to normal roadways and roundabouts. This will cause mayhem whilst being constructed, negatively impacting on the businesses and residents in Emsworth and cost a small fortune in the region of millions of pounds to create. In my opinion a grave error of judgment in suggesting this arrangement and a complete and utter waste of taxpayers' money.</p>	<p>We do not agree but a feasibility study on such a scheme would need to be conducted and would address all these concerns.</p>
<p>Discussions should take place with Highways to consider a feasibility study. In principle I support making better use of shared space and as a result have general support of principle M1. The suggested case study [Poynton] would be hugely expensive and disruptive and probably unaffordable in today's financial climate, so better described as an aspiration. I suggest a conversation with HCC Highways to see what might be achieved at the town roundabout as there is no point in suggesting something that has no chance of becoming a reality in the life of the plan. Additionally a visionary idea might be to suggest a 20 MPH limit throughout Emsworth, among its other advantages [reducing noise and pollution] it would help in crossing the A259 enormously and joining the A259 from side</p>	<p>A feasibility study would be the next stage once we know that the proposal has support. Funding would need to be obtained, and with its inclusion in the NP, work could start on obtaining it.</p>

roads.	
There is an urgent need to 'connect' the north and south of the town currently divided by the roundabout.	
I particularly like the proposal for the re-designed roundabout.	
The A259 divides yes but a roundabout naturally flows. Poynton was different for 2 reasons. More space and had traffic lights. Slow down the traffic more so there are no rules and you will have more congestion for longer and for greater distances from the roundabout. Make the underpass friendlier. If we had a small square nobody in their right mind would cross it on foot for at least 80% of the time between 0700-2100.	Poynton is different in that their situation was worse than Emsworth's. Their case study was included to illustrate what can be done.
I do not know the topography of Poynton but suggest the scheme suggested is impractical. It involves the major diversion route of the A27 (the only east/west trunk road south of M4) and makes no provision for the disabled/blind (those in pushing wheelchairs) or for those with prams or otherwise slow movers. A better underpass and another on west side of roundabout and better facilities under the railway line especially if industry comes to Inter-bridges site	We disagree. These schemes do work and the evidence from other schemes in the UK and overseas supports this. This policy has widespread support. It will make crossing easier for the disabled and parents with prams. We have consulted the Highways Agency and they have expressed no concerns about it because it will ease traffic flows.
I really cannot envisage how this would work	
I support the ideal but I am sceptical if it will lead to the planned improvement as Emsworth already has a free flowing roundabout compared to Poynton's traffic lights,	This proposal is about bringing the north and south together to help pedestrians and cyclists feel safer. It would also improve traffic flows at busy times.
Strongly support this	
Would this mean the demolition of the eyesore that is the Baptist Church? I fear not but a great idea for access.	No, although it would open up and make more pleasant the space in front of the Baptist Church
Policy M1. I have viewed the Poynton video. Agree the need to improve N/S flow to integrate North Street. Not sure that Poynton example is the right solution. No ideas.	

This is a very expensive and long term exercise. We need something even in a small way to happen now.	It is true that it will take several years for this policy to be implemented. It is difficult to see what could be done in the short term to improve the situation but if a feasibility/technical study is done some short-term measures could result.
Footage of Poynton shows a good scheme. Two provisos - must be sure won't build up on approaches to the 'civic space' and drivers need to start using their indicators!	The scheme should ease traffic flows and reduce congestion.
A speed limit of 20mph around the roundabout would control traffic. I doubt if there is space for the Poynton style pedestrian space	Our planning advisers believe there is plenty of space. Traffic speeds are of concern across the whole area, and we have included a new project to address this.
Great idea as long as there is evidence that 'rat racing' through other parts of the town is controlled.	Rat running could be addressed as part of the scheme
New roundabout will succeed if through traffic on A259 is diverted to A27 allowing balanced flow from all directions	We believe the scheme would succeed without diversions.
This is a heavily used roundabout, especially during rush hour. There is already an underpass for pedestrians but some still try to cross the busy A259. I don't think the new road layout would work.	We believe the scheme would work.
I regret that Emsworth Pier harbour hard has not been suggested as a public seating area. Flintstones never has enough outside seating in the summer, and the harbour sea wall also has too few benches for the number of people (visitors and local) who'd like to rest by the sea in the sun. To clear this space of parked cars and to replace them with seating and umbrellas would be a vast improvement at little cost.	The car parking spaces immediately outside the door of Slipper Sailing Club are owned by them. The car parking spaces facing the harbour on the quay are owned by Havant Borough Council. Every Spring and Autumn, for safety reasons, the whole space is closed off to enable boats to be lifted into and out of the water.
I support the policy M1 but cannot see how a "Dutch style pedestrian square" or "double roundel" can be appropriate for the already excessive traffic on A259	The case study we used in Poynton has even more traffic than Emsworth.
I have no particular opinion.	

<p>As a civil engineer with over 30 years design experience, I consider the example of the treatment to be misleading as I believe it would be impossible to apply this sort of treatment to Emsworth - the traffic is too heavy, the space is limited. Looking at Poynton, a vast traffic dominated area has been created- although it looks nice it has no amenity value unless the roads are closed. In any event pedestrian crossing is limited to periphery where it is much narrower and pedestrians can use a central island as refuge. Whilst I agree pushing for intermediate junctions on the A27 seems essential to reduce through traffic (Southbourne and Bosham), I believe it will not reduce traffic sufficiently to make a shared space viable and with no prospect of an underpass, Emsworth will inevitably remain divided. There is a pelican immediately west and subway immediately east that provide safe crossing points, but deviate significantly from north-south desire line. A crossing on the western arm would be best, but would cause potential gridlock for the roundabout, which is the main means of access to both sides of Emsworth.</p>	<p>Our planning advisers believe there is plenty of space. The Poynton example had even heavier traffic. The amenities in Poynton flourished after the scheme was introduced. On the contrary this scheme would support increased traffic flows that will ensue with all the developments between Emsworth and Chichester. It will also make crossing the road easier for pedestrians - following the desire lines.</p>
<p>Seems rather idealistic and could cause massive tail backs on the A275 in all directions, especially West to East. The main A27 urgently needs additional slip roads so that traffic actually flowing through Emsworth is drastically reduced. The A27 bypass was built 'on the cheap' in the first place and has caused problems ever since.</p>	<p>On the contrary this scheme would ease traffic flows</p>
<p>Cannot see how such improvements to the roundabout can be done in the space available</p>	<p>We are advised there is sufficient space.</p>
<p>This almost needs to be the first of the building blocks in the plan from which everything else will grow. To resolve the problems around the flow of traffic, pedestrians, cyclists, and local transport through/around the centre of Emsworth would have a</p>	



huge effect on all Emsworthians, traders and visitors	
Doubt if it will work in practice, Could be a costly mistake. See also YouTube re. Assen NL. Cobbles will create more noise. Do we need to have ban on HGVs except essential deliveries? Or another slip road onto A27 between Havant and Chi? Is a trial feasible?	Technical feasibility studies would need to be done to make sure any scheme works. That would also look at noise containment. It would be unlawful to ban HGVs. A slip road further along the A27 may be desirable but falls outside the scope of the NP.
Such a copy of the Poynton experimental roundabout would require a lot of space, where would this come from? Old Doctor's surgery? Victorian Hospital gardens? Certainly the existing roundabout road surface needs repair, particularly on the West side. It is very difficult/uncomfortable for cyclists	We are advised there is sufficient space without encroaching on the land in surrounding buildings, including the hospital garden. What the scheme could do though is open up spaces for the public to enjoy more.
Very strong support for this, I think a scheme of this nature would improve what is largely a no go area	
I suspect a 'Poynton' scheme would require a lot of additional area - from where? Hospital site and the adjoining garden? Current roundabout could be more pedestrian friendly with traffic calming on approach roads	We are advised there is sufficient space without encroaching on the land in surrounding buildings, including the hospital garden. What the scheme could do though is open up spaces for the public to enjoy more.
It will not be possible to achieve this unless a new major access link road is provided between the A294 and the A27 to the East of Emsworth. It is also very important that the limited free roadside parking is maintained in the Town centre to ensure viability of local shops	This scheme could succeed; we are advised, without a new link road east of Emsworth. We agree that the existing roadside parking is important to retain.
I do not understand how this system would work and I think it would cause a build-up of traffic on the A259.	The scheme is counter-intuitive but has worked extremely well elsewhere and eases traffic flows.
No sure if the Huge lorries that come through would either Cope with or Enjoy the changes considered	It should not make any difference to lorries - except to improve traffic flows that will save them time.

Yes! Improvements to Havant Road and the roundabout strongly supported. Shared surfaces strongly supported	
Fantastic idea	
My thoughts are covered in Question 2	
strongly support	
The roundabout to the Havant/Main Road needs resolving - Emsworth already has a fantastic Civic Space in the heart of the town. These proposals mustn't compete with this - and the case study you have included does actually just that.	On the contrary it could include and support the existing square. It will make it easier for people to shop in all parts of the town centre and give a boost to retailers north and south of the A259
A practical aim would be for a 20mph for the A259, the centre and all residential streets. At the very least street enforcement of 30mph on A259 and 20mph elsewhere	We have added a new project to P1.
Policy M2 (page 44):What are your views on Policy M2 Improve the Pedestrian Environment? (Q23)	
Summary of Comments received	Response from Emsworth Forum
If Footpaths are to be widened then a one way system throughout the village should be imposed	We are not convinced that is necessary
Is there a need for more street furniture i.e. strategically sited benches/seating and cycle stands?	See P1, a new project which addresses both current and future needs.
Excellent from all perspectives - people on the street talking to each other and stopping to pick up litter or purchase Items makes for safer stable communities	
Wider footpaths make it easier to be knocked down by cyclists or EPVs e.g. Emsworth park	This is an enforcement of byelaws issue.
Waste of money.	We do not agree. This policy is widely supported.

<p>Need to be more specific in this policy - which footpaths are currently unsafe? Could suggest pedestrian/cycle link from Emsworth/Cycle link from Emsworth train station and the services on A27T. M2 needs to be more specific. Has contact with HCC and HBC been made over the pavement issue? Has an audit been completed of pavements footways that need widening? Where are they? All new footpaths must comply with DDA regulations. Cycling safety would be improved with a 20MPH limit in the town.</p>	<p>We have added a project regarding a cycle link from the Railway Station to the Service Station on the A27.</p>
<p>I want a 20mph limit on all except a few roads - but I guess you have been through that already!</p>	<p>See P1, a new project.</p>
<p>Well maintained footpaths fine but widening pavements reduces the room for cyclists and motorists to share the roadway</p>	
<p>Inter-bridges site! Underneath the railway line</p>	
<p>This is really important &amp; would fully support plans to improve the Havant Road round about.</p>	
<p>Some pavements need re-surfacing. It is difficult for pedestrians to cross from village to North Emsworth. The subway is in the wrong place!</p>	
<p>Move 700 bus stop to A259 - westward flow - to keep traffic flowing in St Peters Sq. and improve pedestrian safety</p>	<p>This is not a planning issue.</p>
<p>This is a top priority. Our town is divided in two by the A259, which carries increasing volumes and fast through-traffic. However I cannot support, since this Policy is unsupported by any exploration of possible strategies, properly costed, subject to feasibility studies, or evidenced by communication with Highways. As such, the proposals are aspirational and unlikely to develop. Replacing the roundabout with a shared space crossing (e.g. the Poynton model) would be lovely, but is unsupported by facts and</p>	<p>It is not clear what Policy you are referring to. However, Policy M1 is deliberately non-specific as clearly technical work would need to be done to implement it. The Poynton example is illustrative of what can be achieved. There is substantial support for it from the public consultation which enables it to be taken forward by community leaders to the relevant statutory bodies for further work to be done. There have been no objections from the relevant highways bodies. The EF intends to take this forward with a task group who are interested in making it a reality.</p>

figures.	
Fines for parking and driving (partially) on footpaths should be enforced	
Could just get more cars parking partially on the pavement if the roads aren't wide enough. Cyclists these days are getting to be a real danger to pedestrians and there shouldn't be such a thing as a 'shared facility'. They come up fast behind you and a collision results in serious injury for the pedestrian.	Parking on a pavement is an offence. If there are safe designated cycling paths then they should not be a danger to pedestrians. The NP supports more safe cycling routes in Policy M3. The concept of shared space will reduce the risk of accidents.
As above	
Difficult to see how footpaths could be widened without causing further congestion in the centre - exacerbated by necessary retail deliveries and widespread parking on yellow lines. The informal crossing areas need to be either made official with zebra crossings or done away with the avoid confusing motorists and pedestrians alike. Who has right of way? What about mentioning motorised wheelchairs and walking frames that cause hold-ups?	This requires a detailed technical study, which could be part of the feasibility work required for the new Civic Space concept in M1. A project in P1 relates to this.
But serious difficulties with implementation	
Must improve network for mobility scooters for the aged.	
There are theoretical plans for housing in the meadow which includes the county border path. If this path were to be moved, particularly closer to the river, then this essential route would become unusable during any wet winter. (I have seen it extensively saturated several times) Surface water from further north, Redlands Lane, North of Long Copse Lane etc. would trickle down into the Ems and make the through put more extensive. Given a really wet spell of weather, I do not feel that the "ponds" for surface water at Redlands could cope with it all. Many of the Experts have not actually seen what happens -	

Theory is only part of the knowledge base.	
strongly support this	
In areas where there are narrow streets and no footpath, is it possible to reduce speed to a mandatory 10mph to allow pedestrians time to get out of the way as these are often places where people are strolling enjoying the view....Bridgefoot Path and Bath Road are two examples and perhaps the lower part of South Street towards the Town Quay, after the car park/Bluebell entrance.	This requires a detailed technical study, which could be part of the feasibility work required for the new Civic Space concept in M1. A project in P1 relates to this.
Policy M3 (page 44):What are your views on Policy M3 Cycling Strategies? (Q24)	
Summary of Comments received	Response from Emsworth Forum
Huge importance would be made to cycling provision in the area	
Strongly support the expansion of cycle lanes and shared pedestrian/cycle areas. I do not think that a walkway being too narrow should be used as an excuse not to have a shared cycle/pedestrian walkway if there is no alternative cycle lane. The default should be to allow it to be shared even if it does not meet national guidelines on widths. Otherwise, it will be used as an excuse every time! I do not think that pedestrians and cyclists should be separated to the extent mentioned. As an example, Take the pavement leading up into Emsworth from the millpond. This is a narrow, shared pedestrian/cycle lane that works well.	
Excellent	
Wider footpaths make it easier to be knocked down by cyclists or EPVs e.g. Emsworth park. Consider the elderly when spending money	
the cycle lanes in Emsworth and Southbourne are downright	

scary	
Complete waste of money. Look at the area linking the roundabout just off the a27 at the top of Havant road where you have a cycle path on the road and parallel on the pavement. Cyclists seem to prefer using the road even when there is a cycle path next to it.	We do not agree. If cyclists do not use existing lanes it is often because they are unsafe or in need of repair.
Be more specific. HBC has done much to improve safer cycling and now has cycle link between Emsworth and Rowlands Castle. Creating more dedicated cycle routes in Emsworth will be a huge challenge. The route along the A259 is considered “safe” and the restrictions at the rail bridge in North Street make improvements there impossible, CDC and HBC are working together to improve the route the on road cycle route between Emsworth and Chichester. M3. HBC have completed extensive improvements in cycle ways M3 a) and b) talks about the creation of off street routes, we already have these, where do you suggest additional routes can be introduced? The policy needs to be specific otherwise it again sounds aspirational.	We agree that HBC has done a great deal to improve cycle lanes. This policy supports further improvements as there are many places where cyclists do not feel safe. Our public consultations show that there is considerable support for more improvements. Work needs to be done to identify where improvements need to happen.
Support the strategy in principle but safer pavements and roads for cyclists and pedestrians require a ruthless policy of addressing illegal parking on roads and pavements, inconsiderate parking and generally not reducing carriageway widths. Narrower carriageways will generally increase the risk for cyclists. Dedicated off-road lanes/tracks ideal. Consider delineated joint pedestrian/cycle lanes.	
Encourage cyclists to use facility when provided and not the road alongside - national problem!	

A mixed pavement as in the west end of Havant Rd is good. Not too many pedestrians use this main rd. There is the issue of driveways of course, but it would be less dangerous than the current cycle lane with the increasing volume of traffic.	
Facilities shared between pedestrians and cyclists should be kept to a minimum. Too many cyclists travel at speed and approach with no warning. This can be startling and dangerous especially for the elderly.	
More cycle paths needed	
Cyclist discipline needs improving in certain areas where traffic has increased or will be increased. The North/South bottleneck at the station is difficult now without massive housing/transport increases caused by 2000 more houses to the North	
Unspecific and undeliverable without evidence/funding. Where can roads or pavements be widened to provide cycle lanes? Where are cycle racks to be placed?	This policy supports further improvements as there are many places where cyclists do not feel safe. Our public consultations show that there is considerable support for more improvements. Work needs to be done to identify where improvements need to happen. Once identified in a strategic way funding can be sought through government programmes to encourage cycling.
It is essential that cycle routes perform their purpose, rather than being theoretical only, like the cycle route along Victoria Road Selangor Avenue which is so constantly blocked by the residents' legitimately parked cars that it provides no safety at all.	Agreed but Neighbourhood Planning cannot assist with this issue.
Cycling is not the same as it was 30 years ago when people ambled along slowly. Now cyclists can reach speeds of 30 m.p.h. and many generally ride selfishly and aggressively. They do not mix safely with pedestrians on the same pavements.	
On street cycle routes are only safe if cars are not allowed to park on it, e.g. Southleigh Road	Agreed but Neighbourhood Planning cannot assist with this issue.

One of my 'bees in my bonnet' is the lack of decent, continual cycle tracks in and around Emsworth. Cycling along on a designated cycle path and then all of a sudden it finishes and having to join the main road is no fun.	Refer to frequently made comments and questions and P1.
Cyclists must not be supported to the detriment of pedestrians. Also consider the invalid buggies!	
The current state of pavements between pedestrians and cyclists seems to work and is very common in Spain and France	
The cycle lanes which have been painted along Havant Road and Southleigh road are frequently blocked by parked cars; cars need to move into them if there is oncoming traffic passing parked cars. More could be done to promote shared pedestrian cycle space, often seen on the continent. Many pavements are little used by pedestrians	
But serious difficulties with implementation	
This should be extended to cover other options for off road cycling between North/South Emsworth	
Whilst it is good to encourage cycle use and the creation of safe routes it should be remembered there are many people who can't/don't want to cycle	
If only the railway bridge path were wider in the dip. Bicycle use now abandoned!	
Need more cycle racks in town centre too	
strongly support	
Very weak. Safe cycling, particularly for young people, is segregated cycling. I would not let my child cycle to any of the schools.	This policy supports further improvements as there are many places where cyclists do not feel safe. Work needs to be done to identify where improvements need to happen
space does not suggest more of these aims are achievable	This is a challenge that needs to be overcome
Policy M4 (page 45):What are your views on Policy M4 Cycling	



Storage Provision? (Online survey answers to question 25)	
Summary of Comments received	Response from Emsworth Forum
Do not forget storage for mobility vehicles	
More street cycle stands	
Good idea!	
yes yes	
Wider footpaths make it easier to be knocked down by cyclists or EPVs (which are getting more powerful and dangerous e.g. Emsworth park.	
Map p48 footpath from bottom of King St wrongly represented	As the plan is revised maps and named will be checked
I regularly cannot lock my bike to a cycle rack in Emsworth	
Older population. Why do we need this?	It is true that not everyone can cycle but this is needed to encourage and support anyone who wants to remain fit and use a sustainable form of transport. Cycles take less space than cars and do not emit toxic fumes. It is in everyone's interests to reduce car use and to enable that by making cycling easier.
Flats and folding bikes work. There is rarely enough space in flats for full sized bikes unless there is a bike room or cage. However this will raise affordable house prices so will work against the young and less well off.	
How you police storage use?	
Possibly a bit excessive.	
Unspecific and undeliverable without evidence/funding. Where can roads or pavements be widened to provide cycle lanes? Where are cycle racks to be placed?	This is a common planning requirement in new developments and is funded as part of the scheme.
Excellent plan	
See comment for shed space in new terraced affordable homes	
But see largely unused racks at railway station. Provision excessive for residential development	

Support in principle but may not be possible in higher density areas	It is all the more important in higher density areas as there will be less space for parking cars.
Too prescriptive	
Need more cycle racks in town centre too	Agreed. See project in P1.
Strongly agree - this could happen now!	
No mention of cycle racks in the town.	Agreed. See project in P1.
Policy WF1 (page 51):What are your views on Policy WF1 Public Enjoyment of the Waterfront? (Q 26)	
Summary of Comments received	Response from Emsworth Forum
Strongly agree	
Should allow cycling along the millpond wall and the seafront	This could be considered as part of a cycling path review.
This is an essential part of the wellbeing of residents and visitors to Emsworth. Great integrated management, signposting, encouraging sustainable use.	
There must be parking at each end of a walk (not just in front of people's houses). Provision for dogs and for those people who don't like dogs or their mess consideration given.	There is little space for additional public parking. On-street parking is legitimate where there are no restrictions. We agree that there should be more waste bins for dog excrement in popular dog walking areas and have added to this P1.
Given that HBC already has robust policies how did the development of Dolphin Quay get approval? Would the same happen with these policies/plans	The NP cannot be used to stop development. These policies should give the planning authority the ability protect public enjoyment of the waterfront.
this is critical as the developers really want to take that away from the residents	

<p>Residents must be able to enjoy waterfront which must be protected. Wildlife need protection from dogs. Better use of Quay/Beach play area/boardwalk South St/King St. The harbour and coastline is already subject to protection locally and international legislation and WF1 is supported, but could be said to be a repetition of the Local Plan. Again I would like to see specific policy plans like the Boardwalk suggestion and a beach play area for toddlers. We suggested this many years ago [and had a plan] but the then harbourmaster was against it. A small beach play area could easily be created south of the harbour pontoon... However visitor numbers to the coastline need to be carefully managed and is an objective of the Solent Mitigation Strategy currently under review.</p> <p>WF1 [4] Unnecessary as all major planning applications require public consultation.</p>	<p>We agree. This policy is designed to re-enforce other protections in case they are removed. The idea of a boardwalk and beach play area is interesting and could be explored again if there is public support. We have added it as a project, see P1.</p>
<p>As said before, I don't see how it is possible to give public access to some waterfront sites. I do not agree with the provision of an £80,000 bridge for the coastal path at the end of Warblington Road. If that is going to be done to save people getting wet feet twice a month at spring tides, then the same thing should happen by Emsworth Sailing Club's dinghy park where the footpath is impassable at high spring tides too.</p>	<p>It is acknowledged that it may not be possible in all cases to give public access to waterfront sites. However we believe we should seek to do so wherever possible. With regard to the Coastal Path project, we believe that it is important to protect the coastline.</p>
<p>The map on p.47 is odd, with no employment shown in the town (and Brook Meadow highlighted).</p>	<p>As the plan is revised maps and named will be checked</p>
<p>see notes on tourism</p>	
<p>I Need to understand this better</p>	
<p>all the waterfront needs protection from developers</p>	
<p>Support a, b, 4 object c. Typos 4 should be d proposal spelt wrong</p>	

<p>Ensure path alongside beach between the sailing club and approaching Nore Barn woods is maintained. It gets a beating from the sea and has a lot of traffic along it. Public consultation is great when it comes to development but seems to be rarely taken into consideration!</p>	
<p>No mention of coastal cycle paths and Sussex border path. Benefits both to local recreation and to tourism and access to other communities</p>	<p>We agree and this has been addressed in the NP.</p>
<p>Emsworth’s harbour and coastal paths are part of the Solent Recreation Mitigation Partnership, but no reference has been made here to this, and to the vital necessity to protect the coastline and the wildlife dependent on the meeting of salt marsh and water meadows. No apparent awareness in these proposals of the urgent need to promote resilience of the entire Solent coastline.</p> <p>I do not support the presumption regarding delivery &amp; enhancement of England Coastal Path project: to do so sets up likely conflict with biodiversity needs (RAMSAR, SINC, SPA).</p> <p>There is no mention of the unique and fragile local watercourses (chalk streams) that support the harbour ecology, nor any proposals to protect and enhance them.</p> <p>No proposal to provide local co-ordination and future management of the various and disparate SUDs schemes being put in place to facilitate housing development on local alluvial pasture land. Failure of any one of these developer schemes will worsen flood risk and the likelihood of pollution.</p>	<p>Agreed, and a reference has been added regarding SRMP. We note your objection to the ECP project; however, this has overwhelming community support. We recognise the unique and fragile ecology in the area, and there are numerous national and international protections. We do not believe the NP can add to these.</p>

It's essential that access to the waterfront is not reduced. The coastal path between Dolphin Quay and South Street is so well hidden that although I've looked for it I've never found it!	
I particularly support the Natural England's proposal to improve the coastal path along Maisemore Gardens to Nore Barn Woods as this would provide access in virtually all high tide conditions, making it full accessible and improving safety for users	
Anything that protects the waterfront, shore line, harbour, coast, gets my support 100% and in particular the green spaces between housing and the shoreline. Also important are the sea defences up to and including Conigar Point. England Coastal Path strategy for this area must be supported in principal	
Provision of 'slipways & moorings' difficult to implement along waterfront. Christchurch harbour conservancy limitations + controls	
Am concerned at gradual urbanisation of harbour fringe with additional hard surfaces which destroy character of area	
P48 is written as if that coastal path exists - could it be rewritten to indicate it is proposed. Currently I believe the passage way between South St and Kings St is along the beach	
Despite supporting this policy it seems that the waterfront is still not protected e.g. the transfer of management of the Millpond from the Council to the Environment Agency. The Millpond often looks in a very sad state - very low levels and full of rubbish. I understand it is now seen as a flood prevention mechanism rather than an amenity. It also used to be used by the sailing club for a very safe way of teaching young people to sail and was also used by locals for swimming and having fun which I think is a huge loss	As a result of the known issue with the maintenance of the Town Mill Pond, local residents of Bath Rd and Bridge Foot Path have formed a voluntary group to periodically remove rubbish from the Mill Pond, which HBC disposes of. The group work with the Environment Agency and HBC to maintain water levels so both sailing clubs can use the pond for training purposes. More waste bins and waste collection by HBC would improve the situation.

