



ROWLANDS CASTLE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN
REGULATION 14 PUBLIC CONSULTATION
17 June – 14 August 2022
Consultation Responses

All comments have been considered, grouped together where appropriate, summarised and both a response and any changes to the draft plan noted. The replies have been split so that replies for individuals living in the parish, organisations, businesses, statutory authorities, landowners, owners of non-designated historic assets and individuals outside the parish are grouped separately. Comments are also grouped for each policy with number of parties making the comments at the end in brackets.

Any suggestions on further policies or other general comments not referring to policies are shown separately.

Part	Page	Part	Page
Part 1 – Statutory Consultees	2	Part 5 - Individuals living outside the Parish	68
Part 2 – Landowners	16	Policy 1 – Gaps Between Settlements	68
Part 3 – Non designated historical assets	19	Policy 2 – Landscape Character and Views	68
Part 4 – Individuals living in the Parish	24	Policy 3 – Local Green Spaces and Protected Open Spaces	68
Policy 1 – Gaps Between Settlements	24	Policy 4 – Historic Environment: Non-Designated Heritage Assets	69
Policy 2 – Landscape Character and Views	31	Policy 5 – Design and Local Character	69
Policy 3 – Local Green Spaces and Protected Open Spaces	33	Policy 6 – Over 55’s Housing	69
Policy 4 – Historic Environment: Non-Designated Heritage Assets	36	Policy 7 – Rowlands Castle Village Centre	70
Policy 5 – Design and Local Character	40	Policy 8 – Parking	71
Policy 6 – Over 55’s Housing	42	Policy 9 – Flood Risk and Groundwater Management	72
Policy 7 – Rowlands Castle Village Centre	48	Policy 10 – Community and Sports Facilities	72
Policy 8 – Parking	52	Policy 11 – Walking, Cycling and Horse Riding	73
Policy 9 – Flood Risk and Groundwater Management	58	Part 6 – Organisations	75
Policy 10 – Community and Sports Facilities	60	Part 7 – Local or other Businesses	78
Policy 11 – Walking, Cycling and Horse Riding	64	Part 8 – General Comments	79
		Part 9 – Further Policies	84

Part 1 – Statutory Consultees

Hampshire County Council (Mark Housby) Hampshireplanningconsultations@hants.gov.uk

Comment	Response	Changes to the Draft Plan
Policy 3: The County Council has no ownership as such.	HCC made comments relating to the ownership of roads and land alongside village greens in relation to the designation of the Village Green as a Local Green Space. These comments were of no direct relevance to the provisions of the Draft Neighbourhood Plan but were noted in deciding to define the verge as a local green space in Policy 3 of the Neighbourhood Plan.	No changes required.

West Sussex District Council (Planning Policy) caroline.west@westsussex.gov.uk

Comment	Response	Changes to the Draft Plan
No comments to make on the Plan.	None.	No changes required.

East Hampshire District Council (Amanda Dunn) localplan@easthants.gov.uk

Comment	Response	Changes to the Draft Plan
Paragraphs, tables and maps should be numbered consistently throughout the document (for example, Table 2 appears to be missing)	We agree with these comments.	Draft Neighbourhood Plan modified accordingly.
To assist with future interactive mapping, maps showing symbols on a map would be better mapped as outlines of the buildings, located roughly in the location of the building. This would be quite easy to map and easier to define.	The issue was discussed with members of EHDC's Planning Team and a technical solution was agreed.	No changes required.
<u>Introduction, Paragraph 1.12:</u> The Joint Core Strategy was adopted on 8 th May 2014, so although a minor point I would suggest changing 'approved' to 'adopted'. This paragraph also mentions a hybrid local plan and a plan period to 2038. As you are aware the emerging Local Plan is subject to further change as originally stated in our last response, therefore, I would recommend that the last sentence is amended to read:” East Hampshire District Council are in the process of developing an emerging Local Plan.”	We agree with this comment.	Draft Neighbourhood Plan modified accordingly.
<u>Vision and Objectives:</u> I support the list of objectives but would suggest that in the second bullet point you change the word 'when possible' to 'where possible' which provides a more positive stance.	We agree with this comment.	Draft Neighbourhood Plan modified accordingly.