Isn't this the domain of the Chichester Harbour Conservancy and natural England?	It is but this kind of policy can support their work through the planning system
Policy H1 (page 53):What are your views on Policy H1 Design & Heritage? (Q27)	
Summary of Comments received	Response from Emsworth Forum
Heritage - over 80 yrs. my Emsworth has changed. People now want to preserve what other people fought hard to prevent happening. Is now better than then? Consider?	The purpose of this policy is to protect heritage assets that are valued today by the community.
Well done EDS	
I add to my comments on the Baptist Church development at odd with our Heritage assets. There were to be proposals to re-design the ventilation shafts in the roof which give it all the charm of a canning factory. Any answers to that?	This is an enforcement issue for a planning decision that has been made - not the domain of this draft NP. We suggest you raise with HBC planning team and/or Emsworth Councillors.
We must not put Emsworth in a strait jacket. Each case must be reviewed on individual merit. No blanket refusals	
Any new development must regard requirements of Conservation Area as well as the Emsworth Design Statement. Would have helpful to include the 100 or so Listed buildings in town. While I support the continued public & community uses of the core buildings listed in H3 a) there is no strategy or mechanism proposed here for ensuring this is carried through.	It is correct that any developments in the Conservation area will have to comply with conservation rules. Policy P1 suggests a review of listed buildings and assets of community value which could include the buildings mentioned.
A pity this policy was not in place before the Baptist Church was built	
But the Baptist church drawings of the roof vents were quite different to how they finished up. They rode a coach and horses through the council's policies. What's to prevent future developments doing the same?	This is an enforcement issue for a planning decision that has been made - not the domain of this draft NP. We suggest you raise with HBC planning team and/or Emsworth Councillors.
HBC impotent in Baptist Church application	

Design and Heritage are important - this should not preclude high quality, appropriate, modern design though.	
Policy H2 (page 53):What are your views on Policy H2 Heritage Appraisals? (Q28)	
Summary of Comments received	Response from Emsworth Forum
Heritage - over 80 yrs. my Emsworth has changed. People now want to preserve what other people fought hard to prevent happening. Is now better than then? Consider?	see previous response
Well done EDS	
I am nervous of HBC Planning, thy have made such a mess of Havant. They say Emsworth is their 'Jewel in the Crown'. We must keep them to this promise.	
Heritage Statements are already required where development has the potential to affect a heritage asset or its setting. Additional policy is likely to be unnecessary.	It has been added for emphasis as this is such an important issue for Emsworth, and if in the future, planning rules change, the policy in the NP will still pertain.
Any new development must regard requirements of Conservation Area as well as the Emsworth Design Statement. Would have helpful to include the 100 or so Listed buildings in town. While I support the continued public & community uses of the core buildings listed in H3 a) there is no strategy or mechanism proposed here for ensuring this is carried through.	See previous response.
A pity this policy was not in place before the Baptist Church was built	
But how will it be followed up? As with the Baptist Church they just went ahead and were allowed to build something that took no account of the local heritage - hence Emsworth is left with a monstrosity akin to Portsmouth's Tricorn development.	This is an enforcement issue for a planning decision that has been made - not the domain of this draft NP. We suggest you raise with HBC planning team and/or Emsworth Councillors.

Unrealistic. As long as the alteration/development looks nice and better than existing and in keeping with the local environment (which I would hope is existing police anyway) it should be encouraged.	We do not agree. The NP ensures that developer will have to comply with this policy.
Policy H3 (page 54):What are your views on Policy H4 Buildings of Local Historic Interest? (Online survey answers to question 29)	
Summary of Comments received	Response from Emsworth Forum
What about Victoria hospital building being included on list?	The hospital building is not included on this list because preserving the building as it stands would be difficult to achieve and would severely restrict its future use. If the Emsworth community wants to see this site used for community/social purposes then any developer would need to have the ability to maximise the value of the site to pay for that community space. This is more likely to be achieved through demolition and re-build. Any rebuild would need to be of a design that respects the character of its surroundings.
It all depends. We have lost churches, health facilities and 6 halls which provided meeting spaces and a large stage for entertainers	
EVCH frontage if possible with redevelopment for Healthcare	We agree that any re-development of the EVCH site should respect its heritage. Retaining its frontage however could be prohibitively expensive
Should surely be possible to maintain these few buildings without envisaging change of use	Unfortunately the way public services are delivered is changing due to technology and many public and commercial services have different estate requirements today. We therefore believe it is important to anticipate future changes in tenancy and ownership and to protect these historic buildings.
General Support but has the ECA building a long term future? Would museum want to be on ground floor here?	It is our understanding that the Emsworth Community Centre does have a long term future. We are not aware that the museum has any plans to move from its present premises.
The implementation of this policy is likely to be challenging when different historic buildings are in different ownerships	This policy will have effect regardless of who owns the relevant buildings
There is a need to include the Cottage Hospital.	see previous response



As already mentioned, keep the historic buildings	
agree that they should not become derelict but see earlier comments on community centre	
These old buildings must be maintained although their use might not be that originally intended, but the façade must be kept where possible. What is going to happen to the hospital, now it is not required for the Doctor's surgery? Very disappointed with the destruction of the Spencer's, although its replacement is not too bad.	
Confused by these statements	
Exterior protection, yes if possible. However some of the inside spaces are not suitable for a lot of things and should be allowed to be changed if it means the buildings will be used.	
Fire station / Museum / Post Office / Hospital. These buildings should be considered carefully since they occupy an important central site to develop a service hut building of considerable value to an expanding town centre requirement	
Any new development must regard requirements of Conservation Area as well as the Emsworth Design Statement. Would have helpful to include the 100 or so Listed buildings in town. While I support the continued public & community uses of the core buildings listed in H3 a) there is no strategy or mechanism proposed here for ensuring this is carried through.	see previous response
I'm not sure that buildings such as the post office and the fire station are worth preserving if they fall out of use.	We disagree. This policy has considerable public support
The protected buildings should include the Emsworth Slipper Sailing Club mill building and the adjacent Malthouse	Agreed.

These wonderful historic buildings are the essence of Emsworth and must not be allowed to fall into disrepair or misuse, they must be protected and preserved sensitively	
Whilst these buildings should not become derelict, not another tattoo parlour or nail bar please nor a coffee chain. One Costa's is enough, not sure if it is ever full	
Ageing buildings need money and detailed management to be sustainable in long term. ECC case dismissed	This is true. This policy ensures that current and future owners maintain these buildings.
Objective is flawed as proposal is not possible without public subsidy. Object to A1, A2, and A3 at this location. If permitted it will mean too many shops and lead to empty shops. A Hotel might be a possible use for part of the site	We do not agree that public subsidy is required. We agree that a hotel might be an appropriate use.
Where is Emsworth's Old Town Hall?	North Street, next to the Fire Station.
A good concept providing these buildings are properly utilised and do not become derelict and vandalised spaces.	
The Community Centre?	It is included in H3
Policy D1 (page 56):What are your views on Policy D1 General Design Policy? (Online survey answers to question 30)	
Summary of Comments received	Response from Emsworth Forum
And will these apply to the Emsworth/Denville development?	Only to the part that is in the Emsworth ward.
It is surprising what you get used to. What one person likes another hates. It is common sense really	
Already requirement of local plan	It is not. This is why it is included in this NP. The NP gives the Emsworth Design Statement (EDS) more weight.
Perhaps it should be made clear that Policy D1 applies to the whole of Emsworth and not just the area south of the railway.	We agree. All of the policies in the NP apply to the whole of Emsworth and the wording now better reflects this.

The Emsworth Design Guide dates from 2008 and would benefit from reviewing.	We agree. On HBC advice we reviewed and included in the Submission Version of the NP, the intentions of the EDS. These have been translated into policy statements where they remain relevant to the present and future planning situation in Emsworth. The EDS still has considerable support in the community and the NP which gives it weight and legal status which hitherto the EDS did not have.
Again, laudable but where are the specific strategies and long-term mechanisms to carry this wish list through? Nothing about improving Recycling levels locally – still no At-Home provision for Kitchen Waste, Glass or Plastic recycling	The NP is not an action plan. It is a policy document. We agree that recycling could be improved in Havant but that is a service issue for HBC and not within the scope of the NP
Adequate for all "off street parking" should be essential in all developments. new developments should not include provision for birds and bats	Parking requirements in new developments are addressed by HBC policy
As long as it is enforced.	
Provision for off street parking should be made	This is included in the design checklist
But doesn't planning permission belong to Havant Borough Council? New houses in Warblington Rd certainly have to comply with HBC who don't seem too particular on recent revamps of 1955 built homes. (Opposite end of Clovelly Rd)	Yes, HBC is the planning authority which makes decisions on planning applications, and all planning applications will need to conform to the NP.
Each application should be judged individually as it is usually a balanced decision with other things involved. Nothing should be absolutely intractable. There should be some flexibility	This is how the planning system works
Is it true that listed Grade ii and II* buildings can have solar panels?	Yes, on a case by case basis, where Listed Building consent needs to be obtained.
olicy D2 (page 56):What are your views on Policy D2 Height, Mass & Materials? (Q31)	
Summary of Comments received	Response from Emsworth Forum
Do not believe building should generally exceed 2 storeys in height unless ground floor includes garage & storage. Street car	Such a policy would severely restrict space for development. The number of storeys needs to reflect the surrounding area.

parking is not acceptable.	
And will these apply to the Emsworth/Denville development?	Only to the part that is in Emsworth ward - the Neighbourhood Plan (NP) area.
It is surprising what you get used to. What one person likes another hates. It is common sense really	
Encourage/insist on solar panels / PV not just "acceptable"	This has been done.
support solar panels	This has been done.
Building should be 2 storey + roof (which is the current standard in the majority of Emsworth, NOT 3 storeys + roof.	We agree, and the Policy has been amended.
In general...however a lot of new materials and designs can look exciting and add interest.	
The aim of the policy is supported but it is unclear how a policy requiring new buildings to enhance the character of the area will be enforced. There is potential for conflict with paragraph 60 of the NPPF. This does however support the promotion of local distinctiveness.	
Again, laudable but where are the specific strategies and long-term mechanisms to carry this wish list through? Nothing about improving Recycling levels locally – still no At-Home provision for Kitchen Waste, Glass or Plastic recycling	Refer to frequently made comments and questions
I particularly agree that height of buildings should be restricted and that building materials should be chosen to be as environmentally favourable as possible.	

The hideous new Baptist Church roof and the building's general design was able to bypass all local policies by appealing directly to the Secretary of State. The finished roof air vents didn't match the original plans regarding heights etc. but they weren't made to change anything and they fobbed everyone off by saying the architects would have another look- which they didn't. How do we know this won't happen again with other buildings?	Refer to frequently made comments and questions
2 storey in height only	We disagree. The policy is widely supported.
Previously 3 storeys applies to Emsworth town centre - not out into residential areas	
I object to b). It is too prescriptive and does not encourage creative design solutions. The most important consideration is the quality of design, not matching materials from the area. This type of statement will be used to support banal designs that are not good enough for our town.	Integration of the design principles within the EDS informed the NP and is widely supported by the community.
Policy D3 (page 57):What are your views on Policy D3 Layout, Form & Density? (Online survey answers to question 32)	
Summary of Comments received	Response from Emsworth Forum
And will these apply to the Emsworth/Denville development?	see previous response
It is surprising what you get used to. What one person likes another hates. It is common sense really	
To date I believe this has largely been achieved in Emsworth	
The density needs to be controlled	

<p>We observe that the requirement for density of all new development needs to reflect the historic urban grain of the area appears to conflict with the local density standards in policy H3 (Housing density and mix) of the emerging Local Plan which prescribes at least 35 dph across the Borough on all sites over a low threshold. Paragraph 47 of the NPPF indicates that Local Plans should follow their own approach to housing density reflecting local circumstances and the Local Planning Authority have decided that it is essential that all development sites are used efficiently in order to meet the need for housing. The only exception to this is where site specific constraints and local character may justify a different approach having regard to the context of the site. This is a different approach to all development having to reflect the surrounding density. The adopted Havant Borough Core Strategy 2011 defines a range of minimum density thresholds. Low Density is up to 45dph, Medium density is a minimum of 45dph and High Density is a minimum of 60dph. Paragraph 6.22 states “Where the quality of design justifies it, much higher densities could be achievable.” This appears to reflect an aim to use greenfield land efficiently and the emerging Local Plan appears to continue this approach with the stated minimum of 35dph. As Policy D3 is not consistent with the emerging Local Plan we are concerned it will not meet the basic conditions of a Neighbourhood Plan.</p>	<p>We note your comments. The draft NP is required to be consistent with the current adopted Local Plan and national policy.</p>
<p>Again, laudable but where are the specific strategies and long-term mechanisms to carry this wish list through? Nothing about improving Recycling levels locally – still no At-Home provision for Kitchen Waste, Glass or Plastic recycling</p>	
<p>Difficult wording of this policy - seems a bit vague and could be very subjective in interpretation</p>	<p>All planning decisions require the planning authority and planning inspectors to exercise their judgment in implementing the intention of policy</p>

Layout of development should also include open green areas and not just high density housing	We agree, and the revised Design Section says this.
I am not against higher buildings provided they look good	
Policy D4 (page 57):What are your views on Policy D4 Design of External Areas? (Q 33)	
Summary of Comments received	Response from Emsworth Forum
It is surprising what you get used to. What one person likes another hates. It is common sense really	
Support but the wording regarding compliance with the Conservation Area should be more robust.	
The policy should be more specific in its remit and specify whether it aims to influence public open space design or the details of private garden or frontage design. Alternatively this could be incorporated as part of the criteria of an overall design policy.	The design policy has been updated.
Again, laudable but where are the specific strategies and long-term mechanisms to carry this wish list through? Nothing about improving Recycling levels locally – still no At-Home provision for Kitchen Waste, Glass or Plastic recycling	
Impermeable surfaces should be installed as infrequently as possible, so that rain water can be properly absorbed and not cause localised flooding.	This is covered in D6d)

I support this - but as we've recently found at the junction of the High St and Queen Street (outside the Old Pharmacy), wiring boxes for internet connections can be erected in entirely inappropriate places, and be of a size and material that is also entirely inappropriate for a conservation area. There must be better solutions. What is the point of requiring residents and other property owners in buildings which enhance the historic streetscape of 'old Emsworth' to meet the tight planning requirements in a conservation area when legislation enables wiring boxes etc. to be erected without any consideration of the historic external area.	
Policy D5 (page 57):What are your views on Policy D5 Design Integration? (Q34)	
Summary of Comments received	Response from Emsworth Forum
It is surprising what you get used to. What one person likes another hates. It is common sense really	
No mention of industry being encouraged into Emsworth	This policy is about design not business. See previous policies in W1-5
This is broadly supported however public access to the waterfront will not be relevant for all development in Emsworth.	
Again, laudable but where are the specific strategies and long-term mechanisms to carry this wish list through? Nothing about improving Recycling levels locally – still no At-Home provision for Kitchen Waste, Glass or Plastic recycling	
This is another way of looking at an earlier aspect with regard to ensuring any redevelopment has regard to and is sympathetic with Emsworth and its environs	



Bath Spa is a good example of where modern meets historic and a glass interface denotes the two. It is a great design statement and similar should be worth considering when agreeing a new structure abating an older one. Insisting, say, that conservatory or extension should be in keeping with the existing building sounds more like a Poundbury pastiche rather than an attractive design feature. Perhaps we need to be more open-minded about modern design, even in conservation areas.	
Policy D6 (page 58):What are your views on Policy D6 Resource Efficiency? (Q35)	
Summary of Comments received	Response from Emsworth Forum
The more that this could become the norm at affordable prices, the more sustainable the buildings in Emsworth will become	
Be it large or small buildings, all car parking should be "green or open slab" parking. Houses should be made to do the same. (Water run off etc.). Too many solid gardens	We agree. This is an enforcement issue.
To minimise carbon footprint solar/pv panels should be fitted to all suitable roof	
Essential	
Add "increasing recycling levels and reducing waste	
Not sure if grey water recycling can be made safe with respect to contamination issues.	Yes it needs to be made safe for recycling.
Some elements of this policy are unrealistic e.g. c, e, f	we disagree
Needs a town wide evaluation of rain water runoff and dispersal in view of historical problems under railway bridges. Victoria Road/Selangor avenue, Westbourne area building expansion both known and potential	As a result of Emsworth Flood Action Group, a flood alleviation scheme has been installed to the north of Selangor Avenue and a further scheme has been approved for the new houses to the west of Horndean Road (funded by developers). This goes a long way to solve flooding on the A259, Selangor Ave, Bridge Road, Victoria Road. Contributing to the flooding is a combination of Nore Farm Stream and West Brook over-topping after heavy rainfall.

Vitally important	
In view of traffic concerns in connection with inter bridges site, strong efforts should be directed towards developing a solar farm on the western land. Nil pollution/traffic	An interesting idea which has been added as a potential Project. See P1.
This policy is supported however the requirement for new development to reduce the carbon footprint of the neighbourhood area may be problematic to deliver as all development would need to be carbon positive. A more effective and sound policy would be one which requires that proposals should demonstrate that resource efficiency will be maximised and CO2 emissions minimised as reasonably possible.	Noted
Again, laudable but where are the specific strategies and long-term mechanisms to carry this wish list through? Nothing about improving Recycling levels locally – still no At-Home provision for Kitchen Waste, Glass or Plastic recycling	Refer to frequently made comments and questions
Climate change must be addressed seriously in all new development and transport use.	
Agree in principle but solar panels ugly and intrusive - e.g. 1 Stanley Road (rear but facing King Street).	
As long as not too costly for the social housing project	
Policy should provide for enclosed bin storage	
I only object because I think the balance of issues is wrong and misleading*. Emsworth has one near Carbon Neutral home/office - and that is the one that I designed and live in. Please contact me to arrange a visit and I will take you through the lessons-learned. * E.g. Local building materials DO NOT necessarily contribute to a low carbon footprint - because the energy-efficiency of the factory is a bigger consideration than transport energy	Thank you for your kind offer. We are sure there are many lessons to be learned by your experience. However, for the purposes of the NP which aims to reduce the carbon footprint of development in the area, we believe the Policy we have drafted is both ambitious but realistic. We are encouraging the use of local materials for wider social and economic reasons as well as environmental ones.

But obviously not every criterion on this list will be applicable to every new dwelling??	
This should go further for new-build development. This should set targets for green credentials, especially for new B-Use (Office, commercial) and Residential developments. (BREEAM, sustainable ratings etc.)	We believe the Policy we have outlined is ambitious but realistic and will conform to Planning Regulations.
Policy D7 (page 59):What are your views on Policy D7 Rooms in the Roof? (Q36)	
Summary of Comments received	Response from Emsworth Forum
So long as the roof is not above 3 storey properties	
Great design will overcome a lot of problems	
Depends on neighbours and should come under planning regulations.	
good way to enable people to create more living space without digging up fields	
Loft extensions historically have often altered the character of a building and must be carefully considered before agreement	
This appears to be an unnecessary policy whose purpose will already be covered by design guidance and policy on scale and appearance.	Agreed, and this has now been deleted.
Again, laudable but where are the specific strategies and long-term mechanisms to carry this wish list through? Nothing about improving Recycling levels locally – still no At-Home provision for Kitchen Waste, Glass or Plastic recycling	Refer to frequently made comments and questions
Any new build to be no more than three storeys high to keep the town's skyline as it is	
Only if large over-sized dormers are ruled out.	
What about people who want to dig basements for home cinemas etc.? Surely the heavy clay near the surface will give	Planning Regulations would oversee such an application, and would be dealt with on a case by case basis.

flooding problems?	
Should not be an explicit policy. Care needs to be taken when permitting conversions to minimise loss of privacy	We agree this is a normal planning consideration
Rooms in roof are good use of space. However we should not discourage Velux/ skylight windows as they will have very little impact on 'light pollution'	We do not believe a policy covering this is required.
Policy D8 (page 59): What are your views on Policy D8 Mitigate Light Pollution?	
Summary of Comments received	Response from Emsworth Forum
being close the national dark skies area - we should encourage where able light reduction	
How about noise from car alarms which go on and off for hours?	This is not a planning issue. It is a noise enforcement concern.
So important	
Loss of the beauty of the night sky has a bearing on peoples' sense of well-being. Also, no link has been proven between street lighting levels and crime.	
Consider having street lighting responsive to movement after, say, midnight, to reduce waste and light pollution	
Security lights on many buildings emit too much light and may be considered as a policy?	For new developments, yes.
Important to try to keep to the style currently in use, to maintain the attractive appearance, not merely functional.	
Does this or could this apply to private properties with use of security lighting etc.?	For new developments, yes.
This policy is of equal importance to residents in the Northern sector of Emsworth and not just the waterfront. The open countryside feature of parts of Emsworth should be maintained to confirm with the plan objectives.	

This policy is supported although the part of the policy which requires “fittings that emit no upward light” may not pass the tests of soundness.	Noted.
Again, laudable but where are the specific strategies and long-term mechanisms to carry this wish list through? Nothing about improving Recycling levels locally – still no At-Home provision for Kitchen Waste, Glass or Plastic recycling	Refer to frequently made comments and questions
To emphasise point B as a water user and often returning in the dark, it is essential to navigator to minimise light pollution on the waterfront.	
I object to c) if it leads to pastiche street furniture and lamp columns.	
I don't think this should be a strategy set in stone. It sound politically correct but in reality controlling this in new buildings/lighting in Emsworth is not going to make any difference to the existing light pollution. Each project should be taken on its own merits	We do not agree. Whilst this policy will not address existing issues it is important to prevent further light pollution. Each planning application will be taken on its merits.
Light pollution from some shops is also now becoming an issue - particularly the new betting shop on the High Street - this ought to be subject to tighter planning control	
Policy P1 (page 63):What are your views on Policy P1 Neighbourhood Projects?	
Summary of Comments received	Response from Emsworth Forum
Very proactive - brilliant	
Many of these are common sense wants not needs. What is needed is costing before anyone should support	All of these projects will need business cases etc. If they have the support of the community, which they do, this work can be done in that knowledge and funding sought.
Banks? Yes to tourist office and possibly to community bus service.	

<p>Support some but not others 1. Dementia awareness already practised in Town 2. Town Centre Manager not financially viable 3. Visitors Centre where? 4. Hopper Bus by when? 5. No room in High Street for a zebra crossing. Generally supported with the addition of the following.                  Beach Play area.                  Pedestrian/cycle link Train station/ A27T fuel stop.                  20 MPH in Emsworth.                  Boardwalk South St/King St.</p> <p>The NP should also record                  Grade 1 and 11 Listed Buildings in Emsworth.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. Dementia awareness has been introduced that is correct, but it need continuous refresh. If there is a demand for a Town Centre Manager then funding can be sought from a variety of sources. There are numerous empty retail outlets in the town centre that could be used. Introducing a Hopper bus is a major project but there is interest from local bus companies. Re Zebra crossing, this could be investigated but the concept of shared space in M1 would provide a better solution. All of the other project ideas could be added subject to the usual public consultation. We could include a record of listed buildings.</p>
<p>I do not support zebra crossings in the High Street. They seem unnecessary as drivers are generally considerate of the existing crossing "paths" and things generally move smoothly (subject to proper parking). That would also seem somewhat at odds with the principle advocated in policy M1 page 43.</p>	<p>We have added a policy to review zebra crossings in P1.</p>
<p>I support neighbourhood projects which will further enhance Emsworth, however I would like to know how they will be financed</p>	<p>Funding could be sought from a variety of sources: government, business sponsorship and public donation. If we can demonstrate public support for these projects it is easier to raise funds.</p>
<p>I like the idea of pop-up shops, a Centre Manager and a Hopper Bus.</p>	
<p>Not clear what a Neighbourhood Project is. Most of these seem to cover the whole town or at least the town centre. It might be better to focus on a few strategic ideas.</p>	<p>All of these project ideas have come from public consultation. Once community support for them has been demonstrated through this consultation (which it has) we can focus on how they can be delivered. Some can be delivered quite quickly - others will take much longer.</p>

This document is a good start but illustrates mainly the southern part of Emsworth and does little to refer to the north (which possibly houses the majority of residents) These however may be more recent incomers to the town with less concern about the towns development than more established residents	We have added a project to look at this in P1.
Very wide ranging and well thought-out projects. I would like to see a zebra crossing on Horndean Rd, between the junction with New Brighton Rd and North of the Station	We agree that there is an issue regarding crossings on Horndean Road, and a new project in P1 has been added to address this.
Bank and/or 24hr ATM in town centre	
All good and hopefully achievable	
Very well thought out list.	
The provision of a hopper bus serving Emsworth would be supported.	
One project which there is no mention that I can see is the introduction of traffic calming, we as a town have been completely left behind by HBC. There needs to be traffic calming in Victoria Road and Selangor Avenue, speed restrictions and sleeping policemen or speed humps.	We have added a project in P1 to review traffic calming measures across Emsworth.
Merely a Wish List – no supporting evidence or costings. What body is to carry implementation through?	
I support this policy with the exception of "create a visitor centre and/or tourist information centre". These are closing down in many towns/cities and we could include facility in the library. Also query a Town centre Manager	
Definitely need more zebra crossings along the A275 or even a mid-road refuge would help. (Where you wait in the middle of the road - it's trying to get across both directions of traffic in one go which is getting impossible).	
Visitor centre in library could be combined. Think there are enough cycle racks	We agree that a visitor centre could be combined with the Library. Our consultation indicates that people feel there are not enough cycle racks.

I would question Point 4 (where are the banks?!). Unless double red lines are painted in the High Street to stop Disabled Badge holders “parking” and clogging up the road, what is the point of having Zebra crossings. These would only make matters worse in the centre of Emsworth	
Especially agree to encouraging banking services. Who would pay for visitors' centre or to be manned by volunteers? Emsworth is probably too small to warrant a Town Centre Manager (who would fund this?)	
Will a Town centre Manager be a paid employee that would appear on Council tax? Council employees can be highly paid but not always accountable for productivity	It is unlikely in the current financial climate that this role would be funded by local government.
I support most of this, except pedestrian crossings for High Street. These should not be necessary if proper traffic calming measures are introduced for High Street and St Peters Square. The whole area should be remodelled to eliminate the "pavement/road, pedestrian/vehicle" conflict. Use the same thinking as Poynton and some Dutch towns. Hence pedestrian crossings as such will not be necessary.	We have added a project in P1 to review traffic calming measures across Emsworth.
Support some parts but not town centre Manager, Visitor Centre/Tourist Info centre. I don't believe there is enough new work for a TC Mgr. Information boards + same in library should be sufficient for a town of our size. Development of new bus services around the town to provide connections to health centres/surgeries etc.	The scope of any Town Centre role would be determined as part of any project to introduce the role. It may not be a full time post.
I object to ‘Extension’. Contemporary extensions can more successfully ‘compliment’ the existing house. In any event, it is the Design Quality of the extension that is of paramount importance, not the “style”.	We have revised the Design section.



<p>Generally support but please not too many dementia and wheelchair users. There are already plenty of mobility scooter users. Re: my earlier comment that the democratic balance of Emsworth has already changed and we need to encourage the younger families not just old people to our town.</p>	<p>New developments will tend to bring in younger residents as the development of Redlands Grange demonstrated. A mixed population is desirable but Emsworth will always be a destination for retirees and has a growing elderly population whose needs must be catered for.</p>
<p>I'm aware of other communities which have a Town Centre Manager, and have some appreciation of the benefits this type of post could bring, but I'd be interested in who any Town Centre Manager would be answerable to, and how they would connect with the existing groups both voluntary and statutory. How geographically far would their remit go, and how would it (regardless of full-time or part-time) be resourced?</p>	<p>These are important questions that need to be addressed. There are a number of potential models and funding sources that could be used to create this role. Once we know that the idea has support (which this consultation shows that it does) all the relevant stakeholders can work together to develop a business case etc.</p>
<p>Job description for Town Centre Manager needs to be specific. On-off bus service a priority</p>	
<p>Generally support - but please add a point about acoustic improvements to the town. A3, A23, A29, M275 - all nearby sites where acoustic fencing has been installed to protect the local community (both existing, and future). Most of the A27 between Portsmouth and Chichester does have such fencing - Emsworth is notable by its absence.</p>	<p>See P1.</p>
<p>A long list, many of which belong in the relevant sections of the plan and are not "projects". A short doable list would be more helpful. I would put the hopper and links with QA and Oak park at the top as footfall since the Banks all shut seems to me to be urgent</p>	<p>The project list has been restructured and prioritised for ease of reference. All of these projects are ideas arising from the public consultations, and the Forum committee feel they would enhance the quality of life of people living and visiting Emsworth.</p>
<p>with the inclusion of 20mph and proper enforcement of any speed restrictions</p>	

## Responses Received by Email Or Letter

Respondent	Response from Emsworth Forum
<p>Email 1.</p> <p>Thank you for the considerable work you and your team have put into the Emsworth Plan. As a resident who lives in the north east of our town, I am not in a good position to contribute feedback to the other areas I know less well, but if I could make a submission on the bit I am much more familiar with it would be much appreciated.</p> <p>The plan mentions two parks north of the railway line (Hampshire Farm and Southleigh Road). There are of course three, the third being the park to the East of Oakmeadow Close, running from Westbourne Avenue at the southern end to Westbourne Road in the north. This green area is of particular importance to people that live in the north eastern sector of Emsworth. The salient points as to its value are in my eyes (and not necessarily limited to these) as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The park, being over 100m long, is an area of outstanding natural beauty and of great utility to the people of Emsworth for recreation and enjoyment. The trees around the edge of the park are historic and are a wealth of natural beauty and wildlife, as well as a seasonal delight as they change colour, lose their leaves then regrow in the spring. Regarding wildlife – birds, bats, woodland animals and other wildlife are resident. If you would like more details let me know and I can describe further the types of animals that live there. The whole area needs protecting and the trees should all have TPO's at a minimum and the wildlife noted publicly, or an area of special protection could be designated to the whole park. The park is enjoyed not just by the people of east Emsworth, but from the wider Emsworth area as people can and do arrive by car, bicycle or on foot.</li> <li>• The park has a section approximately 50m long to the west of the straight footpath between the two roads (to the south of the retirement community). This used to be</li> </ul>	

<p>mowed, but has now been left by HBC as a natural field. That is fine and the butterflies are plentiful and beautiful in the summer. Both the main field which is maintained by HBC, and the smaller area which no longer is (but is still owned and controlled by them), would lend themselves to maybe forty houses on the larger and four on the smaller, or worse, a block of flats on the smaller. This would be a huge loss to Emsworth, and to east Emsworth especially. This area has become intrinsic to east Emsworth's composition and character. HBC tried to do develop the park once already in the 90's and people were protesting with placards at that time. The plans were thankfully dropped but could be resurrected at any time, especially as the area isn't flagged as green space on the Emsworth Plan in its current form.</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Havant Borough Council have recently banned dogs from being let off the lead on any green space that has unfenced children's play areas. Whilst I am of course keen for children to be safe from dogs, this rule seems punitive and ill thought out, penalising the many safe dogs that have always been taken to one of the three parks north of the railway for a run. Hampshire Farm is massive, and due to the presence of f a slide, a small rope bridge and a sandpit all located to the south of the Hampshire Farm park area and within 1% of its space, dogs are now banned from running on the other 99%, punishable by an £80 fine. Likewise Southleigh Road also has an open play area so that leaves the park to the east that I refer to as the only place east Emsworthians can walk to and then let their dog have a run. Keeping a dog on a lead is hard work for some dog owners so this value is important to preserve given what has happened to the other two.</li> <li>• The land to the east of this park is accessible currently, but it merely has a Right of Way for a foot path from Westbourne to south Emsworth. It also contains free roaming cows and is part of West Sussex not Hampshire, and cannot be relied upon for recreation due to the lack of legal rights to recreation, and due to the risk to safety the livestock pose. Hampshire Farm to the north of this park has a twenty year leasing arrangement; five years of which has already expired so also cannot be relied upon long term for recreation. That means the Emsworth Plan protecting the park I am</li> </ul>	

<p>describing to be of great long term importance. HBC have at best treated Emsworthians with limited consideration and would no doubt be keen to turn this space from a liability that costs them modest expenditure on lawn mowing into a valuable asset and a source of revenue worth millions. Walking to one of the other parks is impossible for the elderly or infirm that live in this area of Emsworth so its protection is of great importance to such people.</p> <p>These are the salient points in my view for consultation purposes. This park marks the outer boarder of Emsworth to the north east, as well as the outer border of Hampshire itself, and this significant area must be protected in my view for the reasons given above. Apologies for writing such a lengthy submission! I attach some google screen grabs below this email of the area I refer to for illustrative purposes so you can easily forward this on to any team members involved.</p>	
<p>Email 2.          Those that deal with housing where the lack of input to Havant Borough Council directed planning policy is regrettable. There is also a puzzling emphasis in parts on "waterside access".          4 Paragraph 2 starting with "Originally..." does not seem to me to accurately reflect Emsworth. Mention needs to be made of the retired population and I don't understand the word "participants". This would seem to suggest some form of sporting activity. Most of the visitors come to Emsworth exactly as that "visitors".          5 I think this is well put although again I would take issue with the use of the word "recreational" on its own. Why not "...attraction for visitors will be..."          6 These are on page 21 not 20. I agree with these and think they are well put.          7 Object. The new doctors' surgery should be in north Emsworth on the Hampshire Farm site reserved for it. If there is to be cohesion between north and south this would contribute substantially as well as providing a better location for a new build facility. The Cottage Hospital site needs comprehensive redevelopment with high quality modern architecture including a substantial low cost housing element.          8 Support</p>	<p>Re 7. The NP is silent on the location of the new surgery as this is a matter for the Doctors. However, a move of the surgery away from the town centre would on balance be detrimental to the social, economic and environmental sustainability of Emsworth. Re 12. see frequently made comments.</p>

<p>9 Support 10 Support but suggest also that the land to the east of Westwood Close should be included as an important recreational facility for walkers. 11 Support 12 Object. The plan should not derogate responsibility to Havant Borough Council in the way suggested. The plan needs to have a strong vision as to where housing would be most appropriate. There is a confused wording in b). Affordable is social housing. Use the definitions from the NPPF please. 13 Support 14 Support 15 Support 16 Support – especially to avoid the development to the east of Westwood Close 17 Support 18 Support</p>	
---	--

<p>19 Object. It is important that a vibrant town centre is maintained and this is more likely if businesses are encouraged without the constraints of a restrictive policy of this nature.</p> <p>20 Support</p> <p>21 Support</p> <p>22 Support</p> <p>23 Support</p> <p>24 Support</p> <p>25 Support</p> <p>26 Object. New accesses are not required. There is plenty of existing access which is entirely adequate.</p> <p>27 Object. Overly restrictive. Good quality modern architecture should be encouraged. It is important to avoid “pastiche”.</p> <p>28 Object. “Any application “ is too wide. This needs to be refined so that the burden is placed only for those developments/applications that merit this degree of planning evidence.</p> <p>29 Object. None of these buildings have intrinsic merit. Proper good quality modern planning would allow a much better use of the land. Think in the context of the museum of the Novium in Chichester.</p> <p>30 Object. What does “high quality” mean? This is so subjective. Better phrasing is needed.</p> <p>31 Object – again this policy seems to be concentrating on the historic centre of the town and pays little attention to the northern part.</p> <p>32 Object. Meaningless.</p> <p>33 Object. Again I see no need for increased public access.</p> <p>34 Support.</p> <p>35 Support</p> <p>36 Support</p> <p>37 Support</p> <p>38 Support except the appointment of a Town Centre Manager.</p>	<p>Re 19. These policies <a href="#">have been</a> reviewed. Re 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33. We disagree. These policies are supported by the consultation.</p>
---	--

## Email 3

- I believe that the green space/green corridor issue should be made more of in the plan and we should preserve natural waling/linking spaces such as the field behind Westbourne avenue. With a simple hard pathway along the border path at this point it would provide safe walking/cycling access to the new surgery which is likely to be built at Redlands.
- Housing on the above field will undoubtedly result in more flooding elsewhere and just because the environment agency has changed its criteria re what is likely to flood (no doubt under pressure to do so to allow more housing to be built) we all know in Emsworth, that what ever the so called experts tell us, there will be a significant flood impact caused by building at this space and so the neighbourhood plan should reflect this.
- I think holding onto the priority re the old hospital site for a community hub is a waste of a priority because we know that the NHS and Government departments no longer have the resources to invest in such projects. However I am dismayed that when a community priority is set in this way that it does not include services for young people. I note the suggestion to develop youth provision away from the centre of Emsworth (have any youth organisations/schools etc been consulted about this?) and believe that this could result in further isolation of young people many of whom often feel marginalised anyway. If you want to seriously improve social cohesion in the area then intergenerational community hubs are the ideal way to move forward. Both older and younger people would benefit from being in closer contact and with the correct professional support the young people could really make a major contribution to the community. In addition it would be an ideal place to include community mental health facilities as the huge increase in mental health issues for young people is well documented and they would benefit enormously in being able to attend positive youth activity sessions and also have on hand expertise in mental health, employment, housing, and legal advice etc.

Regarding EVCH the policy states that other community uses would be acceptable - including provision for young people. Youth organisations and schools have been consulted and participated in the development of the NP to date. We agree that intergenerational facilities would be an example of the kind of community services that this site could be used for.

<p>Email 4</p> <p>I wish to congratulate you and those involved in drawing up the Emsworth Neighbourhood Plan, a welcome vision to those who live and work in our community. This is particularly welcome in view of proposed housing developments and the need for protection of our existing open spaces. With regard to this there is an area of open space that is not identified in your Plan and one that is known to be an area under threat from a newly proposed development. This is land behind Westbourne Avenue currently used by many for walking their dogs, rambling or as an alternative way of accessing Emsworth in an uplifting environment. A natural habitat for wildlife it is currently used for the grazing of a small number of cattle with surrounding areas of land used for keeping horse and other animals. This is a natural gap between Emsworth and Westbourne and I feel sure that this is an open space that many local residents would not wish to lose. I hope that this is something that can be addressed in some way in your final version of the Plan.</p> <p>Having finished reading the pre submission draft it is reassuring that such a comprehensive Plan has been formulated.</p>	<p>Thank you for your support. Please see frequently made comments regarding the Ems Valley corridor</p>
<p>Email 5</p> <p>The document reads well in many ways and the big area of change, housing, is well covered given that it largely a Havant-controlled matter. Though you may be being optimistic about older people downsizing. I couldn't retrieve the source document in time, but I believe it is the case that half UK property is owned by people 55 and over, and when these people move more than half of them stay in the same size accommodation or upsize (measured by bed spaces).</p> <p>I have three main areas of concern, noted below.</p> <p>The Centre</p> <p>For obvious historical reasons the centre is not in the centre of Emsworth but on the south edge. More emphasis is needed on Emsworth as a whole. As the doctors of Emsworth surgery have noted, most of their patients live north of the railway line. Walkable retail and other facilities are needed away from the centre. Shifting</p>	<p>Thank you for your supportive comments. Re the emphasis on the town centre. See frequently made comments. Re The future. We agree that high quality design is most important and we do not want to encourage pastiche. However, there are many examples of where poor design has been permitted and the intention is to prevent that going forward. Protecting the character and design of the town is strongly supported in the consultation. Re. Managed decline. We agree that retail patterns have changed and are still changing and the future of the town centre will change to reflect that. Our consultations show that local people greatly value the range of shops that are still available in the town centre and our intention is to have policies that will support their sustainability by attracting</p>



<p>resources and future developments to the centre drains the periphery. Related to this, the optimistic words about using design and planning measures to bridge to North Street ring hollow. Has anybody any ideas?</p> <p><b>The Future</b>          This document is ostensibly directed to the future. Emsworth is an architecturally diverse and living, ie changing, community. The historic theme park tendency which keeps surfacing in Emsworth needs positive resistance. Why mock gas lamps for street lighting? Why new (now rusty) railings on the Bridgefoot millpond. And many other examples. The p60 statement that modern extensions to traditional houses will be resisted is in my view one of the worst examples (and totally unsupported by any argument). Design quality is the measure.</p> <p><b>Managed Decline</b>          The presentation of Emsworth’s retail future is in some ways naïve. The growth of out of town retail and more latterly internet retail and home-working based service industries reduce the need for retail premises. The number needed in Emsworth will reduce up to 2036. This needs addressing. The overemphasis on The Centre can be seen as a rearguard action to deny that this central decline is happening. It is, and will continue to do so. It needs planning for, not denying.</p>	<p>footfall into the town centre with new retail and recreational outlets.</p>
--	--

## Email 5

The field behind Westbourne Avenue and Westwood Close, Emsworth.

This is an ideal time to keep Emsworth joined up, this field is the link between south Emsworth and the Lumley area to north Emsworth, joining the Redlands and Westbourne areas, through what could become an essential green corridor and informal recreational space. I hope this is an opportunity not to be missed.

If the field is no longer for cattle, then why not embrace the space, have a gravel path suitable for walkers, pushchairs, bikes and electric bikes (elderly) and wheelchairs and a couple of benches for those all important community building chats along the way and for all our health and mental well being. Plant more trees in clusters as has been done next to the Redlands estate and these will help take up some of the excess water experienced in this flood plane and help those further downstream towards sea level, like Lumley.

If housing is built in the field the flooding issues will only increase, the new builds may claim to be flood proof houses, but the pavements and roads do not have to be and at what cost to any houses and people who already live down hill/stream from here.

There is much emphasis these days and more awareness about the benefits of walking 10,000 steps a day and for our mental well being too, 25% of our physical health is down to keeping mentally healthy and active (according to my health app)?

If the GPs surgery is to be in a new bespoke building up at Redlands then it makes sense for people to be able to get there on foot or bike without having to walk next to a busy road, gaining the benefits of clean air and green space on the way. If there are more small pockets of greenery like for locals to access frequently without having to jump into a car to go for a walk we would be healthier, our roads less congested and a reduced need for car parks.

<p>At times we all need to drive to the Doctors but for many routine appointments and check ups it is nice to go on foot. If there was a path (it is currently a very muddy walk, it is a flood plane after all), then many more people would use it, taking toddlers to nursery school, children to the primary school, walking to church, local shopping and going to the pub. If our children experience the great outdoors on a daily basis they are much more likely to develop a strong and healthy attitude to the wider countryside.</p> <p>Can Hampshire claim this green space on the edge of its boundary? New housing is needed but so too are frequent green spaces for us all to have easy access to from our front door not a car journey away.</p> <p>I hope this can be taken into consideration for the Emsworth Forum and the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>We have completed and submitted the questionnaire about the Draft Plan and will follow the progression with interest.</p>	
<p>Email 6</p> <p>I am a resident of Westwood Close where there is a proposed development in the field to the east of our cul-de-sac. I have attached a photo of our beautiful field taken early this morning. To the left in the photo, is the Sussex Border Footpath which the developers are proposing to move. This is a well used green space used by many residents of both Westbourne and Emsworth.</p> <p>Please also find attached an article taken from the Campaign to Protect Rural England's website which mentions Havant Borough Council's planning.</p> <p>I believe you have approached HBC regarding this green gap between Emsworth and Westbourne and so I look forward to hearing the outcome of their decision.</p>	

<p>Email 7</p> <p>The document has obviously had a lot of work put into it, It is well laid out and very readable despite being some 63 pages long!.</p> <p>A few inaccuracies</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The railway line (opened in 1847) an important feature in Emsworth both geographically and part of the transportation system has been left off maps Pages 12, 17, 28 and 30.</li> <li>2. Page 54 paragraph 1 Reference to 'Emsworth Community Centre, The Fire Station , The Old Town Hall, Museum and Post Office' ... It is as if the Old Town Hall was a separate building. The Museum is the Old Town Hall which incorporates the Fire Station. Built in 1900 for Warblington Urban District Council comprising of Council Room, Clerks Office and Fire Station with the Caretakers House, Stables, Stores, Workshop and Yard at the rear.</li> <li>3. Page 12. Map - Brook Meadow is referred to as the Lumley Meadow this was its original name. No longer used .</li> <li>4. Page 17. Last paragraph - Wemsfest might to close due to lack of interest. The Emsworth Arts Trail a regular event which stated some 17 years ago and attracts over 3,000 visitors is not mentioned.</li> <li>5. Page 26. Map - Church Place should rear Church Path.</li> <li>6. Page 29. - Wild Life - a place that provides a haven for wildlife both animals and plants Please add in Birds they are not animals or plants !</li> </ol> <p>Thoughts</p> <p>Page 49. Cannot see the point of this page. Page 50 says it all again</p> <p>Page 33. Although i note the statements on this page I am disappointed that there are no maps of planned developments in the area. Even if the Emsworth Forum will have little or no influence on them. They will have considerable effect on everything to do with Emsworth.</p> <p>Page 6. Thank you for including a picture of the Tile Wall at the Hole in the Wall</p>	<p>Thank you for your feedback. We will check all the points of accuracy you have made.</p>
--	---

Community Pottery.

Although we are not included anywhere else in the document. I would like to point out we are not a commercial enterprise as some misinformed people think. We are a Nonprofit Community Activity. There are no paid staff and never have been. We were established in 1971, when the Community Centre was still a school. Unfortunately we are at capacity - 40 people a week, our building cannot cope with any more. So we have a waiting list of 76!

The Emsworth Sports and Social Club in the Havant road is not mentioned. Nor are the Sailing clubs.

The Poynton traffic scheme was amazing - Would we have enough room to do it in Emsworth?

The residents of the New Brighton area of Emsworth and Westbourne are preparing to fight a proposed development in the fields that form a green corridor up the Ems valley to Westbourne. It is not on the HBC Local housing plan and will ruin a wild life habitat and recreational walk OS Footpath No.73.

Very disappointed that it will not receive any help from the Emsworth Forum. Even though the Emsworth Forum seems very keen on keeping Emsworth a nice place to live.

I also find it a little disconcerting that people who set themselves up in authority sometimes seem to know so little about Emsworth. One of your members thought that Warblington Castle (built 1513 to 1526) was a 'folly' did not realise it was a Tudor Castle. Others do not know where the footpath to Westbourne is.

The Emsworth Sports and Social Club in the Havant road is not mentioned. Nor are the Sailing clubs.

The Poynton traffic scheme was amazing - Would we have enough room to do it in Emsworth?

The residents of the New Brighton area of Emsworth and Westbourne are preparing to fight a proposed development in the fields that form a green corridor up the Ems valley to Westbourne. It is not on the HBC Local housing plan and will ruin a wild life habitat and recreational walk OS Footpath No.73.

Very disappointed that it will not receive any help from the Emsworth Forum. Even though the Emsworth Forum seems very keen on keeping Emsworth a nice place to live.

I also find it a little disconcerting that people who set themselves up in authority sometimes seem to know so little about Emsworth. One of your members thought that Warblington Castle (built 1513 to 1526) was a 'folly' did not realise it was a Tudor Castle. Others do not know where the footpath to Westbourne is.

<p>Email 8          I would like to get the following items included for consideration in the Emsworth Forum Plan:</p> <p>1] Safe Crossing Points for New Brighton Road</p> <p>Owing to the increased traffic that the road is carrying and the planned move of the Emsworth Surgery to the Redlands Estate, this will become an urgent need for both young and old pedestrian road users in New Brighton Road</p> <p>2] Traffic Calming / Speed Camera for New Brighton Road</p> <p>New Brighton Road is not only carrying increased traffic from the development housing centered around it, but has been chosen by drivers as a "rat run" via Westbourne, to the back road through Funtington, into Chichester. With a comparatively straight road, most cars are traveling at at least 40 mph in this 30 mph restricted area.</p> <p>When this is combined with need for Safe Crossing Points, then the building of a "perfect storm" is only a matter of time.</p> <p>I hope these requirements can be included in the Emsworth Forum and considered in the Emsworth Neighbourhood planning.</p> <p>Thank you for your help</p>	
<p>Email 9          This field on the Westbourne / Emsworth border is the latest piece of land to be considered for development. No planning application has yet been put forward but money has already been spent by Hampshire Homes on the necessary surveys.</p> <p>I have lived in my house in Westbourne Avenue for 35 years come this January and I have walked this field with a dog almost every day since I retired more than twelve years ago. Prior to retirement I was obviously confined to walking in the evenings and</p>	

weekends but I still continued to enjoy the vista of this ancient field.  
I got to know the tenant farmers who grazed their cattle in the field and reported back to them if any of their cattle needed attention. One cold January day I found a cow dead with her distressed calf beside her and I reported this back to the farmer whose phone number I always have.

I have been in this field on a sunny day, sucked in the air and felt that it was an extension of my own garden. I pick up any litter left by casual walkers.

Although the foot path route is marked on the map, walkers have always been able to take any route they please through the field, pick berries or even have picnics. Indeed the actual ancient footpath route has never been maintained making it impossible for walkers to stick to it anyway.

In my opinion this is not just any agriculture field. It is also a park and it should be designated "An asset of Community Value" status.

Also, a TPO map has been issued by the council.

As an exercise a few years ago, following on-line instructions from the Woodland Trust, I measured the age of all the oak trees. The eldest is over 300 years old and standing close to where the developer would inevitably have to dig the foundations for some of the houses. These footings would therefore inevitably damage the rooting system of the two oldest majestic oaks and the developer would also eventually be bound to require that their overhanging branches be cut. This then negates the whole reason for having a TPO order.

I consider that this development would be an act of culture vandalism. The field is not just any piece of agriculture land it is more, so much more than this.



<p>Email 10          I am very concerned at the lack of new social housing for local residents who are homeless and cannot to buy a home, but are able to to pay a reasonable rent. I am also very concerned that owners of agricultural land can make astronomical profits when this land is designated for house building. Also the loss of green gaps between Havant and the surrounding villages and towns.          Kind regards          Donald Wells</p>	<p>Policy L1b) addresses the affordable housing issue. It is not possible to prevent landowners profiting from land sales when agricultural land is sold for development. Polci L5 addresses settlement coalescence.</p>
<p>Email 11          The 'plan document' has certainly taken a lot of effort and covers all the necessary aspects for a satisfying place to live.           My greatest concern for Emsworth is over-development and the resulting increase in traffic.           Emsworth housing is expanding northwards year on year.           The north/south roadway is a main artery and will inevitably become over used, causing constant traffic congestion.          Already, walking to the shops, north to south is unhealthy due to constant exhaust fumes.          Your 'plan' does highlight traffic concerns.          I believe it needs a very high priority because there is no easy solution.           I wish you luck in dealing with Havant Borough Council.</p>	

<p>Email 12</p> <p>I have read the Plan and agree with its content. I have only a couple of comments</p> <p>on page 14 reference is made to Primary and Middle School - The term primary school covers ages 4-11 we do not normally use the term middle school in this area.</p> <p>Also reference is made to Southern Health having no access to premises in Emsworth - The local Community Health Teams are currently based in Havant Health Centre and provide a community service to Emsworth and other areas of East Hampshire, accommodation is not needed in Emsworth this would locate the Services away from the centre of their area of coverage.</p> <p>On page 28 Reference is made to Emsworth Park ? which is this? also to page xx</p> <p>page 29 also refers to maps on page xx</p> <p>A huge amount of work has been put into this document and I thank everyone for that.</p>	Noted
<p>Email 13</p> <p>Re p 14 about education. There are no middle schools in Hampshire and haven't been for 25 years. Warblington is for age 11-16 i.e. Years 7-11.</p> <p>Your planning advisors have misinformed you, although I'm surprised the proof reading wasn't better.</p>	Noted
<p>Email 14</p> <p>I would like add more support for the Emsworth Neighbourhood Plan I think it is an excellent document and you are to be congratulated on preparing it so well.</p>	

<p>Email 15</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to speak at your presentation to the ERA meeting regarding the proposal to build an extension to Westwood Close for 49 dwellings. The feeling in this area amongst residents is that the site cannot justify any extension for many reasons and hope that your team will support our opposition.</p> <p>Hampshire/West Sussex strip or Sussex Border path protection area. I have tried further approaches to local residents and have not found written evidence., I await an opportunity to speak to County Hall Chichester since a suggestion has been made that they had requested a Site of Nature Conservation Importance I understand that the boundaries of this strip to be:-</p> <p>From Pedestrian tunnel under A27 road on Sussex Border Path-field going north-western edge=Western Ave house boundaries.// eastern edge- River Ems to Westbourne Road. This includes open recreational land to the north of Westwood Close. ( This land was refused development for housing approximately 16 years ago by both County Authorities)</p> <p>The strip of protected land extends to the North of the Wren Centre Industrial area bounded by the River Ems and the Hampshire Farm Public open Space as far as the road bridge over the River Ems north of Westbourne</p> <p>I hope that this will be of help to you.</p>	<p>see frequently made comments</p>
---	-------------------------------------

<p>Email 16</p> <p>I'm sorry that this email re the Emsworth Neighbourhood Plan is arriving at almost the last moment.</p> <p>There are just two matters that I will comment on here, both of which have been discussed at some length by concerned residents in my Neighbourhood Watch scheme, so I am partly writing on their behalf too, though I hope some of them will have written to you independently.</p> <p>1. Increased volume of traffic in North Emsworth due to housing developments</p> <p>We have noticed a tremendous increase in traffic in New Brighton Road, much of it travelling at well over the 30mph speed limit. This can only get worse, with the large development in the Horndean Road fields, and a proposed development in the field behind Westbourne Avenue. Something needs to be done to calm the traffic, and to enable people to cross safely.</p> <p>2. CCTV the centre of Emsworth</p> <p>There is a suggestion to improve the roundabout area to both improve traffic flow and to lessen the split between the two shopping areas. This is certainly a good idea, but built into any design should be CCTV cameras, which also need to be reinstated in the area of the Square. There are a number of bored, disruptive youths who have caused damage in various areas of Emsworth, both to private housing and to commercial premises. If we want the town centre to thrive, retailers need to feel it is a safe environment.</p>	<p>See frequently made comments</p>
<p>Email 17</p> <p>2 I applaud the work of the Forum in getting the plan together and presenting an attractive document for consideration. The Forum has given good consideration to the High Street businesses and encouraging their survival. It has also rightly emphasised the role of public buildings north of the roundabout. The shoreline of Emsworth is a key feature of the town and its coastal walks/paths should be given high priority including the proposed infrastructure work by Natural England.</p> <p>3 Almost all of the maps in the plan need careful attention – especially mapping AONB/SSSI/SINCs/ other designated areas. PLEASE give the maps careful scrutiny by</p>	

experts before the next document is published.

The traffic measures suggested ('new civic space') to deal with the divide between North and South Emsworth are unconvincing. I cannot find mention of the existing pedestrian underpass of the A259 which is a key feature combatting the 'north-south divide' of the town.

I am surprised there are spelling and grammatical errors in this document.

On P 25 it is not made clear what is meant by the Public Service Hub. The area including the community centre needs much better signage and the Neighbourhood Plan should suggest this. There is no point in protecting the buildings in 'the hub' if they are not obvious to potential users from the road without signage

4 P11 In the Landuse and protection section, the first paragraph makes no mention of the western boundary of the town – which is also an AONB in part, plus public woods – Nore Barn Woods, and the new development W and N of Selangor Ave.

Under Protected Environments, paragraph 2 is vague and incoherent. A lot of the shore line is SAC or SPA or SINC or SSSI or all – and this is not shown on the map at all. Map p12 needs all the different types of protected environments marked clearly with different colours for AONB, SINC, SPA, SAC Ramsar etc – some overlap each other. A good cartographer will deal with this. These are key feature of Emsworth.

P 15 - Heidi's Bakery should be mentioned. Free parking for 45 mins at several central roadside sites helps keep this range of shops in business. This parking should be preserved for the long term. (This is mentioned in passing in section on parking but it is not emphasised clearly enough.)P16 No mention of nearby access to A27 in Havant direction – only 1.5 miles from centre. This does save a lot of traffic from W of town going through Emsworth when heading for Chichester.

P17 Map needs a key – two green colours – one woods, one open space. Dashed boundary of town centre not acknowledged – and how come it goes in the sea in part? Why is there a red line going up Nore Farm stream? Suggest railway line should be added. Pedestrian underpass under A259 should be shown by a symbol. It does not seem to get a mention in the text anywhere.

P19 The sixth point in the Vision Statement about the north south divide sounds as if

the proposed traffic measures are finalised. This is not so.

P21 Again – item 10 is not seen as necessary or on the same level as other principles. But an objective stating protection for the natural environment, especially protected areas like AONBs, should be included.