<p><u>Policy 1 – Gaps between Settlements</u>: Although supported by an evidence base, some of the extent of the gaps appear excessive in terms of what they are trying to achieve. Consideration should be given in some areas whether there is going to be a future risk from potential development, for example, between wooded areas adjacent to Havant? Some areas within the gaps already have fixed boundaries and barriers which would stop/restrict any future coalescence. This may be something an Examiner may seek further justification on. For information, accompanying Map 2 would benefit having a key.</p>	<p>The extent of the gap between settlements proposed in the Neighbourhood Plan is substantially less than the gap identified in the EHDC Local Plan: Joint Core Strategy (2014), Policy CP23: Gaps between Settlements and reflects our view on the degree of protection necessary to secure the sense of place for the village settlements of Rowlands Castle.</p> <p>We agree with this comment.</p>	<p>The Policy has been amended to refer to prevention of coalescence, and the need to protect the landscape and ecological features.</p> <p>Draft Neighbourhood Plan modified accordingly.</p>
<p><u>Policy 2 – Landscape Character and Views</u>: Policy 2 and Map 3 are two distinct topics and although there is some overlap, we would recommend that there is more explanation as to where the ecological network contributes to landscape character</p>	<p>The reasons for inclusion of Network Opportunity Areas were largely to add support for the boundaries of Policy 1 and it was accepted that it had limited application to Policy 2. The inclusion has caused much comment and it has been decided to remove this reference.</p>	<p>References to Ecological Network Opportunity Areas removed.</p>
<p><u>Table 1 ‘Locally Significant Views’</u>, some Examiners wish to see a justification for these and not just that they are views of the general countryside, this may be something to consider adding to Table 1.</p>	<p>We agree with this comment.</p>	<p>Draft Neighbourhood Plan amended accordingly.</p>
<p><u>Policy 3 – Local Green Spaces and Protected Open Spaces</u>: As suggested previously, the ‘Compliance of Local Green Space designations’ table does not necessarily need to be in the Plan itself and may be better suited in the supporting evidence base.</p>	<p>We have included the justification for the designation of Local Green Spaces in the Neighbourhood Plan document since other successful plans have done so, and because it adds a degree of clarification which we believe is helpful. We do not think it detracts from the clarity of the Plan to include it here.</p>	<p>The Policy Objectives were updated to explain the reasons for designating some spaces as “Local Green”, and others as “Protected Open”.</p>
<p><u>Policy 4 – Historic Environment</u>: To assist with future interactive mapping, maps showing symbols on a map would be better mapped as outlines of the buildings, located roughly in the location of the building. This would be quite easy to map and easier to define. This would assist with mapping accompanying Policy 4.</p>	<p>Relates to digital media format selection rather than to policy content. The issue was discussed with members of EDHC’s Planning Policy Team, and a technical solution was agreed.</p>	<p>None proposed.</p>
<p><u>Policy 5 – Housing Design and Local Character</u>: Policy 5’s title includes ‘housing design’ therefore I would suggest that references in paragraphs 1 and 2 refer to housing development. I would also recommend that the word ‘must’ be changed to ‘should’ which would add more flexibility.</p>	<p>This is a similar comment to that from the SDNP though it suggests an opposing course of action. It has been decided to proceed with the SDNP approach so that the policy applies to all development.</p>	<p>Draft Neighbourhood Plan amended in accordance with SDNPA’s comments.</p>
<p><u>Policy 6 – Over 55’s Housing</u>. As per previous comments, the word ‘encouraged’ should be replaced by the word ‘supported’ within the policy. It remains unclear whether encouragement for</p>	<p>The Rowlands Castle Housing Needs Survey 2018 concluded that over the next 15 years there would be a Net Surplus of over 29</p>	<p>None proposed.</p>

<p>such proposals means they would be supported in any individual case. Policy criteria may also be appropriate to clarify the circumstances in which planning permission would be granted unless the support is to be unconditional and reliant on the operation of other policies.</p>	<p>4+Bed Properties released and a shortfall of 49 1-2 Bed/Flat/Bungalows/Retirement Properties.</p> <p>The policy is intended to ensure that the larger properties in the village can be released and redeveloped into multiple 1 and 2 bed units (perhaps even allowing the current owners to reserve an apartment that would be suitable for their needs in the redeveloped site) and would meet the need for 1-2 Bed units not only for over 55's but also younger couples.</p> <p>The policy is intended to strongly encourage these types of developments, and to give a higher priority for them to be undertaken than would be available under other existing planning policies.</p> <p>Our view is that we continue to prefer to use the word 'encouraged'. This is a key policy of the draft Neighbourhood Development Plan and there is strong evidence to widely supported within the community.</p>	
<p><u>Policy 7 – Rowlands Castle Village Centre:</u> There should be some reflection in the background to the policy on changes to the use class system. There is a risk that the community maybe under the false impression that they have more control over the loss of retail and commercial premises than is in fact possible given the changes to legislation.</p> <p>Criterion 2 – please consider specifying the use class (Class E/F?) that would be considered acceptable in the centre.</p> <p>Some clarification of the meaning of the phrase 'support the village community' would be helpful, perhaps mentioning any services/facilities that are thought to be lacking.</p>	<p>We agree that the new Use Classes Order limits control due to permitted development rights.</p> <p>All the facilities are important, and the Policy is to encourage their retention and preclude a change to other non-commercial/community uses such as residential by providing further support over and above existing planning policies.</p> <p>It is recognised that the balance and type of uses will change over time and that the village centre will need to adapt to changing demand for the individual facilities, the policy is designed to provide for this and not be overly restrictive on the individual uses.</p> <p>We agree that the words "support the village community" do not mention any individual services or facilities, we prefer to see an open approach to this and to not set restrictions to any particular use.</p>	<p>Policy 7 amended to make clear that its effect might be limited by existing permitted development rights.</p>
<p><u>Policy 8 – Parking: Criterion 1</u> – this criterion appears to be unnecessary and should be deleted. Any proposal would need to be in conformity with Joint Core Strategy Policy CP31, having regard to matters such as parking standards and safety etc.</p> <p><u>Criterion 2</u> –this criterion appears to be unnecessary and should be deleted. As above, all proposals would need to meet the requisite parking standards in accordance with CP31 of the Joint Core Strategy. Criterion 4 addresses design matters which could consider 'character'</p>	<p>The various consultations identified insufficient parking in the Village Centre as a key concern, both from retail shops and their customers. It was also considered to be critical in maintaining a successful and vibrant village centre.</p> <p>The Policy deals with existing parking facilities which should be maintained rather than setting out criteria for new developments and needs to be considered separately to deal with the local issues in Rowlands Castle.</p>	<p>None proposed.</p>