P23-24 – No comment.

7 POLICY C1 P25

Support

The Cottage Hospital could usefully be used for health/social care purposes/nursery as suggested. Retirement home or flats on upper floors would sell and bring more customers to the town. It is criminal that this site has been empty for as long as it has. Assume 'public service hub' is just a term coined for the area around the carpark – ie ECC, Museum, Cottage Hosp. This area needs much better, more obvious signage on the ground (or install a high arch at the entry to the 'hub'.) The Community Centre is vital, well used and well run. It is a key bonus of the town.

P26 The map on page 26 is truly terrible. The buildings are proportionately the wrong size. Ferial Urbanism needs better cartographic advice. Whatever happens with the traffic, even if we get a new scheme including the roads in this 'hub', delineation is not clear. This is an entirely misleading map.

8 POLICY C2 P26

Support

9 POLICY C3 P27

Support

10 POLICY C4 P27

Support STRONGLY

11 Policy C5 P29

Support – but maps again are terrible on pages 30 & 31. Are they all the same scale?

P28 Last sentence makes no sense and mentions a non-existent policy C6. All the print on this page should be mauve and larger font size.

P 29 puts in xx instead of page nos. NB Map on Page 30 C5 (3) is Nore BARN Woods (not Nore Farm)

<p>12 POLICY L1 P 33          Don't know          L1a is convoluted. I do not understand what you are saying here.          L1b – presumably there is a minimum size – ie a development of 10 houses – 4 for social housing?          The Emsworth Design Statement should be quoted in this section          13 POLICY L2 P34          Support          14 POLICY L3 P 36          Don't know – this doesn't say anything useful          15 POLICY L4 P36          Support          Suggest that at least the upper floors of old cottage hospital be converted to a care home/sheltered scheme.          16 POLICY L5 P36          Seems irrelevant – housing development on waterfront – no space.          17 POLICY W1 P38          W1(a) –no spell check? Industrial          W1(b)          Not possible to try and link all industrial/employment proposals to the waterfront.          Non -sequiter          18 POLICY W2 P38          Support          19 POLICY W3 P39          Parts a, b, c Support W3d – Object          Care needs to be taken that the town does not turn into a 'dead' centre of estate agents and eateries (eg Chislehurst, Kent).          W3e – Support          20 POLICY W4 P41          Support</p>	
--	--

21 POLICY W5 P41

Support

22 POLICY M1 P43

OBJECT

Have yet to be convinced (despite looking at a number of videos and talking to a Poynton dweller) that this would bring any advantage to Emsworth. Poynton had traffic lights in abundance and two offset junctions. Our roundabout is a barrier but is surmountable by pedestrians and cyclists using central reservations and the pedestrian underpass which gets scant, if any, mention in the Neighbourhood Plan.

23 POLICY M3 P44

No strong feelings. Believe most footpaths are OK now.

24 POLICY M4 P44

Support I cycle now and don't find existing provision any problem, although slightly wider cycle lanes would be good in places, or some dual use pavements where possible.

25 POLICY M4 p45

Support

Page 46 The second point makes no sense. Waterfront edge – is fine for walkers. Waterfront paths are nowhere suitable for both cyclists and walkers in Emsworth. As for 'marshland landscapes', the only place that comes to mind is possibly Thorney – which is not included in this. Do you mean mudflats? That's not strictly marshland. Waterfront cycling would need much wider paths with designated lanes. That is virtually impossible to accommodate. Page 49 This crude map does not cover the length of the waterfront covered in the previous or later map.

P50 This map is even worse. The green is not 'fields'. At the western edge it is woods and the eastern is Thorney Island – largely off limits for normal access. It shows little understanding of the unique character of Nore Barn Woods in the west where there is 24/7 public access to a waterside woodland. The fields – privately owned - lie north of the Solent Way path beyond the stream and are not along the waterfront at all.

AONB should be marked on this map. Calling the blue area 'active harbour' is



misleading. A better name would be Historic harbour. What is the point of having the rail line on THIS map? The sailing clubs should be marked on this map. The views of sailing from the waterfront are part of the character of Emsworth and encourage tourism. Many people from further afield than Emsworth come to sail here.

POLICY WF1 P 51

a Does not make sense and cannot think of anywhere on the waterfront where this would apply.

b Seems excessive and impracticable

c Support Strongly – particularly the work planned in partnership with Natural England at the western end of the waterfront over the stream area by Nore Barn Woods.

d (not 4) (Literal – proposal). Seems surplus. All planning applications are public. People can object.

P52 Heritage. Where is the higher ground?? What are ‘urban marshland edges’?

There are mudflats in the harbour and parts of the waterfront are urban. This needs clarification.

POLICY H1 P53

Support but should mention the Conservation area and any impact on views.

POLICY H2 P53

Seems surplus policy. The current planning process covers this I believe.

POLICY H3 P 54

Support strongly

POLICY D1 a, b, P56

Both these could be reworded to make them clearer

POLICY D2 P56

Support but in c) assume you mean roof space (not roof).

POLICY D3 P 57

This seems a bit sweeping and vague

POLICY D4 P 57

Support – but suggest the Emsworth Design Statement already covers most of this – put that document in the appendix?

POLICY D5 P57

What is this thing about access to the waterfront? Not all developments can be linked to the waterfront.

POLICY D6 P 58

Not all developments can do b) or c)

e) suggest cut out wind f) What local forms of power?

POLICY D7 P59 Support

POLICY D8 P59 Support

Comment on all Design Policies – this seems to be a struggling section of the Plan – suggest significant help needed from Planning experts and consideration given to updating the Emsworth Design Statement and including it. This Design section seems the weakest part of the Neighbourhood Plan.

P60 Check list. Suggest Discretion is renamed Parking.

POLICY P1 P63

Suggest these are numbered for easier reference. I like both the transport ideas – particularly the hopper buses which could be v important if surgery moves to Redland.

Not sure how this would be funded – are there plans?

Is this list only Urban projects or could the Natural England-led shoreline project on the approach to Nore Barn Woods be added to the list here. It will improve and raise the path/bridge and thus avoiding tidal flooding (Natural England funded).

Glad there will be further consultation at a later stage.

Email 18

You may like to consider the following reply to the questions you ask:

1. We need a social care/health resource, and an Admin Campus.
2. Free all traffic on the intersection.
3. A pedestrian precinct would be better (and towards the Square).
4. A multi-story car park on Palmers Road.
5. A Technical School on the industrial estate with the Nature Reserve.
- 6.

EMSWORTH COULD BE AN INTEGRATED COMMUNITY.

## Email 19

We spoke at the farmers market on 25 November, and I promised to write to you. I think the Neighbourhood Plan has great potential to shape a positive future for Emsworth. There are two aspects that particularly concern me. The first is the need to better join north and south Emsworth. The underpass is a rather industrialised 'big town' solution, but of course is very safe. The other crossing is nicer, but can be challenging with two lanes of traffic eastbound. It would be great if this could be addressed.

The second is much more of an immediate issue for me. We live in Westwood Close, with an open aspect to farmland and trees. A developer is hoping to build 49 houses in the field to the east of our road, with access through it. The development would be right on the area of flooding, and would require a diversion of the Sussex Border footpath, virtually into the River Ems. This footpath is much loved and heavily used by local people and visitors. In winter it is already necessary to divert from the path to the west, to avoid waterlogged parts of the field. This would be impossible if the houses were to be built. The field is a haven for wildlife, and is the last remaining gap between Emsworth and Westbourne. The Council has deemed it unsuitable for housing in the past, and it is not part of the local plan.

Yet the Neighbourhood Plan makes no mention of this field as a local amenity. In my view the route of the Border Footpath, on its present line, should be designated as an open space and given protection from development.

We spoke about you visiting to see the area for yourself, which you said you hoped to do in early 2018. I'd be very happy to show you around at a time that suits you.

<p>Email 20</p> <p>I did not know there was an Emsworth Forum and have thus managed to miss all the Public Meetings that you held, in the gaps between getting back to a normal life I had a quick look at the website and one item has hit a nerve point.</p> <p>I take issue from time to time with the editors of local newspapers when they use the term "North Emsworth". This has been used in the Feedback comments from the meeting about Transport (Buses). Elsewhere it is recorded that the 'north-south' divide was an issue. I very much share that concern. I do not believe there is any such place as "North Emsworth" . I live in the north part of Emsworth, or northern Emsworth.</p>	
<p>Email 21</p> <p>P12. The Horse Field is not the area shown in green as Brook Farm B, but the area immediately to the north. The Horse Field is not a SINC. The southern edge (coastal strip) of Nore Barn Woods is a SINC, but is not shown on the map.</p> <p>P30. C5(3) should be titled "Nore Barn Woods", not "Nore Farm". C5(7) – strongly support retention of this area, the only green bit of the AONB in Emsworth.</p> <p>P36. Strongly support Policy L5 – Designated Green Spaces.</p> <p>P43. Policy M1 – do not support. As a keen cyclist I believe the traffic in Emsworth is too heavy for a Poynton scheme to work. Safe radial cycle routes should be developed through Palmers Road car park and Bridgefoot Path to bypass the roundabout.</p> <p>P44. Policy M2 and M3 - my view is that unless practical suggestions are provided this becomes a "motherhood" statement only.</p> <p>In particular there should be an initiative to make Emsworth a "cycle friendly" town</p> <p>Policy M3 – Cycling Strategies.</p> <p>Suggest : a) Reintroduce 2 way cycling in Bridgefoot Path (as there used to be) b) Create an additional cycleway along Havant Road on the path between Barn Close and Selangor Avenue c) Convert pathway beside 16 Far Meadow Way into cycle path</p> <p>P48. Coastal path – suggest there should be a policy to bring the responsibility for maintenance into a public body, rather than assorted landowners. Mill pond – suggest</p>	

<p>this requires a volunteer group to manage it (the other 6 areas in Policy C5 have successful volunteer groups).</p> <p>P51. Strongly support Policy WF1 as regards all access and specifically the England Coast Path (note correct terminology – not Coastal). Long distance paths – Emsworth currently is on 2 long distance paths, the Wayfarers Walk and the Solent Way, but does not capitalise on this. Eg no signposts or start signs. The England Coast Path will soon be with us – suggest there should be a policy to waymark and publicise all 3 paths.</p> <p>P60. Design check list – all proposed developments should include designated cycle routes, and these should link into existing cycle routes, so that cycles can pass through them as a through route (this has not been done at Hampshire Farm).</p> <p>Shore protection – there should be a policy to maintain existing coastal protection from Emsworth Millpond westward to Conigar point and beyond. (There are current plans at Southmoor to return areas to the sea, and similar plans to the West of Emsworth would ruin Emsworth.)</p> <p>Parking – the free car park in Bridge Road is a positive discriminator for Emsworth and there should be a policy to retain this.</p>	
<p>Email 22</p> <p>A good plan except for that 'last minute' inclusion of the WF1c) clause which my submission asks to be removed. I feel very strongly about the inclusion of clause c) in Policy WF1 in your draft document. Regrettably, if it remains in the submitted Neighbourhood Plan, I would have to vote against the Plan when the 'referendum' vote is given to us. I'm sure there will be others who will be equally uncomfortable at the thought of potentially giving a quango an override on all matters to do with our much loved shoreline walks.</p> <p>Request for the DELETION of clause c) of POLICY WF1 (page 51 in the pre-submission Draft)</p> <p>REASONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is contrary to the Emsworth Forum’s own slogan of ‘Emsworth Empowered’. It is the only section in the whole document that hands power from the Emsworth</li> </ul>	<p>Noted</p>

community to an outside authority – in this case Natural England, which is a quango currently under the control of the Secretary of State for the Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions.

- The 4 km stretch of ‘coastal path’ from one side of Emsworth to the other, already has a system of urban pavements, twittens, and HCC designated footpaths. Parts of the stretch have always been subject to low level flooding at very high tides, such as in front of the ESC dingy park, and at the end of Warblington Road where it meets the shoreline until the slightly higher ground of Nore Barn Woods. The HCC description of this footpath states that it follows the shoreline (and is tidal). Local people and visitors have happily walked this path for decades; enjoying the constant change in scenery as the tides change. I believe, from their website, that the job of Natural England in respect of the England Coastal Path project is to pull together, on a map, what is already in place, or to achieve by negotiation with landowners a path where access does not currently exist. A four hour wait for tidal water to recede is acceptable under their criteria. Everything that Natural England needs in order to map the Emsworth stretch is already in place and requires no further or future involvement by this authority.

- I refer you to your own survey taken at the end of 2014, under the heading ‘Leisure Facilities’: “People expressed satisfaction with ... walking the coast or the countryside”. Clearly, our community are perfectly happy with the way they can use and access the coast and don’t need any additional input from Natural England.

- The Vision Statement on page 19 of the pre-submission draft states “Emsworth’s attraction as a recreational centre will be enhanced, wherever possible, through a combination of the continued careful conservation of protected area and the sympathetic addition of new facilities”. Great statement and the ‘policing’ of it should be kept in the hands of the community; Policy WF1 c) would remove this ability and, therefore, needs to be deleted.

Request for the DELETION of the wording, in POLICY W1 b) ( page 38)

- “the creation of public access to the waterfront” relating to “employment and industrial proposals”. I can see no reason for this wording.

Request for the DELETION of the last sentence on the Design Check-list under 'Extension'.

- To 'resist' "modern style extensions to traditional houses" is a statement too far and could cause lots of problems in the future. There are already ample safeguards in the planning system to 'protect' our architectural environment.

EMSWORTH NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN – errors/inaccuracies which you may wish to correct?

Page 12 – incorrect extension of Warblington Road along shoreline and into green space.

Page 15 – remove comma before Tesco and insert bracket.

Page 15 – there are at least 8 hairdressers, probably more; and 5 charity shops.

Page 15 – insert a mention of the limited Banking facilities provided by Post Office?

Page 16 – Gatwick is mentioned, why not Southampton?

Page 27 – Policy 4 c): is there a pavilion on Southleigh Road Rec? Maybe, there is, not sure?

Page 29 – "see maps on page xx for locations": xx to be replaced by 30?

Page 30 – see page 12 above.

Page 38 – line 2 of point a) 'n' missing from 'industrial'.

Page 40 – right side, line 5 'will be' in twice.

Page 44 – a definition problem here maybe. Are 'footways' the same as pavements? Do you want to widen and resurface footpaths?

Page 46 – prefix 'salt' in references to marshlands?

Page 48 – footnote to map that the path line indicated is not accurate.

Page 50 – the key to the map is accurate, but the wording refers to the green blocks as containing 'wetland'. This is not accurate as the wetlands are further west than the green block to the left of the map indicates.



## Email 23

Our biggest concern is the proposed development at Westwood, off Westbourne Avenue, which would be catastrophic in our opinion. The other issue I would like to express an opinion is Wemsfest and the attempt to establish a P.G. Wodehouse festival. Although I admire the efforts by Wemsfest, I feel that its productions became rather repetitious and then ceased with the death of Julian Sluggett. If there was a properly funded and professionally produced festival every five years to coincide with significant anniversaries of Wodehouse's birth, then this could be a tourist attraction for Emsworth and generate income.

1. The area of nonstrategic greenfield land adjacent to the rear boundaries of Westbourne Avenue is materially the very last vestige of open countryside that physically separates the neighbouring communities of Emsworth and Westbourne. This area of land supports a diverse range of wildlife and importantly serves an established number of uses such as cattle grazing and also serves the interests enjoyed by the residents of both communities, including walking (the only precious area left that links Westbourne with Emsworth's Town Centre and harbourside waterfront) and regular dog walking; as such it is a much used and much appreciated local amenity green space facility for leisure and recreation pursuits.
2. If planning policy for the avoidance of settlement coalescence is truly meaningful, it needs to be unreservedly applied to the green space/gap (Emsworth Corridor), for as already explained, the land in question is neither redundant nor unused but is essentially a daily active and functional local amenity shared by the two neighbouring communities. Since the land does not feature as a strategic site in the adopted Havant Housing Statement and also remains without any protective designation in the extant Local Plan, it is potentially vulnerable to prospective development as a "windfall" site. Development proposals should therefore be stringently resisted as being contrary to policy.
- 3 The overall narrow depth of the land is restricted by the adjacent east and west boundaries defined respectively by the River Ems and the already intensively developed area westward from Westbourne Avenue and which would likely pose

<p>difficulties to develop satisfactorily. Apart from the principle of development, flood risk and impacts on wildlife would likely present mitigation problems; resultant increased local traffic would also be a serious concern.</p> <p>4. The plain and indisputable truth is that Emsworth simply cannot take any further residential/population growth, further traffic congestion and the severe inconvenience caused by the already existing intensified on-road parking, than has already been committed.</p> <p>Development of the land would cause significant and irreversible harm, resulting in undesirable and unjustifiable coalescence.</p>	
<p>Email 24</p> <p>Thank you for such a great presentation at the ERA meeting. You are so patience with all the questions.</p> <p>I am writing in ref to the idea of doing something with the roundabout. I run the Emsworth in Bloom Community Project and many people have asked me if we could do anything to take over the roundabout planting.</p> <p>Mr Borland who sponsors it was happy to fall in with any ideas. We have only discussed it at this stage as it brings up all sorts of problems Public Liability ( although we do have 10 million pounds of Public Liability Insurance) we would probably need more.</p> <p>The idea of a completely new system of traffic control at this roundabout really appeals as it does cut off the North Emsworth from South.</p> <p>At the moment it is so scruffy all the wood cladding is coming off the concrete planters and the pavoir bricks are full of weeds. The council only seem to afford a few scruffy petunias in the summer In the winter is it empty. Not a good advert for Emsworth in Bloom.</p>	<p>This scheme is likely to take several years to be implemented.</p>

<p>We do not want to go down the road of raising the money to do something about the present roundabout IF there really is a possibility of complete change. So we need to liaise on this subject.</p> <p>You are doing a Great JOB . A LOT OF WORK THAT I OFTEN FEEL RESIDENTS TAKE FOR GRANTED !!!</p> <p>Ref all the housing I do like most residents, worry about the town coping with such high density building. We just have to keep our eyes on the ball and make sure the developers do listen to residents.</p>	
<p>Email from stubo_wills@yahoo.com</p> <p>I like the plans, all except the desired/suggested location of the GP surgery. It simply is not appropriate on so many levels. The GP has to stay in town somehow and that should absolutely be a priority in my view.</p> <p>Many thanks for your hard work and I love the plan for the roundabout, it will be a real feature.</p>	

## Email 25

Having read the Email of 7th November, I visited the Community centre to look at the details, as suggested. I was disappointed that what details existed were ensconced within a somewhat voluminous document ( shades of management consultancy) and there was no schematic drawing of the suggested hub at the A259. The latter being what I really wished to see as it sounded successful but was difficult to comprehend, this even after watching the Poynton video.. It took me c 20 minutes to go through the volume, and this by skipping once I had the gist of a page. The questionnaire could only be answered meaningfully if one referred back to the manuscript question by question.. There was only one Plan copy available, and I doubt if you will get many questionnaires answered in a reliable manner.

I apologise for appearing somewhat damning. I am conscious that volunteers have put many hours into it all, and I nothing. I am relatively new to the area having moved here from Somerset 4 years ago. I felt that as a newcomer I would have little to contribute and that it was hardly my place or right. In fact though I think my years in Somerset do give me something to contribute, and I bring this out in items below as I try to be a little more constructive.

The plan reads that Emsworth is a nice place to live and that we all want to keep it nice. It recognizes that there are early signs that the town centre shows signs of beginning to die. Shops are not thriving and the Banks have all “upsticks” and departed, we are not going to get them back, certainly not in the form of the past.. It recognizes that the busy A259 splits the town into North and South, and as more housing is built between here and Havant the centre of gravity moves further North. What can be done?

The report suggests the improvement of N/S connection of a Poynton type scheme at the A259 link. This is a very positive idea but it needs to be taken to an initial drawing stage that people can pore over. It should be done as an Ideal at which to aim, even ignoring some of the obvious impracticalities that have to be overridden. I do suspect that the traffic volume here is higher than Poynton, and that single lane will not suffice here. There is a double lane/ double roundabout system in the Kingston/Esher

area of South London, known as “The Scilly Isles”. It handles quite massive traffic seemingly successfully ; but I don’t think I would dare cross the road there! Make as much Car Park space as possible and make it Free, or at least the first couple of hours Free. I cite the little town of Castle Cary in Somerset (much smaller than Emsworth) which has a fair selection of shops, no sizeable Supermarket, but did have a Free and accessible Public Car Park. We lived in a modest village 7 miles equidistant from Cary, Wincanton (another small town) and Yeovil (about the size of Havant).. For really major shopping we went to Yeovil, but it was not a relaxing experience and always involved finding a car park and space in it. For quick pleasant shopping we went to Cary as it was so easy.

With the impending build of many houses between Emsworth and Havant this town’s shops need to capture a fair portion of the extra trade rather than it go to Havant. There will also be an additional employment need in the area. It would be beneficial to develop an Industrial Estate in, or close to, the town, this primarily for smaller companies. Ideally this would be on the East side of town ( no doubt raising some extra difficulties because it is Sussex). Hopefully this would feed Trade into the town centre.

I quote Somerset again where many small towns felt a similar pinch to Emsworth. The town of Wincanton almost died on it’s feet in the 1970’s. it relied on two large employers and the A303 which passed through the town bringing trade.. One employer closed its factory, one gradually moved to the midlands, and the A303 was relocated to by pass the town. It did not die it boomed. The council built several Industrial estates which rapidly filled. Morrison and Lidl built Supermarkets, all with Free parking, and recently a newly built hotel has opened.

Email 26

Which part of the plan could be improved?

More demographic information about Emsworth's population, its distribution, age and employment would be useful as background to later statements. To complete the picture the mix of present housing stock, average house prices, travel to work areas, median income levels and employment, glossary of planning terms and an index of associated documents and information sources

Vision statement: Most advice on creating vision statements stresses the need to keep them short. Examples, WWF: We seek to save a planet, a world of life. Reconciling the needs of human beings and the needs of others that share the Earth... The Nature Conservancy: To leave a sustainable world for future generations. (8) Westbourne NP: Our community vision is for Westbourne Parish to continue to thrive as a vibrant and distinctive community: There are six statements in this section of the draft and it's not clear which one is THE vision statement and so perhaps the six may need editing down to one

NP Objectives: The public consultation process included a 20-question survey to which 224 members of the Forum responded but whether this group was truly representative of a community of approximately 5000 households covering a population of over 12000 remains debatable as a representative evidence base. For example, were any steps taken to contact hard to reach groups or to ensure the respondents were broadly in line with Emsworth's age, gender etc distribution profile? It's also not clear to me how the ten objectives connect with the six vision statements.

Policy C1 Community & Public Services Hub: The site or sites around which these policies are focused are prime locations for potential future residential development. Emsworth doctors have already indicated they cannot afford the conversion and rental costs of adapting the former cottage hospital to become a replacement surgery

for the totally inadequate one nearby, Two thirds of the population live north of the railway line so a new surgery in the old hospital might be central for some but, by no means, for most of its customers. As for the hub proposal Emsworth already has a social hub based around the community centre augmented in recent times by the Baptist church facilities opposite.

Policy C2 High St food & drink uses: I support this. The mix of retail outlets is primarily dictated by market forces rather than planning policy. As for supporting applications for food and drink the town already has a wide choice of outlets and earlier shopping surveys by the Emsworth Market Towns Initiative published in 2009 which had almost 300 responses indicated other preferences among the shopping public. The policy should include thoughts on how Emsworth would prepare and respond to a changing High St environment covered at length in the work of retail guru Mary Portas. Restrictions on what businesses can and cannot trade in a high town centres are largely unenforceable and also send out negative signals to potential investors

Policy C3: I Support this. Strong urban design and choice of street furniture, use of space and the right materials, contribute to the quality of public space and accessibility in line with the Civic Trust guidance given in their highly respected and well established award scheme.

Policy C4 Public realm design: There few/no children play facilities south of the railway bridge where a third of population of Emsworth live. As the report says there already much going on in Emsworth and probably much more than in most Havant wards. Easy access to Chichester and the Spring in Havant add to the range of residents leisure choices.

Policy C5 Green spaces: I support this. As much of the town's surrounding green space and green corridors are set to disappear over the next 20 years this is a vitally important policy. The list shown has significant omissions. For example the land in and around the Sussex Border Path (currently threatened with development) and the

town's allotments off Warblington Road and Washington Road near Emsworth Primary School.

Policy L1 General housing: Shaping development within local districts was one of the major reasons why Neighbourhood Planning was launched in 2011. Clearly aspirations on housing sites within the NP area have been overtaken by new planning events with the publication of the Havant Council's Housing Statement in 2016 and this is acknowledged but the Draft doesn't explain how the Neighbourhood Plan can influence future housing policies over and above what's shown in the emerging Local Plan

Policy L2 Housing mix: I Support this. To a great extent this policy have been superseded by recent decisions affecting the former Emsworth Gap making the prospects of avoiding coalescence somewhat uncertain to say the least. There are also the views of another important stakeholder, namely, the residents of Denvilles who are not part of the Emsworth NP.

Policy W1 Employment premises: I Support this. mostly covered by Emsworth Design Statement I assume

Policy W2 Strong economy: Emsworth has a small and fairly robust service and retail sector catering for local needs. It is also part of the Portsmouth and Chichester travel to work areas. The town is neighbourhood shopping centre and part of the regional facilities of Havant and Chichester Thus the local economy, youth training etc is part of the wider picture affecting Emsworth and other area over which the Neighbourhood Plan is likely to have little significant influence.

Policy W3 Change of use: Support

Policy W4 Technology and Tourism: Encouragement of tourism needs to be tinged with realism since the town centre, although attractive, has very limited space for active development of the facilities to cater for increases in tourist traffic, including



hotel capacity and car parking. Taken to extremes tourism can degrade the very same attractions that encourages it.

Policy W5 Home working: I Support this. Home working is an important feature of modern employment and adequate broadband a major dependency. Hot desking is another feature setting aside space for locally based professionals, many young and some retired, to hire facilities by the day.

Policy M1 New civic space: With new developments including a new spine road from the strategic area the A259 will become busier. Traffic speeds are likely to slow so additional safety measures for cyclists and pedestrian are top priorities. The case study roundabout in Poynton cost over £4m when created in 2012. A similar one for Emsworth could cost even more and is unlikely to be approved simply to help join two halves of the town together. Options for achieving more shared space should be pursued through feasibility studies with the county council and Highways Authority.

Policy M2/3/4 Pedestrians and cycling: Given the layout of the town centre opportunities for pavement widening are limited and should be specified. Substantial investments have been made over years in providing better cycling facilities so this policy is being implemented by the District Council

Policy WF1 Public enjoyment of Waterfront: I Support this. I prefer 'harbour side' and 'coast rather than 'waterfront'

Policies H1 & H2 Design and heritage: Support

Policy H3 Buildings of local interest: There are approximately 100 listed building in central Emsworth which do not include the buildings mentioned in this policy. There is already a wide choice of event venues in the town. The museum and fire station have character but if opportunities arise to add tasteful and appropriate development on these sites Emsworth they should be encouraged to consider them

Policy D1/2/3/4/5: Support. These have been fully covered in Emsworth Design

Statement (EDS) was published some years ago and is deemed by Havant Council to be a 'material consideration' in any planning application. Adding the EDS to the NP might strengthen its influence and is thus welcome.