<u>Policy 9 – Flood Risk and Groundwater Management:</u> I note that Rowlands Castle designated area is prone to specific types of flood risk and therefore support the policy as it stands.	Policy supported	No changes required.
<u>Implementation, Monitoring and Review:</u> In the first paragraph there is a comma and a full stop, this needs to be corrected. In the same paragraph I suggest adding in the phrase: ‘currently adopted’ in respect of the Local Plan. When referring to the Neighbourhood Plan, any new, non-strategic policies will have precedence over the non-strategic policies of the currently adopted Local Plan; whereas as the emerging Local Plan may replace these policies and supersede the Neighbourhood Plan policies (depending on the date of adoption relative to that for making the Neighbourhood Plan).	We agree with these comments.	Draft Neighbourhood Plan amended accordingly.
<u>Appendices:</u> I recommend that the appendices are separate documents. The aspirations section on page 57 could be included in the Neighbourhood Plan but it should be made clear that these do not form part of the Neighbourhood Plan and are not subject to the examination process. The aspirations section also refers to ‘2033’; as the Neighbourhood Plan needs to conform to both the Joint Core Strategy and the South Downs Local Plan, the deletion of the timeframe would be more appropriate	We consider it is important that the appendices are included in the Plan as they are important documents that are part of any examination. The Aspirations section has however been removed and included as a separate document as Community Feedback which we agree, is not part of the examination process.	Draft Neighbourhood Plan modified accordingly.

South Downs National Park Authority (Chris Paterson) neighbourhood@southdowns.gov.uk

Comment	Response	Changes to the Draft Plan
<u>Page 5 – Map 1</u> The Neighbourhood Area has been designated; therefore the key should be updated to show the designated neighbourhood area, not the proposed neighbourhood area as currently shown.	We agree with this comment.	Map 1 amended accordingly.
<u>Introduction, Paragraph 1.11:</u> The majority of this paragraph is describing the constraints which exist in the Parish. The first sentence appears to set out the strategy and the second sentence appears to establish the aim. Is the sole aim of the plan to maintain the separate and distinctive settlements of the Parish? Consideration should be given to redrafting this paragraph to focus on the strategy of the plan as the title suggests.	We agree with these comments.	We have modified the Draft Neighbourhood Plan to ensure that the strategy and aims of the plan are clearly expressed. We have also amended the Draft Neighbourhood Plan to reflect the wider purposes and duties of the National Park.

<p>It would be helpful to refer to the purposes and duty of the National Park in this section. As currently drafted the paragraph states that it is essential to minimise any impact on the landscape of the National Park. The purposes and duty of the National Park go beyond minimising impact on the landscape and it would be helpful if the purposes and duty were set out clearly in this section. It is also important to note that under Section 62 of the Environment Act 1995 all relevant authorities including the parish council, the district council and the national park authority are required to have regard to the purposes of the National Park</p>		
<p><u>Introduction, Paragraph 1.14:</u> The reference to Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan is a plan produced by the Hampshire Authorities including Hampshire County Council, the South Downs National Park Authority, New Forest National Park Authority, Portsmouth City Council and Southampton City Council. The reference should be to the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan only</p>	<p>We agree with this comment.</p>	<p>Draft Neighbourhood Plan amended accordingly.</p>
<p><u>Introduction, Paragraph 1.15:</u> This paragraph refers to the Development Plan for the Rowlands Castle. The RCNP will form part of the development plan once adopted; it is currently not part of the development plan.</p>	<p>We agree with this comment.</p>	<p>Draft Neighbourhood Plan amended accordingly.</p>
<p><u>Introduction, Paragraph 1.16:</u> As per the comment above, the RCNP is still a draft plan and not adopted so the paragraph should be amended to address this. The final sentence should be modified as follows as there is no need to refer to resolution of conflict not being in favour of the local plans Any conflict between nonstrategic policies of these documents would be resolved in favour of the most recently adopted plan. not necessarily the Local Plans.</p>	<p>We agree with this comment.</p>	<p>Draft Neighbourhood Plan amended accordingly.</p>
<p><u>Policy 1 – Gaps between Settlements.</u> Further justification of the identified gap should be included in the supporting text to the policy. As currently drafted the supporting text just lists the policy aims and supporting evidence. It would be useful to include some commentary as to why the gap covers such a large area. Are there landscape features or important views within this area which the policy is seeking to protect for example. If the policy intention is to prevent coalescence this should be stated in the policy. For example the policy could be drafted to read: ‘The open and undeveloped character of the gaps between Rowlands</p>	<p>The extent of the gap between settlements proposed in the Neighbourhood Plan is substantially less than the gap identified in the EHDC Local Plan: Joint Core Strategy (2014), Policy CP23: Gaps between Settlements and reflects our view on the degree of protection necessary to secure the sense of place for the village settlements of Rowlands Castle.</p>	<p>The Policy has been amended to refer to prevention of coalescence, and the need to protect the landscape and ecological features.</p>