Policy D6/7/8 Resource, roof rooms, light pollution: Support

Policy P1: This is a wish list which offers no routes through which the items listed can be delivered. Most would require funding which is unlikely to be found from public sources. It's not clear why such a list should be made part of Neighbourhood Plan when much of it is outside the scope of a planning document and the subject of public and/or private initiatives

Overall view: The new Neighbourhood Planning Act received Royal Assent in April this year. Presumably the Draft reflects the provision of the new legislation. As it stands the draft Emsworth Neighbourhood Plan (NP) fails to create for me a real sense of the look and feel of Emsworth as it might appear over the next decade or more or whatever planning horizon is envisaged in the NP. It's light on essential demographic data with rather too many vision statements and high on aspirations without suggesting the means by which they might be fulfilled.

Havant's new draft Local is scheduled to be submitted for consideration in December and it would be prudent to consider and possibly revise what it has to say and how it might impact on the content of Emsworth's NP before its submission to Havant District Council.

<p><b>Letter 1</b></p> <p>When I recently read the draft Emsworth Neighbourhood Plan I was concerned to see that there was no specific mention of the Countryside that borders the community in the East. This area which reaches down to the River Ems is one of natural beauty no less than the areas enjoying "protected" status. These meadows with their bountiful hedgerows surely constitute the essence of Englishness? Over the centuries countless metaphors, symbols and allegories have been employed to render such landscapes as a lost moral world of goodness and peace. The Westbourne church spire in the distance reminds us that we once attached sacred meanings to such a world. It is a world that is surely worth preserving from the imminent threat of developers! Clearly I have a vested interest in this matter but I hope you will see that my concern extends well beyond this. Please help me to preserve this cherished landscape.</p>	
<p><b>Email 27</b></p> <p>Sorry I couldn't get to the AGM last Saturday and that this communication is only just before the cut-off date/time. Truth to tell I've been beset with medical tests and practical household problems – but here we are: hopefully better late than never!! Firstly, you and your team are to be congratulated on the Draft Plan. Presentation, layout, clarity and text are excellent in my view.</p> <p>Unless I've missed something (!) there is little mention of specific projects or requirements; the document (plan) is more an analysis of the considerations and constraints which should (must?) be applied to future developments and planning applications in order to meet the needs, requirements and wishes of our local Emsworth Community within the constraints of available funding and overriding planning constraints such as the, quote, “emerging Havant Borough Council Local Plan 2036.”</p> <p>Before detailing and commenting on a few specific items which I think merit priority consideration I would like to formally point up some of the difficulties which interested parties may (will) have come across in attempting to respond to your request for comment. Perhaps you could consider these when preparing future questionnaires.</p>	<p>We recognise that answering all the questions required a great deal of time and commitment and are grateful to those who took the time to do so. The format of the questions follows the format recommended by our consultants.</p>

1. Length. The draft plan runs to 68 pages, the questionnaire to 10. A lot to take in and cross-refer on a computer screen; never mind laptop, iPad, etc.
2. On-line completion of questionnaire. My guess is that to provide a meaningful and honest response would take at least 10 hours: say a full week-end with a paper copy of the plan beside me and the questionnaire on-screen or on-paper. The big problem with on-screen completion is that if you 'press the wrong key' you may delete all that you've written(!) and if you switch the computer off and try to get back to your form the next day, you will have to fill it in again from scratch – the website doesn't retain your part-completed form once you come off-line.
3. Questionnaire questions. Questions such as No2, "Which part of the plan do you most like and why?" are like A-level or university-level questions!! Do you honestly think anyone could give a meaningful answer without an in-depth study and reasoned response? OR... (at random) No27, "What are your views on Policy H1 Design & Heritage? ~ Support? ~ Do not know? ~ Object? ~ Please expand on your answer if you wish." Thanks, but no thanks!! Prove me wrong: did you get several hundred detailed and useful answers? Several people have told me that they took one look at the questionnaire and put it back down!!  
In my view the ideal questionnaire poses simple, easy-to-answer questions such as "Put A, B, C, D and E in order of importance." OR... "Rate the following statements as: agree strongly, agree, neutral, disagree, disagree strongly." You could add a 'box' to "Add a comment if you wish." Done this way I can read the report, get the gist of it and zip through my answers fairly quickly.  
Suggested specific items which are or should be included in this plan.  
A. The Double Roundel suggestion to replace the A259 roundabout. Sounds a good idea. I lived near Poynton in Cheshire for over 20 years in the 1960s and 70s. Very similar to Emsworth in many respects: its population is older than the national average age, and it has grown from a one-time small mining (c.f. fishing) village to its present retirement and smart dormitory town for the likes of Stockport and Manchester. Now Google "poynton double roundel system" and look at some of the pictures down the page. It's enormous! Sorry it wouldn't fit where our roundabout

sits, not without demolishing one or more of the properties around it and/or cutting into the Memorial Garden. Now envisage some of the ultra-long delivery vehicles which frequent North Street and Seagull Lane trying to navigate (or should I suggest 'traverse') the two mini-roundabouts being suggested. And don't forget the tanks and troop-carriers that occasionally pass this way. See end of text for two of the pictures.

B. Health and Doctors. If the surgery moves to Westbourne then... a. We must guarantee regular public transport between there and Emsworth. b. I believe we should insist on Emsworth having an off-shoot surgery just as Westbourne does at the moment. When I raised this point at a public meeting Dr Chinwalla responded that "there was no money in the NHS/surgery plan for this." SORRY, NOT GOOD ENOUGH." c. We should strive for a (better) bus or mini-bus service to QA hospital and the Oak Park centre. Mini-busses can turn round at Oak Park.

C. Traffic Control and Crossings. I believe that we need... a. A 20 mph limit from the A259, up North Street until past the junction with New Brighton Rd. I live on this stretch of road, just where cars and motorbikes really put their foot down!! c. An extra pedestrian road-crossing is badly needed North of the station. This needs to be traffic-light-controlled and would be best sited between the bridges where the local (county?) council recently provided a dropped kerb cycle crossing point with "Tactiles" (those bobbly flags) to alert those with impaired vision where to cross. This is a much-used crossing point with good visibility in both direction – but not much use if you can't see or take a long time to cross with your limp and a stick or a pram and two children!! Go and see for yourselves!!

D. Public Toilet. There is no public toilet between the one in South Street and the one half way up Horndean Road. The station? Only open in the morning and, I think, only if there is someone there to open it. NOT GOOD ENOUGH for North Street shoppers, elderly people, expectant mothers, those with small children and visitors arriving/leaving by train. WE REALLY DO NEED a public toilet North of the A259. My best suggestion is at the northern end of the Palmers Road car park, near the glass and clothing bins.

E. The site of the now-demolished gas holder. (Gasometer to some!) This is a large

site, up for sale and (re-) development. There is only one vehicle access point which is off the north east corner of the Palmers Road complex. The site could easily accommodate 50 housing units in three storey blocks resulting in 50-100 vehicles. Most would go off to work and return during rush hours, all fighting to get into or off North Street down the narrow east-west legs of Palmers Road, usually clogged with parked cars and ultra-long Tesco delivery vehicles. I DON'T THINK THE PLAN MENTIONS ANY POTENTIAL PROBLEMS ASSOCIATED WITH THIS SITE'S DEVELOPMENT.

F. Correction needed. The map on page 26 of the Plan identifies one of the pink buildings as "Post Office" This is a very misleading error; it took me a couple of minutes to get my bearings on the map. The post office is in the Co-op store, south of the A259. The building in question is properly called (so they told me when I enquired) The [Royal Mail] Delivery Office or, if you prefer, Sorting Office. But "Post Office" it is not and never has been. PLEASE CORRECT THE MAP.

Letter from Gladman Developments Ltd.

Re: Emsworth Neighbourhood Plan Regulation 14 consultation Introduction pre- submission version of the Emsworth Neighbourhood Plan (ENP). Gladman specialise in the promotion of strategic land for residential development with associated community infrastructure.

Gladman has considerable experience in the development industry across a number of sectors, including residential and employment development. From that experience, we understand the need for the planning system to provide local communities with the homes and jobs that are needed to ensure residents have access to the homes and employment opportunities that are required to meet future development needs of the area and contribute towards sustainable economic development.

Through these representations, Gladman provides an analysis of the ENP and the policy decisions currently being promoted within the Plan. Comments made by Gladman through these representations are provided in consideration of the E established by paragraph 8(2) of Schedule 4b of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) and supported by the Neighbourhood Plan chapter of the Planning Practice Guidance<sup>1</sup> (PPG).

Legal requirements

Before a neighbourhood plan can proceed to referendum it must be tested against a set of basic conditions set out in paragraph 8(2) of Schedule 4b of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended). The Basic Conditions that the ENP must meet are as follows:

- a) Having regard to national policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State, it is appropriate to make the order.
- d) The making of the order contributes to the achievement of sustainable development.
- e) The making of the order is in general conformity with the strategic policies contained in the development plan for the area of the authority (or any part of that area).
- f) The making of the order does not breach, and is otherwise compatible with, EU

obligations.

1 Section ID: 41

National Planning Policy Framework

how these are expected to be applied. In doing so it provides guidance on the requirement for the preparation of neighbourhood plans to be in general conformity with the strategic priorities for the wider area and defines the role which neighbourhood plans can play in delivering sustainable development.

which, as outlined in paragraph 14, should be seen as a golden thread running through both plan-making and decision taking. For plan-making this means that plan makers should positively seek opportunities to meet the development needs of their area and Local Plans should meet Objectively Assessed Needs (OAN) for housing, with sufficient flexibility to adapt to rapid change.

This requirement is also applicable to neighbourhood plans.

Paragraph 16 of the Framework makes clear that the presumption in favour has implications for how communities engage in neighbourhood planning, stating that neighbourhoods should;

- Plan positively to support local development, shaping and directing development in their area that is outside the strategic elements of the Local Plan; and
- Identify opportunities to use Neighbourhood Development Orders to enable developments that are consistent

Furthermore, paragraph 17 sets out that neighbourhood plans should define a succinct and positive vision for the future of the area and that neighbourhood plans should provide a practical framework within which decisions on planning applications can be made with a high degree of predictability and efficiency. In addition, neighbourhood plans should seek to proactively drive and support sustainable economic development to deliver the homes, jobs and thriving local places that the country needs, whilst responding positively to the wider opportunities for growth. Further guidance for groups involved with the production of neighbourhood plans is specified at paragraph 184;



set of tools for local people to ensure that they get the right types of development for their community. The ambition of the neighbourhood should be aligned with the strategic needs and priorities of the wider local area. Neighbourhood plans must be in general conformity with the strategic policies of the Local Plan. To facilitate this, local planning authorities should set out clearly their strategic policies for the area and ensure that an up-to-date Local Plan is in place as quickly as possible. Neighbourhood plans should reflect these policies and neighbourhoods should plan positively to support them. Neighbourhood plans and orders should not promote less development than set out in the Local Plan or undermine

This makes clear that the ambition of the neighbourhood plan should be aligned with the strategic needs and priorities of the wider area as confirmed in the adopted Development Plan. It is therefore important that sufficient flexibility is included within the Plan so that it is able to respond positively to changing circumstances which can arise through the preparation of any future emerging Local Plan.

Plans, including policies for housing and economic development;

#### Planning Practice Guidance

It is clear from the requirements in the Framework that neighbourhood plan policies should be prepared in general conformity with the strategic requirements for the wider areas, as confirmed in an adopted Development Plan. The requirements set out in the Framework have now been supplemented by the publication of Planning Practice Guidance (PPG).

On the 11th February 2016, the Secretary of State (SoS) published a series of updates to the neighbourhood planning chapter of the PPG. In summary, these updated a number of component parts of the evidence base that are required to support an emerging neighbourhood plan.

This guidance is intended to ensure that emerging evidence of housing need is addressed, to in turn help to minimise any potential conflicts which can arise and ensure that policies are not overridden by a new Local Plan or subsequent Site Allocations Local Plan.

On the 19th May 2016, the SoS published a further set of updates to the neighbourhood planning chapter of the PPG.2 The update also emphasised that; areas and so blanket policies restricting housing development in some settlements and preventing other settlements from expanding should be avoided unless their use can be

3

Accordingly, the ENP will need to ensure that it takes into account the latest guidance issued by the SoS so that it can be found to meet basic condition (a).

Relationship to Local Plan

Adopted Development Plan

The current adopted plan that covers the Neighbourhood Plan area and the development plan which the ENP will be tested against, is the Havant Local Plan Core Strategy (adopted 2011) and the Allocations Local Plan (adopted 2014). However, it is important to note that the Council are in the process of undertaking a review of the adopted Core Strategy. It is therefore important that the ENP allows for sufficient flexibility so that it is not ultimately superseded by the emerging Local Plan as s38(5) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 states that:

If to any extent a policy contained in a development plan for an area conflicts with another policy in the development plan the conflict must be resolved in favour of the policy which is contained in the last document to be adopted, approved or published (as the case may be).

Emsworth Neighbourhood Plan

Context

This section highlights the key issues that Gladman would like to raise with regards to the content of the ENP as currently proposed. It is considered that some policies do not reflect the requirements of national policy and guidance. In this regard, Gladman have therefore sought to recommend a series of alternative options that should be explored prior to the Plan being submitted for Independent Examination.

2 Paragraph: 084 Reference ID: 41-084-20160519 (Revised 19/05 2016) 3 Paragraph: 044 Reference ID: 41-044-20160519 (Revised 19/05/2016).

## Policies

### Policy C5: Designated Green Spaces

Gladman does not consider Policy C5 to be in compliance with the basic conditions as it seeks to refuse development that may cause harm to environment or habitats of the neighbourhood area and could be used as applying to areas beyond that identified as Local Green Space (LGS) designations. As currently worded, it does not therefore provide a clear indication of how a decision maker should react to a development proposal contrary to paragraph 154 of the Framework

Furthermore, it is important to note that the policies contained in the neighbourhood plan do not have the ability to refuse development proposals as this responsibility falls solely to the local planning authority who must consider the merits of a development proposal through the planning balance exercise.

Furthermore, in order to designate land as LGS the Parish Council must ensure that it is able to demonstrate robust evidence to meet national policy requirements set out in the Framework. The Framework makes clear at §76 that the role of local communities seeking to designate land as LGS should be consistent with the local planning of sustainable development for the wider area. Paragraph 76 states that: areas of particular importance to them. By designating land as Local Green Space local communities will be able to rule out new development other than in very special circumstances. Identifying land as Local Green Space should therefore be consistent with the local planning of sustainable development and complement investment in sufficient homes, jobs and other essential services. Local Green Spaces should only be designated when a

Further guidance is provided at §77 which sets out three tests that must be met for the designation of LGS and states that:

should only be used:

- Where the green space is reasonably close proximity to the community it serves;
- Where the green area is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty, historic significance,

recreation value (including as a playing field), tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and  
 -Where the green area concerned is local in character and  
 It is therefore clear that in order to designate land as LGS, the parcel of land must meet all three tests identified above.

**Policy L1: General Housing Policy**

In principle, Gladman support the approach that new housing will be permitted as contained within the Havant Local Plan. However, the recent Housing White Paper confirms that Local Plans will need to be reviewed at least every 5 years. As such, it is important that the policy refers to any subsequent Local Plan to ensure that the policy remains up-to-date.

Further, we do not support the inclusion of a specific affordable housing dwelling requirement as affordable housing need may change as new evidence becomes available. Accordingly, it is considered that reference to the 40% affordable housing requirement is deleted and is instead modified to read

they deliver opportunities for affordable housing

Gladman is also concerned over the statement made that roofscapes identified in the Emsworth Conservation Area Character Appraisal (March 2010).

important that the policy allows for a degree of flexibility through the use of a criteria based approach relating to landscape views.

**Policy L3: Walking Distances**

In principle, Gladman support the inclusion of the above policy but would recommend that the reference

of 800m from origin to destination is removed from the supporting text. The ENP correctly identifies the most up-to-date guidance on acceptable walking distances however this guidance suggests that accessibility to services can be extended to a preferred maximum distance of 1,200m and the policy should instead refer to the preferred maximum walking distances contained in national guidance.

**Policy L5: Avoiding Settlement Coalescence**

This policy seeks to avoid coalescence of settlements and development will only be permitted if they do not impinge on the current gaps between Emsworth and its neighbouring settlements nor encroach on the protected landscape area to the north. Gladman consider that this is a strategic issue that should only be considered through the Local Plan process, if this policy is to be retained then the key consideration of the policy is whether development would erode the visual separation between settlements. Gladman submit that the wording of the policy should be altered to allow for a balancing exercise to be undertaken which assesses any harm to the visual or functional separation of settlements against the benefits of the proposal.

Conclusions

Gladman hopes you have found these representations helpful and constructive and would welcome the ability to assist in the Parish Council in preparing the neighbourhood plan prior to its submission under Regulation 15.

If you have any questions do not hesitate to contact me or one of the Gladman team.

Yours faithfully,

John Fleming

Gladman Developments Ltd.

<p>Letter from Turley</p> <p><b>EMSWORTH NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN</b> Ref: ASHR3002</p> <p>We write on behalf of our client, Markfield Investments Ltd, in respect of the current consultation on the Emsworth Neighbourhood Plan Pre-Submission Version (November 2017). Our client has important land interests in the Neighbourhood Plan area, in particular SHLAA Site UE11, Land west of Emsworth which has previously been promoted through the Local Plan process for residential and/or retirement living development.</p> <p>We note that the Neighbourhood Plan does not propose any site allocations and instead proposes policies which will seek to guide the form of development when sites are allocated for development through a new Local Plan for Havant. It is considered that this is an appropriate approach which will help to ensure the Neighbourhood Plan is not rendered quickly out of date following the adoption of the Havant Local Plan in due course.</p> <p>In following this approach it is important however that the Neighbourhood Plan does not prejudice the future delivery of development in the Plan area, and provides sufficient flexibility to respond to the emerging requirements of the Havant Local Plan and changing circumstances in the years ahead.</p> <p>In this regard we make the following observations on a number of emerging Neighbourhood plan policies:</p> <p>Policy C5 of the draft Neighbourhood Plan proposes to designate the following green spaces as 'Local Green Spaces':</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Brook Meadow Nature Reserve</li> <li>• Hollybank Woods</li> <li>• Nore Barn Woods</li> <li>• Peter's Pond (part of)</li> <li>• Slipper Millpond</li> <li>• Emsworth Millpond</li> </ul>	<p>Noted</p>
--	--------------

• Chichester Harbour AONB (part of).  
 With regards to these areas, the Policy states:  
 “a) Planning applications for development that may cause significant harm to the designated green spaces, natural environment or habitats of the neighbourhood plan area will be refused.  
 b) New development proposals that detract from the visual, historic, recreational, landscape or ecological value of designated green spaces will not be supported.”  
 Concern is raised that by seeking to designate locations as Local Green Space the Neighbourhood Plan is seeking to artificially restrict potential development sites in locations around the settlement. It is important that the Neighbourhood Plan allows sufficient flexibility to ensure it is able to respond to emerging requirements as work on the new Havant Local Plan progresses.  
 As shown on the supporting plans, our client’s site to the west of Emsworth is proposed for designation as a Local Green Space forming the ‘Chichester Harbour AONB (part of)’ site.  
 Paragraph 76 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) establishes the principle of the identification of Local Green Spaces through Neighbourhood Plans. Paragraph 77 of the NPPF provides further guidance on the designation of Local Green Spaces and states that:  
 “The Local Green Space designation will not be appropriate for most green areas or open space. The designation should only be used:  
 • where the green space is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves;  
 • where the green area is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty, historic significance, recreational value (including as a playing field), tranquillity or richness of its wildlife;  
 and  
 • where the green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land.” The supporting text to the Neighbourhood Plan identifies the following justification for the proposed designation of the Local Green Spaces:

“The Emsworth Neighbourhood Plan has identified this network of green infrastructure and open spaces through the town, linked to the surrounding countryside, that the community use for enjoyment and have a wildlife benefit and value. They are afforded Local Green Space designation here to protect them into the future... These have been considered worthy for inclusion due to their value to Emsworth based on the following five criteria:

- Beauty – A place of aesthetic beauty that adds to the visual qualities of the town.
- History – A place with significant historical importance for the town.
- Recreation – A place which offers formal or informal recreation and sporting opportunities for residents and visitors.
- Tranquillity – A place that offers an escape from everyday urban noise and activity.
- Wildlife – A place that provides a haven for wildlife, both animals and plants.”

In respect of our client’s site at land west of Emsworth, it is identified as having been proposed for

designation due to the following three criteria:

- Beauty
- Tranquillity
- Wildlife.

With respects to ‘beauty’, the Neighbourhood Plan defines this as a “place of aesthetic beauty that adds to the visual qualities of the town.” The site is designated as forming part of the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and as such in accordance with the requirements of the NPPF is afforded a high level of protection. However, whilst our client’s site is designated as forming part of the AONB, it has a close relationship to the adjoining settlement. Existing built development bounds the site to both the north and east and the site is considered to read as part of the existing settlement. The site is not publically accessible although a public footpath runs along its western boundary. The public footpath is well screened from the site by existing vegetation and as such the site is not perceived as forming part of the wider AONB. Whilst the northern boundary of the site is relatively clear of vegetation the site is perceived in combination with the existing settlement and long distance views



across the remainder of the site to the Harbour are prevented by intervening vegetation.

The northern parcel of the site is comprised of paddocks used for the grazing of horses and as such is not an untouched natural landscape and is therefore of a significantly different character to the remainder of the AONB. The southern parcels are actively farmed so again do not form an untouched landscape. As such it is considered that the site does not meet the 'beauty' criteria for the Local Green Space designation.

The Neighbourhood Plan defines 'tranquillity' as being demonstrated by a "place that offers an escape from everyday urban noise and activity." As discussed above, whilst a public footpath runs along the western boundary of the site there is no public access to the site and as such the site cannot be considered a place that offers an escape. Furthermore the public footpath is located in close proximity to the existing settlement and Havant Road to the north and as such it is considered that this is an area where everyday urban noise and activity will be experienced, not a place that offers an escape from the experience of these. For these reasons it is considered that the site does not meet the requirements in respect of tranquillity.

With regards to 'wildlife', the Neighbourhood Plan defines qualifying sites as a "place that provides a haven for wildlife, both animals and plants." As discussed above the northern parcel of the site is used for the grazing of horses and the southern parcel is used actively for arable farming. It is therefore considered to be of limited ecological value. Whilst there are features such as existing trees and hedgerows within the wider site which may be of some ecological value, these would be of no more value than found in many countryside locations and is considered insufficient justification to designate the site as a Local Green Space. It is acknowledged that the southern portion of the site is designated as a Site of Important Nature Conservation and as such has been recognised as being of ecological value. This is however considered to be further justification as to why the site should not be designated as Local Green Space given the site is already subject to existing levels of protection.

For the reasons outlined above we do not consider that the site meets the criteria

<p>which the Neighbourhood Plan Forum has itself created for the designation of Local Green Spaces.</p> <p>The site clearly does not meet the criteria outlined in the NPPF for when sites should be considered for designation as a Local Green Space, and furthermore the site is already subject to designations which mean that the additional designation as a Local Green Space is unnecessary.</p> <p>We trust that the Neighbourhood Plan Forum will consider the above comments in the next stages of development of the Plan and we look forward to continuing to engage with this process. Should you require any clarification of the comments made or wish to discuss in further detail please contact us.</p> <p>Yours sincerely          Donna Palmer          Associate Director          donna.palmer@turley.co.uk</p>	
<p>Letter from The Slipper Mill Pond Preservation Association welcomes the consolidation of the many policy documents in circulation but fears that following attached section of the official Havant Borough Council's borough plan which shows the Borough and County boundary as a thin green line. Our area of interest starts in the South following the West side of Slipper Mill Pond bank, includes Chequers Quay and crosses Queen Street then along the perimeter of the Lillywhite's Garage to cross the A259.</p> <p>There is no mention of consultation with West Sussex County Council, Chichester District Council and Southbourne Parish Council as well as Chichester Harbour Conservancy. All could have comments to make to support the Plan.</p> <p>Introduction</p> <p>Page 12 includes reference to both Slipper and Peter Ponds which lie in West Sussex and are administered by Chichester District Council. Since they are both 'Sites of Nature Conservation Interest' they are, in effect, a 'Protected Environment' The</p>	

paragraph on page 12 states: *“Although not designated, the Slipper Mill Pond on the east of the town centre and Peter’s Pond which flows into it, are both important habitats for birdlife as well as other flora and fauna. These environmentally valuable areas provide an important framework for the town as well as offering considerable recreational opportunities.”* Note that the pond and its banks are private property that offers opportunities for “informal recreational” use but is not a public space.

Policy C5 Designated Green Spaces p 29

Slipper Mill Pond lies in West Sussex so does not fall within the scope of this report  
Natural England’s “England Coastal Path” project

Coastal Path P 48

The plan is indicative of the route proposed in and is grossly incorrect. The detail along to the East of King Street and Dolphin Creek is unrealistic and should reflect HBC public footpaths. The designated path runs along the West side of Slipper Pond on the top of the bank.

The pious hopes expressed in this section ARE NOT the policy currently adopted by HBC. The recent approval by the Council of the Dolphin Quay development can be considered as meeting some of the criteria but has disregarded the reasonable access to the small marina at the head of the creek.

Even more alarming is HBC ignoring its impact on the view from the East affecting residents and visitors who choose not to walk along the footpath along the pond's bank. This was shamefacedly admitted at the HBC approval meeting and is in complete contradiction with the sentiments of these sections.

Policy P1 p 63

There no inclusion of a plan showing existing Tree Preservation Orders and Trees of Interest listed by the Co-ordinator Havant Borough TreeWardens?

Email from Sheila Morris, Emsworth in Bloom:

I am writing in ref to the idea of doing something with the roundabout. I run the Emsworth in Bloom Community Project and many people have asked me if we could do anything to take over the roundabout planting.

Mr Borland who sponsors it was happy to fall in with any ideas. We have only discussed it at this stage as it brings up all sorts of problems Public Liability ( although we do have 10 million pounds of Public Liability Insurance) we would probably need more.

The idea of a completely new system of traffic control at this roundabout really appeals as it does cut off the North Emsworth from South.

At the moment it is so scruffy all the wood cladding is coming off the concrete planters and the pavior bricks are full of weeds. The council only seem to afford a few scruffy petunias in the summer In the winter is it empty. Not a good advert for Emsworth in Bloom.

We do not want to go down the road of raising the money to do something about the present roundabout IF there really is a possibility of complete change. So we need to liaise on this subject.

You are doing a Great JOB . A LOT OF WORK THAT I OFTEN FEEL RESIDENTS TAKE FOR GRANTED !!!

Ref all the housing I do like most residents, worry about the town coping with such high density building. We just have to keep our eyes on the ball and make sure the developers do listen to residents.

Letter from MAISEMORE GARDENS LIMITED

Response from the Directors of Maisemore Gardens Ltd to the Neighbourhood Plan drawn up by the Emsworth Forum. December 2017

Background

Maisemore Gardens Ltd (MGL) is a company that manages the leasehold of 74 properties in Maisemore Gardens, which lies on the western edge of Emsworth, south of the A259. It abuts the shore and the AONB area on its western flank.

Directors commend the Emsworth Forum on the work behind the publication of this document and hope that the feedback they receive is from a large cohort of the population eligible to respond. We hope you achieve a 'broad-based consensus'.

The estate of Maisemore itself does not figure in the Neighbourhood Plan and the Directors of MGL have confined their comments to the more immediate area around Maisemore Gardens and the western part of town's built up area. We have also made comments on community facilities, but not on matters that are better left to individuals for their comments.

Feedback on the Neighbourhood Plan from Maisemore Gardens Ltd

(Please note yellow highlighted text is drawing attention to presentational matters rather than comments on Policies)

Emsworth Today pp10-12

On P 12 'The Horsefield' is mentioned in the text, but on the map Brook Farm is marked. The two are the same area. Not everyone has this level of local knowledge. The map does not have a key so the different areas with differing levels of protection are not clear. The area north of Nore Barn Woods is AONB – this needs to be clear from the key. (The map also, incidentally confuses Brook Meadows and Lumley Meadow – with one name on the map and the more commonly used name in the text.) The map also labels an area 'Conigar Point Meadows' – this label seems misplaced. The blue areas on the map may all be SINCs (although there are others – eg S of Nore Barn Woods) but other designated areas (eg SSSI etc) should also be mapped here. These protected areas are key to understanding the unique character of Emsworth.

**P17 Map**

This map needs a key – there are three shades of green. Somewhere in your Plan it needs to be pointed out that Nore Barn Woods is owned by Havant Borough Council and is a public open space. It would be helpful to name Nore Barn Woods on this map.

**P21**

Item 7 ‘Ensure that land made available for new development will be developed in such a way as to improve people’s quality of life, for both new and existing residents’ suggest adding ‘while avoiding protected environments and habitats such as AONB designated land as much as possible.’

Item 9 ‘Protect and enhance Emsworth’s unique linear waterfront for use both by current and future generations’ The Directors of MGL strongly support this statement

**COMMUNITY**

P29 Policies C5 a, b and c. The Directors of MGL support these.

(Comment – the map showing Nore BARN Woods on P 30 has the name of the woods incorrectly.)

**LIVING P32-36**

L1 The Directors support this Policy

L5 Directors fully support the Policy of no housing development on the southern side of the A259 on the AONB/Horse field west of Emsworth, or any further west in order to preserve the gap between Emsworth and Denvilles.

**WATERFRONT**

Map P 50. Labelling the Green area ‘Field’ is too simplistic and again fails to mention in the text the Public Open Space (Nore Barn Woods) to the west, which is a key area attracting people to walk along the waterfront path from Emsworth, especially dog walkers.

**P51 POLICY WF1 –**

a) and b) We suggest some rewording might be considered here to clarify.

Policy WF1 c) The Directors of MGL support this section of Policy. We assume this is a reference to the projected Upgrade Project at the approach to Nore Barn Woods to raise the path above the high tide levels and replace the failing bridge with a higher

<p>one. The seawall of Maisemore Gardens estate is owned by MGL. Directors would fully support the extension westwards of the path along this wall, subject to sight of detailed plans and reassurances of any contractors on the careful management and maintenance of attachments to the seawall.</p> <p>HERITAGE and DESIGN</p> <p>The Directors feel no need to comment on these two sections as they have been addressed by other experts more fully – eg Chichester Harbour Conservancy’s submission. Within Maisemore Gardens we are investigating Conservation Area status as a way of protecting the heritage and design of our own immediate environment.</p>	
<p>Friends of Nore Barn Woods Comments: (1) Strongly support policy C5 of Nore Barn Woods being a green space; (2) Support policy WF1 to deliver the England Coast Path in principle; and (3) Suggest a new policy to ensure sea defences are maintained westwards at least to Conigar Point.</p>	

## Responses from Statutory Consultees

Respondent	Response from Emsworth Forum
<p>Chichester Harbour Conservancy</p> <p>Further to your email dated 3.11.2017, The Conservancy has now considered the Draft Neighbourhood Plan. Thank you for giving The Conservancy the chance to comment. At its meeting today, The Conservancy's Planning Consultative Committee agreed to accept the Officer recommended adjustments to the Draft Emsworth Neighbourhood Plan (ENP), set out in <i>Appendix 1</i> to the attached report. Please consider these comments when preparing the next stage of the Plan. In addition to those comments, the Committee more generally wanted the forum to consider that the ENP should usefully:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More specifically convey the importance of the Chichester Harbour Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB).</li> </ul> <p>Indeed, paragraph 115 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF – 2012) stresses that plan makers and planning decision takers give great weight to conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of such areas. It was also confirmed by the Government in 2000, that such areas had equal importance as protected landscapes as National Parks.</p> <p>This would be greatly assisted by showing the boundary of the AONB on relevant maps throughout the ENP;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Simplify the first and second paragraphs after the p.11 heading 'Protected environments', to instead read –</li> </ul> <p><i>"Emsworth is within and immediately adjacent to a number of environmentally and sensitive and valuable areas, which have various levels of protection. Chichester Harbour Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) is designated</i></p>	<p>We agree that the AONB is extremely important for Emsworth and the conservation of its natural beauty.</p> <p>We have amended the maps to show the AONB where it is most relevant.</p> <p>We agree and have amended the Submission Draft Plan</p>



<p><i>for its attractive landscape under UK law. The whole harbour itself is a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) under UK law for its wide range of flora and fauna, and is both a Special Protection Area (SPA) for its birdlife and Special Area for Conservation (SAC) for its habitats under European law. Both these latter two designations are jointly referred to as the Solent Maritime European Site (SEMS). The same area is a Ramsar site, recognised internationally as an important wetland.”;</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recognise that Emsworth is noted as the largest settlement that is part of and historically related to the Chichester Harbour AONB;</li> <li>• Point to the policy context which the ENP is compliant with. This might best be done by having a matrix under each Policy wording, referring to relevant parts of the NPPF, NPPG, Development Plan, Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD) and other published guidance pertaining to the Plan Area (including the Emsworth Design Statement, 2008). For an example of this, please go to p.10 of –</li> </ul> <p><a href="http://www.conservancy.co.uk/assets/assets/Planning%20Principles_2016_final.pdf">http://www.conservancy.co.uk/assets/assets/Planning%20Principles_2016_final.pdf</a></p> <p>Whilst The Conservancy’s Planning Principles are not statutory planning guidance, it may be helpful for developers to have regard to them in preparing proposals within the AONB.</p> <p>For example, Policy CS12 from the Havant Borough Core Strategy (2001) clarifies that regard must be had to meeting the aims of the Chichester Harbour Conservancy AONB Management Plan 2014-2019.</p> <p>Also, just this year in fact, Havant Borough Council adopted jointly with Chichester District Council, design guidance for the AONB as a SPD. Whilst it is clear that SPD is only applied within the AONB, CS12 assesses the impact of new development on the AONB, <i>and</i> its setting; and,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• That the ENP should recognise that employment land is an important part the</li> </ul>	<p>This will be covered in the Basic Conditions Statement that we are required to produce</p> <p>Havant’s Local Plan already addresses this</p> <p>This is covered by the Havant Local Plan. We do not think it is necessary to repeat it in the Emsworth Neighbourhood</p>
---	---

<p>settlement and to identify the industrial land concentrations and Havant Borough Council’s employment land allocations from the Development Plan on a map, relating to the text on page 37 and perhaps the plan on page 17.</p> <p>As a final point, in deciding the Plan Area, The Conservancy is surprised that this did not include that part of the Emsworth Channel, which is within Emsworth Ward.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Steve Lawrence MRTPI, Planning Officer, Chichester Harbour Conservancy</p>	<p>Plan</p> <p>The Plan area covers the electoral ward of Emsworth – which does not include the Emsworth Channel.</p>
<p>CHICHESTER HARBOUR CONSERVANCY PLANNING COMMITTEE – 11TH DECEMBER 2017 REPORT BY CONSERVANCY OFFICERS</p> <p>1.0 Introduction</p> <p>1.1 On 25 June 2014 the Emsworth Forum had its application for a neighbourhood area and the emsworth forum to be recognised for the purposes of neighbourhood planning agreed by Havant Borough Council’s Cabinet.</p> <p>1.2 Since that time the Forum has been meeting and analysing data for Emsworth Ward, to produce a Neighbourhood Plan. The Forum has been assisted by an Urban Design Consultant in preparing the plan, which builds on the Emsworth Design Statement (July 2008).</p> <p>1.3 Neighbourhood Plans were introduced under the Localism Act 2011 to allow local communities to positively influence the planning of their areas. Regulations must be adhered to in the designation, preparation examination and adoption of such plans. To be found sound and meet the baseline conditions, a Neighbourhood Plan must accord with the provisions of the relevant Development Plan. For Emsworth, that means compliance with the Havant Borough Core Strategy 2011 and Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations) development plan document 2014. A review of the Development Plan is currently being undertaken, looking forward to the year 2036.</p> <p>2.0 The Plan Objectives</p> <p>2.1 A vision and related objectives on pages 18-21 of the plan inform 7 Policy headings, set out below. A conscious decision was taken not to have any housing</p>	

allocation policies in the Plan, owing to the strategic nature of housing allocations in the Ward, addressed through Havant Borough Council's Local Plan Housing Statement, which was approved by Havant Borough Council in December last year.

2.2 The 7 headings are – Community Living Working Moving Waterfront Heritage Design

2.3 The Policies put forward are, for the most part, compliant with the Development Plan, but where they are not, this is pointed out in parts 2 and 3 of Appendix 1 to this report.

The Agenda Item 5

2 Neighbourhood Plan would allow the residents of Emsworth to positively influence new development proposals to ensure that the distinctive character of the Ward and settlement – a significant part of which is within the Chichester Harbour Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty - is maintained and that the needs of the community in terms of new development are met in a sustainable way.

3.0 Recommendation

That the Emsworth forum be commended for bringing forward its Neighbourhood Plan and that observations in *Appendix 1* to this report be passed to the Emsworth Forum and copied to the Planning Policy Team at Havant Borough Council for their consideration. SRL for 11.12.2017 CHC Planning Consultative Committee.

*Appendix 1*

This Appendix is split into 3 parts. All comments refer to the sub-headings and page numbering used in the Emsworth Neighbourhood Plan: Pre-submission version.

The first concerns direct comments where The Conservancy considers direct reference to the Chichester Harbour Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty could be more strongly emphasized in the Neighbourhood Plan. The second relates to general observations on the current statutory operation of the system of town planning in England, in terms of its implications for policy wordings and text used. The third is a miscellany of small errata found within the current text.

Part 1:

Generally – it would be useful in the preamble to the Plan, for The Forum to more

clearly in pages 7-9, to acknowledge the framework of national and local planning policy and guidance. Reference to an Appendix would be useful for applicants to see that each policy relates to existing policy and guidance in the form of a matrix. Whilst it is entirely appropriate to refer to the Emsworth Design Statement of 2008, the local planning authority has adopted other supplementary planning documents (SDP) – for example, The Borough Design Guide (2011) and more recently the Joint Chichester Harbour AONB SPD (2017).

p.11/Land use & protection. Whilst it is appropriate to say '*development will be very sensitively managed*' close to the Harbour, it would be more useful to start with a map showing the boundary of the Chichester Harbour AONB (hereafter just referred to as the AONB) and directly referring to the AONB in the text. Cross reference could also be made to paragraphs 115 and 116 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF - 2012), where by designated landscapes like AONB's are given the highest level of protection, especially against major development. The map would make clear that certain parts of the town centre and fields west of Brook Gardens are also within the AONB, where any new development should conserve and enhance the natural beauty of the area.

p.12/Protected environments The map here should appear earlier in the document and clearly show the AONB boundary annotated.

p.17 / Green spaces, recreation & leisure. The map could also usefully show any statutory public footpaths and (non-statutory) permissive pathways, distinguishing between the two, in consultation with the Rights of Way Team at Hampshire County Council. Informal recreation gained by walkers using these routes has health benefits and allows people walking those passing through the AONB to appreciate its natural beauty. Their maintenance and improvement may be legitimate items under the 4 Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Regulations, where CIL is payable on new development, if statutory tests are met.

p.19 / Vision statement It is clear the Forum has listened to residents and considered those matters which directly influence the quality of life of the citizens of Emsworth. No doubt the forum and residents would seek to lobby decision takers on these

Pages 7-9 of the draft NP does, we believe, explain the National and Local Planning policy framework adequately. The Basic Conditions Statement will describe the relationship of the Plan policies to national and local planning policy. Re the Emsworth Design Statement, the revised draft incorporates this following HBC advice.

p.12. The Submission Plan will show the areas lies within the AONB.

p.17. We agree. However we don't think it necessary to duplicate this information in the NP.

p.19. We agree. These are matters to be pursued as Projects once the Plan has been agreed.

<p>matters where they relate to land use and transportation planning in the Ward. How they translate into Policy should be made clearer though, where matters such as budgetary decisions on Highways, Social Services and any NHS Trust are probably beyond direct influence. The proposals for traffic calming of the A259 and thereby enhancing the setting of the AONB should be supported though as a practical project which could legitimately channel CIL monies from adjoining development proposals under Policies C1 (p.25) and M1 (p.43).</p> <p>P.21 / Neighbourhood Plan objectives. Bullet point 2. Suggest this is re-worded to – <i>“2. Ensure new development contributes to the creation of safe, sustainable, liveable and mixed communities, with good access to jobs and essential services for all members of the community”</i>. The forum however needs to think carefully about how it will evaluate how this objective has been met, when it considers applications for development. Bullet point 3. A network of streets and spaces already exists in the Ward, so suggest the word ‘Create’ is instead replaced by – <i>“Ensure new development contributes positively to...”</i> Bullet point 7. Suggest this be adjusted to read – <i>“Ensure all new development improves the quality of life of the people of Emsworth, especially where this is within or affects the setting of the Chichester Harbour AONB”</i></p> <p>P.24 / Increasing the dwell time... (3rd line down) <i>“significant enhancements”</i>. If this is a key project associated with Policy C1 and M1, then more needs to be specifically said about this.</p> <p>P.29 / Policy C5 (a) (2nd line down) – suggest delete ‘may’ and insert <i>“would be likely to”</i>. This will suggest to applicants that they must evidence no significant harm would result from their proposals.</p> <p>P.30 / Map to C5 (3) Full support is given to the designation of Nore Barn Woods as a local green space.</p> <p>P.31 / Map to C5 (7) &amp; P1 / p.63 Full support is given to the designation of fields west of Brook Gardens, including The Horsefield, as a local green space, provided the tests of NPPF paragraph 77 can be evidenced by the Forum in the support text to the Policy.</p> <p>P.33 / Policy L1 (c) Assuming the Borough Council gives its permission, it would be worth reproducing the character appraisal map from the Emsworth Conservation Area</p>	<p>p.21. Although we do not disagree with the suggestions we do not feel it necessary to change the wording.</p> <p>p. 24. This is dealt with elsewhere.</p> <p>p.29. We will reserve any decisions of this nature to the Neighbourhood Plan Examiner.</p> <p>p.33. We are advised that the NP Examiner is likely the strike out duplication of other documents.</p>
--	--

Appraisal in the Neighbourhood Plan, to identify the important views and roof-scapes set out in that document.

P.36 / Policy L5 Suggest the various areas that encroachment is not desired be bullet pointed and importance of the AONB recognised, so that the wording becomes –  
*“Policy L5 Avoiding settlement coalescence Housing development proposals of a non-strategic nature will only be permitted if they do not impinge on –*

*Current gaps between Emsworth and its neighbouring settlements; or*

*The protected landscape area to the north; or*

*The waterfront; or*

*The Chichester Harbour AONB and its setting”.*

(9th line up) It is worth showing the strategic housing land boundary on a map base.

P.39 / Policy W3 (a) It would be good to add some justification for why the figure of 50% has been chosen and also require – before this tipping point is reached – any applicant to show how the site has been marketed for its authorised commercial purpose for a set period of 12 months, before proposing mixed use development. In fact, a cross reference to existing Development Plan Policies CS2 and DM3 would not go amiss, the latter setting out detailed marketing requirements, against which such proposals will be assessed.

P.51 / Policy WF1 (a) This policy, although worthy, interferes with private property rights and I would suggest is unlikely to pass the appointed Examiner. Short of a local planning authority to use its compulsory purchase powers, or such access being negotiated through a S.106 planning obligation, the policy should instead be worded to say proposals which facilitate public access to the waterfront will be supported. It is unnecessary to state the reason for the public access in the policy wording. Are there any particular parts of the Waterfront where The forum consider improved public access should be negotiated? If so, then put them on a map and link it to an adjusted policy wording.

P.51 / Policy WF1 (b) To have this part of the policy apply to ‘any’ form of development applied for by the waterfront is troublesome. For example, what if applicant ‘X’ is merely applying for a new conservatory between their home and the

p.36. Agreed. We have made these changes.

p.39. This policy has been changed in the revised draft NP.

p.51(a). Past NP examinations have approved such a policy.

p.51 (b). We will reserve any decisions of this nature to the Neighbourhood Plan Examiner.

<p>waterfront? The wording suggests they must carry out <i>'an appraisal of options for the provision of public spaces and leisure amenities, including slipways and moorings'</i>. This raises a number of questions. Is this proportionate to the development sought? Will the local planning authority refuse to validate a planning application if no such appraisal is submitted? The Development Plan under policy CS1 (12) currently prohibits any additional moorings in Chichester Harbour, so in that sense, the Policy may not be compliant with the Development Plan, unless the location of moorings was being swapped over, meaning no net addition to the number of moorings.</p> <p>P.51 / Policy WF1 (d) I suggest this part of the policy is deleted. The local planning authority has a duty to give publicity to all applications and whilst paragraph 66 of the NPPF encourages applicant's to engage with the local community, it is not a mandatory national validation criterion.</p> <p>P.53 / Policy H1 The following rewording is suggested – <i>"Any new development shall, in terms of its design, scale and materials, preserve or enhance the setting of heritage assets, whether designated or undesignated, especially within the Emsworth Conservation Area. Applicants shall show how they have taken account of the Emsworth Design Statement (2008) in any design, heritage and access statement required to be prepared."</i></p> <p>P.53 / Policy H2 (a) The following rewording is suggested – <i>"Where any new development directly or otherwise affects the setting of heritage assets, whether designated or undesignated, or the character or setting of the Emsworth Conservation Area, the applicant shall prepare a design, heritage and access statement. This shall cross reference any media that has been submitted, to show the relationship of the new development to the heritage asset, including any impact to roofscapes and prominent public views."</i></p> <p>P.53 / Policy H2 (b) Suggest this criterion is deleted, as these are management issues which might be controlled through planning condition requiring submission of a 'construction environment management plan' (CEMP), detailing method statements of working to ensure the heritage assets is not damaged during the build process. Also</p>	<p>p.51(d). To be considered</p> <p>p.53/Policy H1. We agree and the policies have been revised</p> <p>p.53/Policy H2(a). We agree and the policies have been revised</p> <p>p.53/Policy H2 (b). We agree and the policies have been revised</p>
--	--

<p>a question of proportionate requirements and what information is essential to enable the local planning authority to (a) validate the application and (b) properly assess impact to the heritage asset. For example, if applicant 'X' wanted to change a door in a Listed Building, it would be wholly inappropriate and disproportionate to require the submission of information under the current criterion (b).</p> <p>P.54 / Policy H3 (a) Full support for this Policy to preserve the setting of the adjacent AONB. It would be useful in the supporting text for the policy to set out the special architectural characteristics of each building in the wording, including any statutory List description given by Historic England.</p> <p>P.54 / Policy D1 (a) Suggest clearer re-wording to – <i>“The design of development proposals should have regard to the Borough Design Guide supplementary planning document (SPD)(2011), Emsworth Design Statement (2008) and the following documents where applicable –</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Emsworth Conservation Area Character Appraisal and Management Plan;</i></li> <li>• <i>Joint Chichester Harbour AONB SPD - and should be of high quality, in terms of scale, layout, appearance, access and landscaping.”</i></li> </ul> <p>P.54 / Policy D1 (b) Suggest clearer re-wording to – <i>“Where a design and access statement is required as part of submitting a planning application, the applicant shall demonstrate how they have taken account of the development’s wider impact in the land/townscape, especially within the Chichester Harbour AONB. Where mitigation may be necessary to preserve or enhance local character within Emsworth, the applicant shall fully demonstrate how the impact has been mitigated.”</i></p> <p>P.56 / Policy D2 (a) Suggest the word ‘enhance’ may be rather a stiff (albeit worthy) test for parts of Emsworth not within the AONB or Conservation Area.</p> <p>P.56 / Policy D2 (b) Suggest this should be part of the supporting text, or reword to say – <i>“(b) The external surfaces of buildings shall be clad in materials typical for the area. Where any deviation is proposed, the use of alternative materials should be fully justified by the applicant.”</i> I would also suggest that a separate strand/criterion be devised covering solar panels and their siting/appearance. The Conservancy favours panels which are wholly dark in colour (i.e. no lighter aluminium margin visible to the</p>	<p>P54. H3 We agree and have amended the text to include this.</p> <p>p.56-61. The Design Policy has been revised in the light of advice received from HBC.</p>
--	---



edge of each panel and positioned on a roof surface to be visually contained and evenly placed to still allow the roof surface to be 'read' as a distinct architectural feature of the building.

P.56 / Policy D2 (c) Suggest this should be re-worded as – *“Buildings should normally no more than three storeys to roof eaves level, albeit use of the roof void to create a fourth level of accommodation will be considered in terms of its overall impact to the roofscape of the area, where any rooflights and dormer windows should not dominate the roof surface on which they are located.”*

P.57 / Policy D3 What is meant by the word 'form' in the Policy title? Does it mean the shape of a piece of development? It could be generally useful to have a glossary of terms at the end of the plan, so that those trying to respond to policies are absolutely clear about what The form is expecting to see delivered by adhering to the Policy.

P.57 / Policy D4 / D7 (b) / p.59 Is the Emsworth Design Statement still fit for purpose? How does it relate to advice in the NPPF? Is it worth updating it and making it an Appendix to the Neighbourhood Plan, so that it too passes through a formal public consultation process and thus ultimately have more weight afforded to its advice, especially when being considered by Planning Inspectors at Appeal?

P.58 / Policy D6 (f) '*...local forms of power*' needs better definition. I would suggest the placement of wind turbines in close proximity to the AONB will be likely to draw objections from The Conservancy, where such proposals may need planning permission.

P.58 / Policy D6 (g) '*...CO2 transport options*' needs better definition. If this just means the incorporation of bicycle parking to the required standards, then this should just be said and a cross reference be given to where an applicant might find the local planning authority's standards. If, however, The Forum is looking forward and trying to incorporate electric vehicle charging points into new development too, then greater explanation of the policy out to be given in the supporting text.

P.59 / Policy D8 (b) Suggest add after 'waterfront' the words *“and Chichester Harbour Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty”*.

P.59 / Policy D8 (c) Suggest rewording to – *“Lamp columns and other street furniture*

*forming part of development proposals shall be designed to achieve full horizontal cut-off of any light beam and respond to the character of the area in terms of their outward appearance as structures.”*

P.60 / Design check-list. Suggest that the national planning guidance relating to the preparation of Design and Access Statements is ‘signposted’, including the types of application for which it is not necessary to prepare such a statement. (See NPPG ID 26, paragraph 034). By all means encourage the preparation of such statements even where they are not required though.

P.60 / Amenity (2nd line) ‘new houses’ – better to say ‘new dwellings’? Is The Forum saying that it will not expect flattened schemes of new housing not to need to provide common amenity space?

P.60 / Construction (1st line) ‘build’. The local planning authority/community assisting the council’s planning enforcement function, does not really have much power to influence the build quality of new work, other than in the most obvious cases that the work clearly does not accord with approved plans or materials used do not tally with what the local planning authority has agreed in writing. What the council and community can influence though is ‘design’ quality, through the planning application process. Overall, probably better to say “*The design quality*” instead. ‘*Building maintenance should be cost-effective and easy to administer*’. Whilst there are no objections to this normative statement, will The Forum be monitoring this aspect post development and to what end?

P.60 / Density. (3rd line) ‘impression of spaciousness’. This is a relative design consideration. The conservancy is happy to promote new native plantings, but ultimately if the density and urban grain is dense, then it will be wholly appropriate to match that character and context. Perhaps better to say that density should be context driven to respond to the character of the area whilst taking opportunities to introduce new native species soft planting where this is possible.

P.60 / Domestic (1st line) use of the word ‘small’. Again I would suggest that proposals should be context driven to match the scale of the host building or to be no greater than the scale of surrounding buildings, unless there are particular urban design

<p>benefits from introducing a taller building, such as at a prominent corner or creation of a 'gateway' along any route.</p> <p>P.60 / Evolution. This text needs to acknowledge that the strategic housing developments, such as land at Havant Road and Selangor Avenue are a necessary part of meeting the unmet housing needs of Emsworth/The Borough, but that otherwise The Forum is seeking to ensure that other, smaller forms of new development will allow for the respectful organic growth of the settlement, to retain its character as a distinct settlement.</p> <p>P.60 / Extension. I do not believe the last sentence of this text is flexible enough. It is for an applicant to demonstrate, through careful design, whether an extension is respectful to the character of the host building. Suggest the last sentence is reworded or deleted.</p> <p>P.60 / Layout. I cannot see how applications for householder or other forms of minor development will 'incorporate access routes' as part of their proposals. If The forum considers there to be parts of Emsworth where levels of permeability, having regard to S.17 the Crime and Disorder Act 1998, would bring urban design benefits of greater connectivity and activity/passive surveillance, then these ought to be identified as projects, so that any planning application coming forward that could assist with their delivery might contribute to delivery through a S.106 planning obligation.</p> <p>P.61 / Locality / Tradition. As both of these sub-headings have a direct bearing on context and character, I suggest they are combined.</p> <p>P.61 / Sustainability. As the text relates to the promotion of forms of wildlife, I suggest the sub-heading more appropriately be reworded to 'Promotion of biodiversity'.</p> <p>P.62 / Projects list. Are there any unimplemented projects for the Conservation Area which ought to be prioritised? For example, the council said it would give consideration in the future to making an Article 4 Direction, removing certain permitted development rights in the Conservation Area. (7th line down) 'full mitigation'. The Conservancy's main concern here is two-fold. Firstly there is the ecological impact from recreational disturbance at the Harbour shoreline to the overwintering bird populations in the Langstone and Chichester Harbours Special</p>	<p>p61.The Design Policy has been revised in the light of advice received from HBC.</p> <p>p.62/Projects List. We have expanded and re-organised the list but are minded not to prioritise it.</p>
--	--

Protection Area. An interim strategy exists to deal with the 'significant likely affects' and it would be useful for the Neighbourhood Plan text to report this. Secondly, the impact of treated sewage and surface water run-off from new housing sites, in terms of how this affects water quality in Chichester Harbour also need to be flagged up as a matter that needs careful consideration by developers.

P.63 / Policy P1. (12th and 13th bullet points) If these can be secured or partly secured through planning obligations related to the strategic housing proposed in Emsworth Ward, the Conservancy will be supportive of that approach.

P.63 / Policy P1. (7th and 10th bullet points) Full support for protecting heritage and trees which form part of the natural beauty of the AONB and character of Emsworth Ward more generally.

Part 2:

p.14 / Schools and education / P.63 Where a Neighbourhood Plan becomes 'made' and adopted by the Emsworth Forum / recognised by Havant Borough Council as part of the statutory Development Plan, it is worth pointing out that the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Regulations will allow the Forum to claim 25% of monies collected from new development where CIL is payable. Whereas a list of projects is identified (p.63), it should be made clear that only those projects meeting the 3 statutory tests set out in the CIL Regulations, will be eligible for expenditure.

P.25 / Policy C1 (c) If there is a clear capital programme of spending by Hampshire County council as regards any proposals for a new library in Emsworth, this should usefully be set out in the supporting text.

P.25 / Policy C1 A small point, but the map associated with this policy heading could usefully appear straight after the Policy heading and the supporting text say more about traffic calming the A259 as suggested by the red policy boundary also encompassing the highway.

P.26 / Policy C2 Most local planning authorities would accept Class A5 takeaways in a high street location, albeit perhaps in secondary shopping frontages. The supporting text does not make plain why such uses would not be acceptable.

p.26/Policy C2. This policy has been changed.