<p>Castle and Havant as shown on the Policies Map will be protected to prevent coalescence, retain the identity of the separate settlements, protect their landscape setting and protect designated views’.</p>		
<p><u>Policy 2 – Landscape Character and Views:</u> The first criterion of the policy (1) is seeking to address landscape character and the Ecological Network Opportunity Areas. Whilst these matters are clearly related, it is not clear in the policy or supporting text how the Ecological Network Opportunity Areas relate to the landscape character or what contribution they make to the distinctive landscape character of the Parish. Further consideration should be given to whether the Ecological Network Opportunity Areas should be included within the landscape character and views policy, or whether they would be better addressed in a Biodiversity policy or are adequately addressed in other parts of the development plan</p>	<p>The reasons for inclusion of Network Opportunity Areas was largely to add support for the boundaries of Policy 1 and it was accepted that it had limited application to Policy 2. The inclusion has caused much comment and it has been decided to remove this reference. Information relating to views and the justification for selection are included in the supporting views report.</p>	<p>References to Ecological Network Opportunity Areas removed. No changes to the Policy required.</p>
<p>Criterion 2 of the policy seeks to protect a large number of locally significant views. It would be helpful to provide some more information to support the designation of particular views. For example, views of St Hubert’s Church are clearly significant and important as they seek to protect views of an important land mark building. However, other views identified and listed would benefit from a short description to explain why the view is valued locally and warrants protection.</p>	<p>We agree with this comment.</p>	<p>Draft Neighbourhood Plan amended accordingly.</p>
<p><u>Policy 3: Local Green Spaces and Protected Open Spaces.</u> It is not clear in the policy or supporting text why the plan seeks to designate some areas as Local Green Spaces and others as Protected Open Spaces. Are the three areas proposed as protected open spaces not appropriate for Local Green Space designation? Further explanation should be provided to help the reader understand why certain open spaces warrant Local Green Space Designation and others do not.</p>	<p>We agree these comments.</p>	<p>The Policy Objectives were updated to explain the reasons for designating some spaces as “Local Green”, and others as “Protected Open”.</p>
<p>The Local Green Space identified as Wooded Area along the western and eastern sides of Shipwrights Way/Staunton Way (HCC Bridleway 24) (from Whichers Gate Road to The Drift) is quite significant in size. It would be helpful to provide further justification to demonstrate why this is not considered to be an extensive tract of land, as this may be picked up by the Examiner during Examination.</p>	<p>We agree with this comment in the sense that some further justification of the designation of this land as local Green Space is appropriate.</p>	<p>Draft Neighbourhood Plan amended to clarify this point.</p>