<p>P.33 / Policy L1 (b) / p.34 Owing to National Ministerial Statements, backed up by A court of Appeal decision in May 2016, overturning a High Court judgement in favour of Reading Borough and West Berkshire District Councils, the trigger for the provision of affordable housing has been set at schemes of 11 or more dwellings. Unless the forum can evidence from a detailed local housing study for the Ward, that “all” developments where there is a net gain of housing should make 40% provision towards affordable housing, this policy wording will need to change as it would otherwise not accord with national Policy and Policy CS9 (2) within the current Development Plan for the Borough. Even if evidenced, I would suggest that where schemes do not produce a whole number of dwellings to be provided on an affordable basis on the site, that the Policy wording contains the flexibility to allow an applicant to alternatively make a financial contribution towards affordable housing provision in Emsworth Ward. Whilst reference is made to a Housing Needs Assessment and some highlights from of this is given on p.34, that document really ought to form an appendix to the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>P.33 / Policy L1 (d) Suggest “or access to boating infrastructure” is added between the words “edge” and “resulting”, given the recent experience of the determination of application APP/16/00921 at Dolphin Quay, Queen Street, where uncertainty existed over future access to two retained pontoons, which did not form part of the application site.</p> <p>P.34 / Meeting the needs of younger people If there is clear evidence of younger people leaving Emsworth, then its source should be identified and a summary of findings given in supporting text. If the text is purely aspirational and seeking to guard against such an eventuality, then that ought to be explained with some commentary on the Ward population structure and average dwelling prices given.</p> <p>P.35 / A range of housing types &amp; sizes 3rd and 4th lines down). This supporting text should make it clear whether the conversion of larger dwellings to smaller dwellings will be acceptable, given what has been said in the preceding two paragraphs of the Plan on p.34.</p> <p>P.35 / Need for specialist housing (4th line up) It may be as well for the forum to</p>	<p>p.33-34/Policy L1(b). P33 - we agree and this has been amended.</p> <p>p.33/L1(d). We feel the existing wording is sufficiently broad. We will wait for an examiner to provide further advice.</p> <p>p.34/Meeting the needs of younger people. The source is already referenced.</p> <p>p.35/A range of housing types &amp; sizes. We have decided not</p>
--	--

<p>suggest some appropriate locations. The site identified in Policy C1 would seem suitable.</p> <p>P.35 / Policy L3 This Policy wording seems to suggest that new housing that is not within 800m of a local (convenience) shop may be refused, whereas the NPPF recognises that people will meet their travel needs in different ways. The 3rd line up also seems to suggest there may be some hilly topography within the Ward. If that is true, a map showing such areas could be useful, as would there be merit in plotting the location of all known local shops, selling items for day to day living.</p> <p>P.37 / Working / Policy objectives (1st line) If this section is about working, then no need to talk about “<i>living and...environments</i>”, unless the Forum is trying to make some point about the propomotion of live/work units, or homeworking or generally seeking that any new business development requiring planning permission should not impinge on residential amenity.</p> <p>P.38 / Policy W1 (a) (5th line down) Suggest the words “as a visitor attraction and” are deleted as it would not be realistic for all commercial planning development proposals to achieve this requirement.</p> <p>P.38 / Policy W1 (b) (5th line up) Suggest a full stop is placed after the word context and all remaining wording to (b) deleted. These aspirations are eluded to elsewhere in the Plan. For example, it would not be possible for an applicant in the High Street wanting a new shopfront to deliver access to the waterfront.</p> <p>P.38 / Policy W2 (b) Not sure this element of the Policy actually will deliver anything over and above what planning applications for commercial development have delivered in the past. This is more to do with national polices and other legislation about training and education equipping young people to enter the workforce, than the planning system being able to refuse development because it did not deliver such opportunities.</p> <p>P.39 / Policy W3 (b) Unless a planning condition or Article 4 Direction would prevent it, where no material change of use is involved, or such a change would be permitted development, the combining of retail units to form larger single retail units does not require planning permission. I suggest this aspect of the policy be deleted. If the</p>	<p>to allocate sites.</p> <p>p.35/Policy L.1. We do not believe this is necessary.</p> <p>p.38/Policy W1(a)the policy has been revised to address this concern</p> <p>P.38. Policy W1 (b). Agreed. The policy has been revised to address this concern</p> <p>p.39/Policy W3(b). We do not agree. Once this Plan is 'made' this policy will over-ride permitted development.</p>
--	--

<p>Forum wishes to affect such a change, I suggest they lobby the Borough Council to make an Article 4 Direction.</p> <p>P.39 / Policy W3 (c) Unless a planning condition or Article 4 Direction would prevent it, such a change to Class A2 may be permitted development under Part 3 of Schedule 2 to the town and country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (as amended) and perhaps not require planning permission. I also suggest this aspect of the policy be deleted, or at least qualify it to say that where permission is required, no more than two together will be acceptable. If the Forum wishes to affect such a change completely, I suggest they lobby the Borough Council to make an Article 4 Direction to remove the relevant permitted development rights.</p> <p>P.39 / Policy W3 (d) Such a change to Class A3 use could be achieved as permitted development from Class A4 or Class A5 uses. The forum should identify in the wording what detrimental impacts would include – for example, odours, noise and highway safety. Key – or primary – retail frontages, also in relation to more secondary retail frontages should be identified on a map base to support the Policy.</p> <p>P.39 / Policy W3 (e) This wording is in direct conflict with what Policy C2 says in respect of Class A4 uses. I think it highly unlikely such a ‘embargo’ policy would be likely to pass examination. Instead, it may be better to reword to state that at where permission is required, no more than two together will be acceptable, justifying this by saying the Forum is seeking to promote a vibrant and active retail frontage, which will maintain the interest of the passing browsing shopper and visitor.</p> <p>P.40 Banks, etc. The reversal of the bank closures that has been occurring is unlikely to occur. The key test of an A2 uses is whether it provides a financial or professional service to visiting members of the public. If the Forum is concerned about the overall concentration of non-Class A1 uses in the town centre, then it may be appropriate to evidence this by a land use survey and seek to justify that no more than ‘X’ % of all units should be anything other than Class A1.</p> <p>P.40 / Vibrant &amp; vital town centre / Policy W4 (b) / p.41 (6th line down) This wording is in direct conflict with what Policy C2 says in respect of Class A4 uses. The forum should be aware that Class A4 uses are also a strong part of the tourism and</p>	<p>p.39/Policy W3(c). We do not agree. Once this Plan is 'made' this policy will over-ride permitted development.</p> <p>p.39/ (d) We do not agree. Once this Plan is 'made' this policy will over-ride permitted development.</p> <p>p.40/41 Banks, etc. This section has been reworded.</p>
---	---

<p>visitor attraction of Emsworth per se, where the number of such uses has actually declined in the last 20 years. The forum also needs to evidence why Class A5 uses will not be allowed, if it is to stand any chance of this aspect of the Policy passing examination. What are the related detrimental impacts the Forum and residents of Emsworth recorded over time?</p> <p>P.44 / Policy M2 (9th line up) If there are particular hot-spots where The forum would like to see pedestrian safety improved and pavement widths widened, perhaps these should be identified on a map and prioritised as projects under Policy P1 (p.63).</p> <p>P.45 / Policy M4 If this Policy only duplicates Policies CS1 (8) and DM13 and DM14 of the existing Development Plan, then I would suggest M4 is deleted and supporting text signpost those other policies.</p> <p>P.46 / 2nd bullet point. Greater explanation of the word '<i>open</i>' should be given. Does the forum have particular parts of the Ward waterfront that it would like to see opened up to public access?</p> <p>P.47 / 11th and 12th lines down. Suggest full stop placed after waterfront and "<i>than other similar coastal settlements.</i>" deleted. Suggest boundary of AONB added to map.</p> <p>P.49 / p.50. Suggest boundary of AONB added to each map.</p> <p>P.54 / Policy H3 (b) This Policy wording needs to chime with the wording for Policy C2, which suggests that residential dwellings above ground floor may be acceptable as apart of a mixed use development. Use of 'These buildings' is fine if this wording is seen alongside criterion (a). However, if reproduced in isolation by others, those words have no meaning. I suggest either the buildings described in (a) are restated or "<i>set out in criterion (a) above</i>" is added after 'These buildings'.</p> <p>P.55, 3rd bullet point It would be useful to cross-refer back to the pages of the plan where each part of the area's character is set out. I suggest these are pages 11-17 &amp; 50.</p> <p>P.58 / Policy D6 (b) / (d) Is 'rainwater capture' and 're-use of rainwater' two different aspects of water conservation or the same thing. If the latter, one can be deleted from this list of criterion.</p> <p>P.63 / Policy P1 (1st bullet point). Whilst a laudable aim, it is not related to land use</p>	<p>p.44/Policy M2. Agreed. This is a separate Project, post adoption of the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>p.45/Policy M4. We have retained this for emphasis, even if it duplicates what is in the Local Plan.</p> <p>p.47. Agreed.</p> <p>p.54/Policy H3(b). We agree and this has been changed</p> <p>p.55. Noted</p> <p>p.58/Policy D6(b)/(d). This section has been revised</p>
--	--



and transportation planning, unless the proximity of disabled parking bays is a matter that could be positively influenced by The Highways Authority (Hampshire County Council).

Part 3: Generally – A capital letter only need be used for the first word of each sub-heading throughout the document.

p.15 / The town centre retail offer It may be worth mentioning Heidi’s bakery as a local amenity.

p.23 / Physical & mental health benefits. Suggest more positive to say “*will*” rather than ‘may well’ play a key part of...

p.23 / Increased footfall & economic benefits (Grammar, 3rd line down) “Increased levels of activity *help...*” (not helps).

p.23 / Meeting on the street (4th line down) “has been shown”. Useful to back this statement up by reference to a study.

P.25 / Policy C1 (c) ‘enhances’ should read “*enhance*”. (2nd paragraph from bottom) – these points have been made earlier in the document and probably do not need repeating.

P.28 / (d) (2nd line up) ‘xx’ it is assumed the page number cross-referred to will be inserted once the next iteration of the plan is finalised.

P.29 / - Chichester Harbour AONB (Part of) (2nd line down) – suggest delete ‘through’ and insert “*throughout*”. (5th line down) ‘xx’ it is assumed the page number cross-referred to will be inserted once the next iteration of the plan is finalised.

P.38 / - Policy W1 (a) (2nd line down) “*industrial*” mis-spelt P.38 / - Policy W1 (a) (3rd line down - grammar) a coma between the words ‘required’ and ‘through’ is missing.

P.38 / Policy W2 / supporting text. Suggest first sentence better worded as – “*Emsworth should provide a wide variety of retail offer, maintaining lots of interesting shops which complement each other, rather than a small number of retailers dominating the town*”.

P.51 / Policy WF1 (d) (3rd line down) Small typographical error – ‘propsal’ should read ‘*proposal*’. Slightly academic though, as I am suggesting (above in Part 1) that this part of the policy be deleted.

<p>P.56 / Policy D2 (c) (1st line) ‘by’ should read “<i>be</i>”. (Supporting text, 3rd line down) suggest words “<i>to be</i>” be inserted in front of “in keeping”. P.58 / Policy D6 (e) ‘...where application’ does not make grammatical sense. Was ‘<i>where applicable</i>’ meant instead?  P.58 / Policy D6 (g) ‘...<i>CO2 transport options</i>’ – the ‘2’ should be sub-scripted in the text to read – “<i>CO<sub>2</sub></i>”.  P.59 / Policy D7 ‘Application’ should read “<i>Applications</i>”.  P.63 / Policy P1 (16th bullet point - grammar) Suggest word ‘<i>a</i>’ can be deleted.</p>	
<p><b>Emsworth Councillors</b>  The local ward councillors recognize the value of this neighbourhood plan as it brings together local residents and organisations for the future development of Emsworth. We also recognize the significant work that has gone into its development. The Emsworth Forum has been working closely with Havant Borough Council in an ongoing dialogue to promote social, economic and environmental well-being for the residents and this collaborative work has produced a ‘living’ document’ for the future. Once finalized and approved, this Neighbourhood Plan will become a statutory planning document within the legal planning framework and therefore it is important that it is developed and matures appropriately so it best reflects as many aspirations for Emsworth as possible.  Comments:  <b>Schedule for regular adjustments and updates</b>  Due to the need for a living document to continue to be ‘future proofed’ - we would like to see a schedule for all items to be revisited and scrutinized with a regular review schedule to be incorporated into the Plan so that any of the policies can be adapted to reflect the current status quo – e.g Emsworth Victoria Cottage Hospital or the local Hub.  <b>New roundabout with pedestrianised square. Policy M1</b>  The A259 is now a major road between Chichester and Emsworth and serving many settlements in between and many more planned for the future. It is also an alternative route for when the A27 is closed. The proposed Plan to reduce its capacity</p>	<p>Schedule for adjustments and updates: It is not for the Neighbourhood Plan document to address this. Implementation of its policies and projects is for all relevant statutory and community organisations to address once it has been adopted.</p>

with a pedestrianised square could potentially cause more traffic issues and be hugely expensive as it is currently uncoded. We would like to propose that a conversion to a traffic light controlled junction to replace the roundabout could be viable and would allow pedestrians to cross safely on a level surface within the traffic light stages. This would help with the proposed 're-joining' of the North and South of the town. (We are unsure about where to locate policy M5 as stated on P16).

**Community and Public Services Hub Policy C1**

This is an aspirational idea –focusing on not just health care services but also if this is not possible - the wider public services hub. These projects are subject to the strategy of the NHS estates and is one of the key areas or policies in this Neighbourhood Plan that would be an important part of the schedule required to be re-visited every 2/3 years to re-assess the viability of all ideas.

**Designated Green spaces Policy C5**

While the Neighbourhood Plan has identified a network of green infrastructure and open spaces – there are several which have been omitted and should also be worthy of recognition and preservation. For example, Emsworth Victoria Cottage Hospital Garden, Hampshire Farm Meadow and the western corridor or the River Ems between Westbourne and Lumley which is being considered for housing early next year. The DCF for this site is on 16 January 2018

**Types of houses Policies L1, L2, W3**

Regarding the need for social housing, market forces will dictate the percentage of these on each site but certainly a better variety of housing units should be encouraged to reflect the changing needs of the demographics and enable more flexibility of movement in the local housing market. Retail units remaining vacant are also dictated to by market forces – particularly the rents charged – and are outside the control of the Borough Council.

**Further suggestions**

Installation of 20mph in the town centre. As part of a Hampshire Highways document, there is a Transport Statement Live Scheme List for the Havant area including

Designated Green Spaces Policy C5: Agreed, and these have been included in the revised draft.

Types of houses Policies L1, L2, W3: See Frequently Made Comments (FMC).

Further suggestions: These have been added to the revised Project List.

<p>Emsworth which was last updated in October 2013 but is due to be updated in 2018 with various schemes including the installation of the 20mph zone for town centre Road Safety (HBC0089). This could also include 1 or 2 pelican crossings across High Street to replace the section of the road with different coloured stone that currently serves as an unofficial crossing that many people believe provides an official ‘safe’ crossing but is highly risky.</p> <p>Another idea that could be explored is to close the western side of the Square by the Methodist Church to create a public shared area that would provide “match-making” opportunities for sociability by increasing the “dwell time” in the centre by residents and visitors and prosperity for the business and retail units. This would require the widening of the eastern side of the Square to enable 2 way traffic which was how the centre of Emsworth was in 1940’s/1950’s. The impact of this would also slow traffic to 20mph.</p> <p>A pedestrian / cycle route from the train station and North Street to the M&amp;S/fuel stop on the A27 for jobs and local economy</p> <p>Liaising with the ESSC to create an improved use of the Quay on the Coastal path which is the best under used asset in the town, creating an area with several benches so the view can be enjoyed but these can be removed when boats are being lifted in or out of the water.</p> <p>Traffic slowing measures or crossings on New Brighton Road as this road will have increased traffic due to further developments in North Emsworth and the possible move of the surgery to Redlands Grange.</p>	
<p><b>HBC Planning 19/12/17</b></p> <p>Thank you for consulting Havant Borough Council on your Regulation 14 draft of the Emsworth Neighbourhood Plan, which I have reviewed with interest.</p> <p>To start with, I’d like to congratulate you on getting the plan to this stage. I know how much time and effort you have put into this, and to bring together a draft plan when it is not your full time job is an impressive achievement.</p> <p>However, I do have a few concerns with a few aspects of the plan, which I have set out below. In making these comments I am having particular regard to the general</p>	

conformity with the Local Plan (both adopted and emerging), as well as being mindful of government guidance on Neighbourhood Plans.

Please note these are technical officer comments which have not been formally endorsed by Havant Borough Council.

**Aspirational Policies**

There are a few policies in the plan, which appear to be purely aspirational. I am thinking in particular about policies

- a. C1 Community & Public Services Hub (in particular reference to library)
- b. M1 New Civic Space
- c. L1b General Housing Policy (affordable housing provision)

Firstly, I am concerned that an examiner would wish to see evidence both of the reasoning for these policies, but also of their deliverability. Secondly, I am mindful of the fact that by including these things in your plan in the way that you have, the community might reasonably expect them to happen, yet I can see no delivery mechanism for these things going forward. It would be unfortunate if the Neighbourhood Plan raised false expectations.

Having said this, I do acknowledge that policies C1 and M1 give general support only, rather than making specific allocations. I would suggest that the supporting text needs to be reviewed. For example, the text of M1 places a lot of emphasis on a particular junction solution, when actually the policy is simply to support improvements which ease traffic flow and improve conditions for pedestrians and cyclists.

**Duplication with provisions in Local Plan (and other adopted policy document)**

I understand that examiners have been known to delete policies from neighbourhood plans which duplicate National Policy or policies in Local Plans. There are a large number of policies which make very similar provisions to those in the adopted and/or emerging Local Plan. I am not suggesting that these policies are not of value or importance to the Neighbourhood Plan Area, simply that they add little to no detail

Aspirational Policies: See FMCs

Duplication with provisions in Local Plan: We are advised that it is acceptable to duplicate policies where they relate to matters of great significance to the area and to local residents. Furthermore, we are aware that the Havant Local Plan is currently being re-drafted and we wish, therefore, to guarantee that the local development planning guidance includes policies that are critical to Emsworth.

Emsworth Neighbourhood Plan – Consultation Statement

ENP Policy		Equivalent HPLP 2036 Policy	
C2	Retail, High Street & Food/Drink Uses	C5	Emsworth District Centre
C3	Public Realm Design	E6	High Quality Design

<p><b>Hampshire County Council</b></p> <p><b>Minerals Safeguarding</b> The Emsworth Neighbourhood Plan references the Havant Local Plan (HLP, 2036), which in turn references the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan (HMWP, 2013). It acknowledges that should minerals be present within or on a site that has been identified for development, consultation with Hampshire County Council in regards to whether prior extraction is viable will be required. HCC as the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority would strongly support this and would also recommend that this is applied particularly in relation to West of Horndean Road, as this site is over three hectares and identified within the Minerals and Waste Consultation Area – minerals layer.</p> <p>The site <b>West of Horndean Road</b> is a housing allocation of 5.24ha that lies within the mineral safeguarding area – sand and gravel (superficial) layer. Should the decision be made to progress this site for development, Hampshire County Council, as the Mineral and Waste Planning Authority would need to be consulted at the application stage. It would be expected that a mineral assessment is conducted and opportunities for mineral extraction as part of the preparation for the development are considered and maximised.</p> <p><b>Waste Infrastructure</b></p> <p>The HLP states that the site is also close to existing sewerage infrastructure (safeguarded waste water treatment works, Budds Farm) and acknowledges that ‘appropriate easement’ from existing waste infrastructure will be a further requirement as part of development. Although this site is over 250 meters west of the Horndean Road housing allocation, it is noted that sewerage capacity is limited, thus increasing connections to the nearest sewerage system at Budds Farm, would mean appropriate mitigation measures (against impacts such as noise, dust, visual impact, odour and traffic movements) should still be considered as early on as possible in the planning application process.</p>	<p>Minerals Safeguarding and Waste Infrastructure: The Neighbourhood Forum has decided to leave these important topics to the HBC Local Plan.</p>
--	---

<sup>1</sup> Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 (as amended)

**Library Services**

Hampshire County Council Library Service would like to specifically comment on the Community and Public Service Hub proposal where the Neighbourhood Plan outlines "POLICY C1

**Community & Public Services Hub**

a) Support will be given for planning applications for the development of health or social care facilities on the former site of Victoria Cottage Hospital.

b) If applications for such uses do not come forward on this site, a mix of community and public services will be supported with particular emphasis on ground floors.

c) Applications for a public library, nursery or other social or cultural service that enhances social integration in the proposed public service hub will be supported."

Hampshire County Council Library Service currently rents the Library building which is located on the high street within the Town Centre of Emsworth, of which the lease is due to be renewed next year. The high street location is a prime location and Emsworth Library is well used and has strong community engagement. However, as the building is not entirely fit for purpose other locations for the Library have been explored; such as the community centre, but none have found public support. Hampshire's Library Service is committed to developing libraries as thriving community hubs, delivering a wide range of community focused services from our trusted spaces. HCC Library service is currently exploring the potential to work with other partners which provide complimentary services. With regards to the Victoria Cottage Hospital site, the health and well-being benefits of public libraries have been recognised for some time now [ <http://www.artscouncil.org.uk/health-and-wellbeing-benefits-public-libraries> ] and there would be synergy in co-location. Consequently, HCC Library Service would appreciate being part of the conversation about the development of Emsworth Community and Public Services Hub, to discuss how services can be better integrated for the benefit of residents. Due to HCC Library Service timeframes regarding their existing building and the decisions that they will have to make, the HCC Library Officers would greatly appreciate any early engagement that the Neighbourhood Planning Group can offer.

Library Services: We welcome the interest of HCC in any potential development on the EVCH site or neighbouring buildings to include Library Services. We have informed the newly formed Emsworth Community Land trust of your interest in this site.

<p><b>Highways England</b></p> <p>Thank you for inviting Highways England to comment on the Emsworth Neighbourhood Plan Pre-Submission Consultation (Regulation 14 Neighbourhood Planning General Planning Regulations 2012).</p> <p>Highways England has been appointed by the Secretary of State for Transport as strategic highway company under the provisions of the Infrastructure Act 2015 and is the highway authority, traffic authority and street authority for the strategic road network (SRN). The SRN is a critical national asset and as such Highways England works to ensure that it operates and is managed in the public interest, both in respect of current activities and needs as well as in providing effective stewardship of its long-term operation and integrity. We will be concerned with proposals that have the potential to impact the safe and efficient operation of the SRN, in this case the A27.</p> <p>We have reviewed the plan and supporting documents. There is unlikely to be a direct impact to the safe and efficient operation of the A27 and we therefore offer no comment at this stage.</p> <p>I hope the above information is useful, please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any queries.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p><b>Historic England</b></p> <p>Thank you for your e-mail of 13<sup>th</sup> November advising Historic England of the consultation on the Emsworth Neighbourhood Plan. We are pleased to make the following general and detailed comments.</p> <p>The nature of the locally-led neighbourhood plan process is that the community itself should determine its own agenda based on the issues about which it is concerned. At the same time, as a national organisation able increasingly to draw upon our</p>	<p>We have noted the comments and helpful suggestions</p>



experiences of neighbourhood planning exercises across the country, our input can help communities reflect upon the special (heritage) qualities which define their area to best achieve aims and objectives for the historic environment. To this end information on our website might be of assistance – the appendix to this letter contains links to this website and to a range of potentially useful other websites.

We are disappointed and surprised not to find anything about the historical development of Emsworth or the designated heritage assets therein in the section entitled “Emsworth Today Understanding the context”. Given that omission it is not surprising, but no less disappointing that there is no reference to the historic environment being conserved and enhanced in the Vision Statement.

However, we welcome Neighbourhood Plan Objectives 1, 5 and 6, although we consider that it would be helpful for the Plan to set out what the results of the public consultation exercise were so as to demonstrate the justification for the objectives.

We welcome and support the first Policy Objective under Community and Policy C3. Our publication, *Streets for All* may be of interest and use here as it contains advice on public realm improvements in historic areas (<https://content.historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/streets-for-all/heag149f-sfa-south-east-consultation-draft.pdf/>).

We also welcome and support clause b) of Policy C5 and the second criterion under clause e).

We welcome the reference to Emsworth’s rich and outstanding maritime heritage in the first Policy Objective under Working.

We welcome and support Policy M1; again, our “*Streets for All*” or our experience in public realm works and place-making might be helpful.

We welcome and support the section on Heritage, but would rather it referred to “historic heritage” rather than “built heritage” as not heritage is built. We support and welcome the two Policy Objectives under Heritage. However, again, we are surprised and disappointed that there is no indication at all of what the “rich and outstanding heritage” of Emsworth comprises. According to the National Heritage List for England there are there are 92 listed building records for Emsworth.

Their distribution could helpfully be shown on a map, as could the boundary of the Emsworth Conservation Area. It would also be helpful to explain when the Conservation Area was designated, what its special interest is (the reason for its designation), when the designation was reviewed and when the Character Appraisal and Management Plan were published.

The National Planning Practice Guidance states “... where it is relevant, neighbourhood plans need to include enough information about local heritage to guide decisions and put broader strategic heritage policies from the local plan into action at a neighbourhood scale. ... In addition, and where relevant, neighbourhood plans need to include enough information about local non-designated heritage assets including sites of archaeological interest to guide decisions”.

Is there a list of locally-important buildings and features ? The identification of a possible Neighbourhood Project to investigate the creation of an undesignated heritage list under Policy P1, which we welcome, suggests not. Non-designated heritage assets, such as locally important buildings, can make an important

contribution to creating a sense of place and local identity. We have published advice on local listing, the link to which is included in the Appendix to this letter.

Have the Hampshire Historic Environment Record and Historic Landscape Character Assessment been consulted, the former for non-scheduled archaeological sites, some of which may be of national importance ?

We welcome and support, in principle, Policy H1(the National Planning Practice Guidance advises neighbourhood plans to *“put broader strategic heritage policies from the local plan into action at a neighbourhood scale”*), but it should require any new development or alteration to an existing structure to conserve (rather than “preserve”) or enhance the significance of heritage assets (i.e. what is important and of interest about the asset). We welcome and support Policy H2 and Policy H3.

We welcome and support the four Policy Objectives under “Design” and Policies D1 – D5, particularly the reference to the Emsworth Conservation Area Character Appraisal in Policy D4. We consider that this suite of policies satisfies the requirement of paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework, which states *“...neighbourhood plans should develop robust and comprehensive policies that set out the quality of development that will be expected for the area. Such policies should be based on stated objectives for the future of the area and an understanding and evaluation of its defining characteristics.”*

Historic England also welcomes the Emsworth Village Design Statement and Conservation Area Character Appraisal both as providing the *“understanding and evaluation of its defining characteristics”* required by paragraph 58 but also because Historic England considers that Neighbourhood Development Plans should be

<p>underpinned by a thorough understanding of the character and special qualities of the area covered by the Plan. Characterisation studies can help inform locations and detailed design of proposed new development, identify possible townscape improvements and establish a baseline against which to measure change. We would be pleased to offer further information on this matter.</p> <p>Is the condition of heritage assets in the parish an issue ? We note that there are no assets on the Historic England Heritage at Risk Register, but the Register does not include grade II secular buildings outside London. Has there been a survey of the condition of grade II buildings in the Plan area (if not, this could be another Neighbourhood Project) or has there been any or is there any ongoing loss of character, particularly within the Conservation Area, through inappropriate development, inappropriate alterations to properties under permitted development rights, loss of vegetation, insensitive streetworks etc ?</p> <p>Finally, a general observation. We think the Plan could be clearer in setting out in detail the issues affecting Emsworth that the Plan’s policies and proposals are intended to address. In our experience Neighbourhood Plans usually include a section on issues that have been identified through the community consultation process and/or higher level plans, which then inform and justify the Plan’s policies and proposals.</p> <p>We hope you find these comments helpful. Should you wish to discuss any points within this letter, or if there are particular issues with the historic environment in Emsworth, please do not hesitate to contact us.</p>	
<p><b>Natural England</b>  <b>Planning:</b> Emsworth Neighbourhood Plan Pre-Submission Consultation (Regulation 14 Neighbourhood Planning General Planning Regulations 2012)</p>	<p>Your comments and suggestions are noted and supported.</p>

Thank you for your letter dated 03/11/2017 notifying Natural England of the Pre-Submission Consultation of the above Neighbourhood Planning Area.

Natural England does not wish to make comment on the suitability of the proposed plan area or the proposed neighbourhood planning body. However we would like to take this opportunity to provide you with information sources the neighbourhood planning body may wish to use in developing the plan, and to highlight some of the potential environmental risks and opportunities that neighbourhood plans may present.

### **Natural England's role**

Natural England is a non-departmental public body. Our statutory purpose is to ensure that the natural environment is conserved, enhanced, and managed for the benefit of present and future generations, thereby contributing to sustainable development. The local planning authority will be aware and should advise the neighbourhood planning body when Natural England should be consulted further on the neighbourhood plan.

### **Planning policy for the natural environment**

Neighbourhood plans and orders present significant opportunities, but also potential risks, for the natural environment. Proposals should be in line with the National Planning Policy Framework. The key principles are set out in paragraph 109:

The planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by:

- protecting and enhancing valued landscapes, geological conservation interests and soils;
- recognising the wider benefits of ecosystem services;
- minimising impacts on biodiversity and providing net gains in biodiversity where possible, contributing to the Government's commitment to halt the overall decline in biodiversity, including by establishing coherent ecological networks that are more resilient to current and future pressures;

The neighbourhood planning body should also consider the natural environment policies in the area's Local Plan. The neighbourhood plan or order should be consistent with these, and the neighbourhood planning body may decide that the emerging Neighbourhood Plan should provide more detail as to how some of these policies apply or are interpreted locally.

***Bird Aware Solent***

The Solent is internationally important for its wildlife. Each winter, the Solent hosts over 90,000 waders and wildfowl including 10 per cent of the global population of Brent Geese. Research has shown that the planned new housing for the Solent will lead to more people visiting the coast for recreation, potentially causing additional disturbance to these birds. The Solent Recreation Mitigation Partnership Definitive Strategy (known as Bird Aware Solent) provides a strategic solution to mitigate for the additional recreational disturbance arising from new housing. All new housing developments (within 5.6km of the Solent SPAs) can make a financial contribution towards mitigation or, alternatively, provide bespoke mitigation measures.

Bird Aware Solent is an initiative to raise awareness of the birds that spend the winter on the Solent, so that people can enjoy the coast and its wildlife without disturbing the birds. Bird Aware Solent aims to prevent bird disturbance from recreational activities through a series of management measures which actively encourage all coastal visitors to enjoy their visits in a responsible manner rather than restricting access to the coast or preventing activities that take place there.

This strategy is relevant to the waterfront area within Emsworth. It is consistent with the Neighbourhood Plan policy objectives to avoid harm to areas designated for their ecological importance and Natural England would support measures that raise awareness of the Bird Aware Solent's initiatives.

**Biodiversity gain**

Natural England strongly recommends that all development proposals achieve net biodiversity gain in line with National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) paragraphs 9, 109 and 118. We recommend that planning applications are supported by a Biodiversity Mitigation and Enhancement Plan (BMEP). BMEPs could include the following measures and these measures may also be applicable to the neighbourhood projects proposed in the Emsworth Neighbourhood Plan:

- All landscape planting (local and strategic) to utilise appropriate native species.
- Promote enhancements of green spaces, wildlife corridors and woodland.
- Creation and long term management of areas of species rich grassland.
- Creation of habitat features such as wildlife ponds, habitat piles, etc.
- Creation of a community orchard (using traditional varieties) and / or the provision of fruit trees within allotment plots or gardens.
- Provision of new bat roosting and bird nesting opportunities within new builds located adjacent to green infrastructure, including the provision of nesting opportunities for swift and other birds.
- Provision of additional bat roosting opportunities within established woodland.

**Green Infrastructure**

Natural England supports Policy C5 Designated Green Spaces. It is acknowledged that open space and green infrastructure provide important health and well-being opportunities to the wider community and recognise the challenge to ensure green spaces are protected as development comes forward. We consider that it is important to include measures for biodiversity enhancement within green infrastructure and open spaces to help maximise the ecological and biodiversity network opportunities. We would also support the development of the Green Infrastructure network to help ensure there are improved links to less sensitive open space areas by public transport, walking and cycling and look to directing recreational pressure away from more

<p>sensitive areas.</p> <p><b>Water and energy efficiency</b>          Natural England supports policy D6 Resource Efficiency which encourages water and energy efficiency.</p>	
<p><b>Public Health, Hampshire CC</b></p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Emsworth Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>We welcome the many policies in the plan that will have positive impacts on health and wellbeing. However, without a specific objective around wellbeing, this theme does not run as strongly throughout the plan as it could and we have some suggestions for increasing the emphasis.</p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Incorporate <a href="#">guidance</a> from the document produced by Warwickshire County Council<sup>i</sup> on how the wider determinants of health can be addressed through the Neighbourhood Planning process</li> <li>• Incorporate 5 Ways to Wellbeing into the Plan for Emsworth. The 5 ways to wellbeing report was produced by the New Economic Foundation, on behalf of Foresight (2010) and identifies how to improve everyone’s mental capital and mental wellbeing through life. Evidence suggests that a small improvement in wellbeing can help to decrease some mental health problems and also help people to flourish. A link to the 5 Ways to Wellbeing can be found here; <a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/five-ways-to-mental-wellbeing">https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/five-ways-to-mental-wellbeing</a></li> </ul>	<p>Your comments and suggestions are noted and supported.</p>



**Context**

Firstly, it would be useful to include some background data on the demography and health of Emsworth's residents as a context for the plan. The plan clearly recognises the ageing population so it would be useful to quantify this. For instance, the latest Hampshire County Council population forecasts predict by 2023 over 30% of residents in Emsworth ward will be aged over 65 and over 6% will be more than 85 years<sup>ii</sup>.

**Recommendation:**

- Include data on health and wellbeing using publicly available resources such as Public Health England [Fingertips tools](#) and [Local Health](#) and also [Hampshire County Council's population forecasts](#): the Public Health team can provide further support on this if required

**Healthy Neighbourhoods**

We fully support the intention under the 'Community' theme to promote social cohesion (p.22) but we would suggest that this could be strengthened with regard to the older population.

There is emerging evidence that a healthy food environment can have positive health outcomes<sup>iv</sup>, therefore, opportunities for allotments, community gardens and healthy food outlets should be maximised in the plan.

We note that Use Class A5 (takeaways) is not supported in policy C2 (p.26) which is a positive step in terms of health. However, we would suggest that this could be strengthened by placing limits on new A5 outlets.

**Recommendation:**

- Refer to guidance documents such the [RTPI Dementia](#) resource<sup>iii</sup> on how to create a neighbourhood that encourages older people to get out, be active and connect with others
- Consider policies to encourage growing of healthy food (e.g. allotments and community gardens)
- Consider including a policy to limit new A5 outlets in Emsworth

**Transport**

We welcome the policies within the 'Moving' theme that will serve to encourage walking and cycling within Emsworth. We would like to support you in strengthening these policies through use of a robust evidence base.

**Recommendation:**

- Refer to [Public Health England's Spatial Planning for Health Evidence Review](#)<sup>iv</sup> to strengthen 'moving' policies with a robust evidence base.

**Healthy Homes**

Under the 'Living' theme we support the proposed proportion of affordable homes (p.33). However, it is important to make sure that these are truly affordable and, therefore, we would suggest a stronger policy than simply 'encouraging' social housing. In particular, there needs to be an appropriate balance between homes that are available for affordable rent and those that are offered for affordable home ownership in order to ensure affordable homes remain available in the future.

<p>We note the consideration of specialist housing for independent living (Policy L5) and support this. However, with the aging population, it is also important to consider how best to accommodate older and mobility-impaired people within their own homes.</p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Within the 40% affordable homes requirement, set a threshold of 65:35 affordable rent: affordable home ownership</li> <li>• Consider requiring a significant proportion of new homes to be built to Lifetime Homes standard<sup>v</sup></li> </ul>	
<p><b>NHS SE Hants CCG</b></p> <p>Thank you for your letter dated 3rd November 2017 in which you invite the CCG to make representation on the Emsworth Neighbourhood Plan Pre-Submission consultation.</p> <p>We have read the document and have some comment on the Health Services section on page 14. The health services provided by the Emsworth surgery are currently provided from a town centre location. The current surgery is space constrained, and small by modern standards. The building itself is unable to be extended adequately to meet the needs of the growing population, so the practice intends to relocate its surgery to a new site to the north of the Town centre of Emsworth. A new facility would enable the practice to expand and provide opportunity to work differently. Southern Health Foundation Trust hold the contract for Community and Mental Health services for the Emsworth area, which they provide from a base location in Havant. Community Health Service for the Emsworth Community are provided from the local hub, Oak Park Community Clinic.</p> <p>Bus and Rail services run from Emsworth to Havant, however the Community clinic is</p>	<p>Your comments are noted.</p>

<p>not presently on a bus route.</p> <p>We have also advised NHS Property Services of the consultation document and they have requested that with regard to the Emsworth Victoria cottage hospital site any community use is only established based on its proven need and economic viability.</p>	
<p><b>Southern Water.</b></p> <p>Southern Water is the statutory wastewater undertaker for Emsworth and welcomes the opportunity to comment on the Pre-Submission Emsworth Neighbourhood Plan. Please find following our response in respect of specific policies. We hope that you will find this useful and that it will be taken into account in the next version of your Neighbourhood Plan. We would be grateful if you could keep us informed of future progress.</p> <p><b>Policies C4: Leisure &amp; Recreational Facilities and C5: Designated Green Spaces</b>  <b>Page 27-28</b> Southern Water understands Emsworth Forum's intention to protect Leisure, Recreation and Green Spaces. However, we would also wish to ensure that planning polices that seek to protect such spaces (as defined in Paragraphs 74 and 76 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)) are not overly restrictive so that essential wastewater infrastructure can be delivered if the benefit outweighs any harm. The NPPF identifies that there are 'very special circumstances' in which development would be permitted in such locations. Paragraph 76 of the NPPF sets out that neighbourhood plans can identify green areas of particular importance with the intention of ruling out '<i>new development other than in very special circumstances</i>'. Paragraph 88 of the NPPF explains that special circumstances exist if the potential harm of a development proposal is clearly outweighed by other considerations. Southern Water considers that should the need arise, special circumstances exist in relation to the provision of essential wastewater infrastructure (e.g a new pumping station) required to serve new and existing customers. This is because there are limited options available with regard to location, as the infrastructure would need to connect into existing networks. The draft National Planning Practice Guidance</p>	<p>Your comments and suggestions are noted, and changes made. Regarding the wording of the "New and improved utility infrastructure...", we have added a new policy L6.</p>

<p>recognises this scenario and states that <i>'it will be important to recognise that water and wastewater infrastructure sometimes has needs particular to the location (and often consists of engineering works rather than new buildings) which mean otherwise protected areas may exceptionally have to be considered'</i>.</p> <p><b>Proposed amendments</b></p> <p>Accordingly, we propose the following additional text to <b>Policy C4</b> (new text underlined): <i>The following existing community spaces should be protected, except in special circumstances, for example essential utility infrastructure, where the benefit outweighs any harm or loss and it can be demonstrated there are no reasonable alternative sites available.</i></p> <p>Additionally, we propose the following additional text to <b>Policy C5</b> (new text underlined):</p> <p><i>a) Planning applications for development that may cause significant harm to the designated green spaces, natural environment or habitats of the neighbourhood plan area will be refused except in special circumstances, for example essential utility infrastructure, where the benefit outweighs any harm or loss and it can be demonstrated there are no reasonable alternative sites available.</i></p>	
<p><b>Sport England.</b></p> <p>Thank you for consulting Sport England on the above neighbourhood plan.</p> <p>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</p>	<p>Noted</p>

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.

It is essential therefore that the neighbourhood plan reflects and complies with national planning policy for sport as set out in the NPPF with particular reference to Pars 73 and 74. It is also important to be aware of Sport England's statutory consultee role in **protecting playing fields** and the presumption against the loss of playing field land. Sport England's playing fields policy is set out in our Planning Policy Statement: 'A Sporting Future for the Playing Fields of England'.

<http://www.sportengland.org/playingfieldspolicy>

Sport England provides guidance on **developing planning policy** 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.

<http://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/planning-for-sport/forward-planning/>

Sport England works with local authorities to ensure their Local Plan is underpinned by robust and up to date evidence. In line with Par 74 of the NPPF, this takes the form of **assessments of need and strategies for indoor and outdoor sports facilities**. 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.

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.

<http://www.sportengland.org/planningtoolsandguidance>

If **new or improved sports facilities** are proposed Sport England recommend you ensure they are fit for purpose and designed in accordance with our design guidance notes.

<http://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/tools-guidance/design-and-cost-guidance/>

Any **new housing** 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.

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 **any new development**, 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.

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.

NPPF Section 8: <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/national-planning-policy-framework/8-promoting-healthy-communities>

PPG Health and wellbeing section: <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/health-and-wellbeing>

Sport England's Active Design Guidance: <https://www.sportengland.org/activedesign>

*(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.)*



<p>If you need any further advice, please do not hesitate to contact Sport England using the contact details below.</p>	
<p>The Environment Agency. 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 and developers on pre-application enquiries, planning applications, appeals and strategic plans.</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>Having read your plan we have no detailed comments to make at this stage. However together with Natural England, English 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><a href="http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20140328084622/http://cdn.environment-agency.gov.uk/LIT_6524_7da381.pdf">http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20140328084622/http://cdn.environment-agency.gov.uk/LIT_6524_7da381.pdf</a></p> <p>We have worked with and supported your Local Planning Authority as they are developing their Charging Schedule.</p> <p>We would also welcome the opportunity to work with your neighbourhood forum on this to ensure environmental infrastructure is taken into consideration when looking to fund local infrastructure.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

**Westbourne Parish Council.****PROPOSED RESPONSE TO EMWORTH NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN REGULATION 14 CONSULTATION**

Under 'Protected Environments' (pp11-12) there is no mention of the River Ems corridor, north of the A27. I know it is not protected, but neither, I think, is the Slipper Pond, which also gets a mention. Could it not be designated as a SINC?

Although this is not a public space, there is no mention of the River Ems corridor, north of the A27 in the 'Green Spaces, Recreation & Leisure' section on p17.

Although this is not a public space there is no mention of the River Ems corridor, north of the A27 in the Leisure & Recreational Facilities section on P27

P29 "a) Planning applications for development that may cause significant harm to the designated green spaces, natural environment or habitats of the neighbourhood plan area will be refused. b) New development proposals that detract from the visual, historic, recreational, landscape or ecological value of designated green spaces will not be supported." It is recommended that a number of areas be designated as Local Green Spaces These should include The River Ems Corridor.

Policy L5: 'Avoiding Settlement Coalescence' (P36) is considered to be woefully inadequate.

"Housing development proposals of a nonstrategic nature will only be permitted if they do not impinge on the current gaps between Emsworth and its neighbouring settlements, nor encroach on the protected landscape area to the north or the waterfront area to the south.

The local characters of Emsworth, Westbourne, Southbourne and Denvilles should remain distinct and allow each community to have their own identity. Protecting green gaps between settlements will retain the landscape quality with benefits for wildlife, leisure, recreation, and mental well-being. That said, this neighbourhood plan acknowledges the strategic site allocation (known as the area between Denvilles and Emsworth) in both the adopted Havant Housing Statement and the emerging Havant Local Plan. It is acknowledged that the development proposals will inevitably lead to an increase in built-up area between settlements but with careful landscape and design work, these settlements should remain distinct and allow each community to have their own identity. Similarly, the waterfront area provides the community with a unique local attraction.”

Westbourne Parish Council (WPC) would like to comment on Policy L5 in regard to the area between Emsworth, on its north-western boundary, and the Parish of Westbourne.

Although the policy states that the reasons for retaining the gaps are to enable surrounding settlements to retain their separate identities and to maintain the “benefits for wildlife, leisure, recreation and mental well-being”, WPC believes that more detailed explanation and evidence would enable the policy to be strengthened.

1. It would be helpful to have a map of the Neighbourhood Plan area showing the current gaps between Emsworth and the neighbouring settlements superimposed with Havant Borough Council’s proposed housing allocations. This would demonstrate the impact of the proposed developments on the gaps.
2. It should be noted that the gap between Emsworth and Westbourne marks the boundary between Hampshire and West Sussex.

3. The development of Redlands Grange on land owned by Hampshire Farm eroded a large portion of the gap between Emsworth and Westbourne. Land at Long Copse Lane has been allocated for 260 housing units, which will erode the gap on the northern section of the boundary still further.
4. There are also current proposals to build circa 50 units on a greenfield site on the southern side of Westbourne Road to the rear of gardens at Westbourne Avenue, which would effectively close the gap on the Emsworth side of the boundary between the two settlements in that area.
5. The extent of these developments – recent and proposed – will effectively result in the disappearance of the separate identities of Westbourne and Emsworth.
6. The proposals for the site near Westbourne Avenue have been drawn up so that the housing units will be in Flood Zone 1 but immediately adjacent to land in Flood Zone 3. Emsworth and Westbourne residents, in separate consultation exercises, have expressed deep reservations about development proposals which may well exacerbate the risk of flooding in both communities. The WPC considers that this site is not in a sustainable location.
7. Gaps between the two communities provide an amenity for the public to enjoy semi-natural open space. Proposed development near Westbourne Avenue will alter the character of this area from a rural space with a trodden footpath (the Sussex Border Path) to a more urbanised, built-up area. The natural gap needs to be retained in order to preserve the landscape quality referred to in Policy L5, which contributes towards the well-being of the residents of Westbourne and Emsworth.

8. Policy L5 refers to the gaps between Emsworth and surrounding settlements providing benefits for wildlife. There is a SINC within the vicinity of the site proposed at Hollybank Lane/Long Copse Lane. Construction in this area is likely to have a significant impact on biodiversity. The proposed site adjacent to Westbourne Avenue is next to a Biodiversity Opportunity Area (BOA), designated because of the presence of Water Vole and Bat networks. Water Voles and Bats are two of the most endangered species in the country and development in such close proximity to a BOA will undermine all attempts to encourage creation, restoration and restoration of habitat for these two species.

Westbourne Parish Council is aware that when Emsworth Forum began to prepare its Neighbourhood Plan, it was unaware that the town would be presented with proposals for a large housing allocation to be incorporated into the emerging Havant Borough Local Plan 2036. This housing allocation (now adopted by Havant Borough Council) has presented the Forum with significant challenges. However, Westbourne Parish Council believes that it is vitally important for the two settlements of Westbourne and Emsworth to support their residents in their wish to retain their separate identities and for each community to work together to ensure that only sustainable development is permitted. Maintenance of the gap between Westbourne and Emsworth with its semi-natural open space will prevent the risk of greater flooding and permit opportunities for the enhancement of biodiversity and promote public wellbeing.

## Quantitative Support for the Policies in The Pre-Submission Plan

Q7 Policy C1 (page 25): What are your views on Policy C1 Community and Public Services Hub?

Answered: 65 Skipped: 12

Support	86.15%	56
Do not know	12.31%	8
Object	1.54%	1
TOTAL		65

Q8 Policy C2 (page 26): What are your views on Policy C2 Retail, High Street & Food & Drink Uses?

Answered: 67 Skipped: 10

Support	82.09%	55
Do not know	10.45%	7
Object	7.46%	5
TOTAL		67

Q9 Policy C3 (Page 27): What are your views on Policy C3 Public Realm Design?

Answered: 65 Skipped: 12

Support	87.69%	57
Do not know	9.23%	6
Object	3.08%	2
TOTAL		65

Q10 Policy C4 (page 27): What are your views on Policy C4 Leisure & Recreational Facilities?

Answered: 70 Skipped: 7

Support	94.29%	66
Do not know	5.71%	4
Object	0.00%	0
TOTAL		70

## Q11 Policy C5 (page 29): What are your views on Policy C5 Designated Green Spaces?

Answered: 70 Skipped: 7

Support	88.57%	62
Do not know	7.14%	5
Object	4.29%	3
TOTAL		70

## Q12 Policy L1 (page 33): What are your views on Policy L1 General Housing Policy?

Answered: 66 Skipped: 11

Support	72.73%	48
Do not know	16.67%	11
Object	10.61%	7
TOTAL		66

## Q13 Policy L2 (page 34): What are your views on Policy L2 Housing Mix?

Answered: 67 Skipped: 10

Support	77.61%	52
Do not know	14.93%	10
Object	7.46%	5
TOTAL		67

## Q14 Policy L3 (page 35): What are your views on Policy L3 Walking Distances?

Answered: 65 Skipped: 12

ANSWER CHOICES RESPONSES

Support	83.08%	54
Do not know	12.31%	8
Object	4.62%	3
TOTAL		65

## Q15 Policy L4 (page 36): What are your views on Policy L4 Independent Living?

Answered: 67 Skipped: 10

Support	88.06%	59
Do not know	8.96%	6
Object	2.99%	2
TOTAL		67

## Q16 Policy L5 (page 36): What are your views on Policy L5 Avoiding Settlement Coalescence?

Answered: 66 Skipped: 11

Support	81.82%	54
Do not know	10.61%	7
Object	7.58%	5
TOTAL		66

## Q17 Policy W1 (page 38): What are your views on Policy W1 Employment Premises &amp; Design Quality?

Answered: 66 Skipped: 11

Support	87.88%	58
Do not know	9.09%	6
Object	3.03%	2
TOTAL		66

## Q18 Policy W2 (page 38): What are your views on Policy W2 Strong Economy &amp; Youth Training?

Answered: 65 Skipped: 12

Support	93.85%	61
Do not know	4.62%	3
Object	1.54%	1
TOTAL		65



## Q19 Policy W3 (page 39): What are your views on Policy W3 Change of Use Applications?

Answered: 66 Skipped: 11

Support	66.67%	44
Do not know	22.73%	15
Object	10.61%	7
TOTAL		66

## Q20 Policy W4 (page 41): What are your views on Policy W4 Technology &amp; Tourism?

Answered: 64 Skipped: 13

Support	89.06%	57
Do not know	9.38%	6
Object	1.56%	1
TOTAL		64

## Q21 Policy W5 (page 41): What are your views on Policy W5 Home Working?

Answered: 67 Skipped: 10

Support	89.55%	60
Do not know	7.46%	5
Object	2.99%	2
TOTAL		67

## Q22 Policy M1 (page 43): What are your views on Policy M1 New Civic Space?

Answered: 69 Skipped: 8

Support	69.57%	48
Do not know	20.29%	14
Object	10.14%	7
TOTAL		69

## Q23 Policy M2 (page 44): What are your views on Policy M2 Improve the Pedestrian Environment?

Answered: 69 Skipped: 8

Support	86.96%	60
Do not know	7.25%	5
Object	5.80%	4
TOTAL		69

## Q24 Policy M3 (page 44): What are your views on Policy M3 Cycling Strategies?

Answered: 68 Skipped: 9

Support	82.35%	56
Do not know	10.29%	7
Object	7.35%	5
TOTAL		56

## Q25 Policy M4 (page 45): What are your views on Policy M4 Cycling Storage Provision?

Answered: 68 Skipped: 9

Support	82.35%	56
Do not know	10.29%	7
Object	7.35%	5
TOTAL		68

## Q26 Policy WF1 (page 51): What are your views on Policy WF1 Public Enjoyment of the Waterfront?

Answered: 66 Skipped: 11

Support	92.42%	61
Do not know	7.58%	5
Object	0.00%	0
TOTAL		66

## Q27 Policy H1 (page 53): What are your views on Policy H1 Design &amp; Heritage?

Answered: 67 Skipped: 10

Support	92.54%	62
Do not know	7.46%	5
Object	0.00%	0
TOTAL		67

## Q28 Policy H2 (page 53): What are your views on Policy H2 Heritage Appraisals?

Answered: 67 Skipped: 10

Support	82.09%	55
Do not know	16.42%	11
Object	1.49%	1
TOTAL		67

## Q29 Policy H3 (page 54): What are your views on Policy H4 Buildings of Local Historic Interest?

Answered: 70 Skipped: 7

Support	81.43%	57
Do not know	11.43%	8
Object	7.14%	5
TOTAL		70

## Q30 Policy D1 (page 56): What are your views on Policy D1 General Design Policy?

Answered: 67 Skipped: 10

Support	92.54%	62
Do not know	4.48%	3
Object	2.99%	2
TOTAL		67

## Q31 Policy D2 (page 56): What are your views on Policy D2 Height, Mass &amp; Materials?

Answered: 68 Skipped: 9

Support	83.82%	57
Do not know	10.29%	7
Object	5.88%	4
TOTAL		68

## Q32 Policy D3 (page 57): What are your views on Policy D3 Layout, Form &amp; Density?

Answered: 64 Skipped: 13

Support	85.94%	55
Do not know	10.94%	7
Object	3.13%	2
TOTAL		64

## Q33 Policy D4 (page 57): What are your views on Policy D4 Design of External Areas?

Answered: 66 Skipped: 11

Support	87.88%	58
Do not know	12.12%	8
Object	0.00%	0
TOTAL		66

## Q34 Policy D5 (page 57): What are your views on Policy D5 Design Integration?

Answered: 65 Skipped: 12

Support	89.23%	58
Do not know	9.23%	6
Object	1.54%	1
TOTAL		65

## Q35 Policy D6 (page 58): What are your views on Policy D6 Resource Efficiency?

Support	85.94%	55
Do not know	12.50%	8
Object	1.56%	1
TOTAL		64

## Q36 Policy D7 (page 59): What are your views on Policy D7 Rooms in the Roof?

Answered: 65 Skipped: 12

Support	90.77%	59
Do not know	7.69%	5
Object	1.54%	1
TOTAL		65

## Q37 Policy D8 (page 59): What are your views on Policy D8 Mitigate Light Pollution?

Answered: 65 Skipped: 12

Support	93.85%	61
Do not know	3.08%	2
Object	3.08%	2
TOTAL		65

## Q38 Policy P1 (page 63): What are your views on Policy P1 Neighbourhood Projects?

Answered: 63 Skipped: 14

Support	77.78%	49
Do not know	15.87%	10
Object	6.35%	4
TOTAL		63

---

<sup>i</sup> Warwickshire County Council 'Neighbourhood Development Planning for Health' <https://apps.warwickshire.gov.uk/api/documents/WCCC-630-656>

---

<sup>ii</sup> Hampshire County Council's 2016-based Small Area Population Forecasts <http://www3.hants.gov.uk/factsandfigures/population-statistics/pop-estimates/small-area-pop-stats.htm>

<sup>iii</sup> RTPI (2017) Dementia and Town Planning: Creating better environments for people living with dementia <http://www.rtpi.org.uk/knowledge/practice/dementia-and-town-planning/>

<sup>iv</sup> Public Health England's Spatial Planning for Health Evidence Review <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/spatial-planning-for-health-evidence-review>

<sup>v</sup> Lifetime Homes Standards <http://www.lifetimehomes.org.uk/>





EMSWORTH  
FORUM