<p>The justification for designation of Local Green Spaces set out in the table on page 25 and 26 does not need to be in the main Neighbourhood Plan document; it could be included as an appendix or referred to as supporting evidence.</p>	<p>We have included the justification for the designation of Local Green Spaces in the Neighbourhood Plan document since other successful plans have done so, and because it adds a degree of clarification which we believe is helpful. We do not think it detracts from the clarity of the plan to include it here.</p>	<p>None proposed.</p>
<p><u>Policy 5: Housing Design and Local Character</u> Is the intention of the policy to inform the design of all development? As currently drafted the policy refers to development and therefore would be applied to all development which would align with the plans objective to ‘improve the quality of the built environment through high quality design’. If this is the intention of the policy the policy title should be amended to remove the word housing.</p>	<p>Agree with these comments.</p>	<p>Policy amended accordingly.</p>
<p>Criterion 1 of the policy does not offer anything in addition to the second part of the policy. If the second criterion of the policy is applied it will result in achieving high standards of design which respect the character and identify of the surrounding area. Further consideration should be given to the wording of Policy 5.</p>	<p>Agree with comments.</p>	<p>Criterion 1 amended accordingly.</p>
<p><u>Policy 6: Over 55’s Housing</u> It is unclear how this policy will offer anything more than existing policy in the East Hampshire Joint Core Strategy and South Downs Local Plan. Further consideration should be given to whether this policy is necessary. The evidence to support this policy appears to be the Housing Needs Survey from 2018. Has there been a more recent update or is there more recent evidence available to support the intention of this policy.</p>	<p>The Rowlands Castle Housing Needs Survey 2018 was hand delivered to all residents. It was promoted to identify residents’ housing requirements, identifying what type of properties they would require, and what properties would become available over the next 15 years.</p> <p>The main conclusion was that over the next 15 years there would be a Net Surplus of over 29 4+Bed Properties would be released and a Shortfall of 49 1-2 Bed/Flat/Bungalows/Retirement Properties.</p> <p>The policy is intended to ensure that the larger properties in the village can be released and redeveloped into multiple 1 and 2 bed units (perhaps even allowing the current owners to reserve an apartment that would be suitable for their needs in the redeveloped site) and would meet the need for 1-2 Bed units not only for over 55’s but also younger couples.</p> <p>The policy is intended to strongly encourage these types of developments and to give a higher priority for them to be undertaken than would be available under other existing planning policies</p>	<p>None proposed.</p>
<p><u>Map 16:</u> Map 16 shows the Settlement Policy Boundary; however, it doesn’t seem to be referenced in any policy or supporting text. The RCNP doesn’t seek to amend or set a</p>	<p>Agree with this comment.</p>	<p>Policy 6 wording amended to reference Map 16.</p>

<p>Settlement Policy Boundary so it is unclear as to why it is included. It may be more appropriate to include it at the beginning of the document and include the boundary on the policies map.</p>		
<p><u>Policy 7:</u> Rowlands Castle Village Centre It is unclear how this policy will offer anything more than existing policy in the East Hampshire Joint Core Strategy and South Downs Local Plan. If the plan intends to ensure the ongoing vitality and viability of the village centre it should set out what type of development / facilities would be supported and seek to protect any particular facilities which are important locally. Further consideration should be given to the change in use class system and this should be referenced in the supporting text so it is clear where the policy can influence development, in particular the change of use of existing retail or commercial premises. Criterion 4 of the policy will not be necessary if the Housing Design and Local Character Policy (5) is amended as suggested above.</p>	<p>The consultations undertaken showed strong support for a policy that protected the village centre amenities such as the Village Shop, Hardware Store, Surgery, Pharmacy, Café etc as these facilities, together with the Rowlands Castle Village Green, form the heart of the Rowlands Castle Village, and there is a strong consensus that they be retained so far as possible. All the facilities are important, and the Policy is to encourage their retention and preclude a change to other non-commercial/community uses, such as residential, by providing further support over and above existing planning policies. It is recognised that the balance and type of uses will change over time and that the village centre will need to adapt to changing demand for the individual facilities, the policy is designed to provide for this and not be overly restrictive on the individual uses. We will include a reference in the Policy, as suggested, to the change in use class system and permitted development rights to make clear control is subject to this. Criteria 4 will be deleted as unnecessary in view of the changes to Policy 5.</p>	<p>Policy 7 wording expanded to clarify that it could not control permitted changes of use, such as under the new Use Class Order effective 1st September 2020. It was also modified so that it applied to all developments.</p> <p>The requirements as to design were removed as this is already controlled by Policy 5.</p>
<p><u>Policy 8:</u> Parking Reference to the South Downs Parking Supplementary Planning Document should be included in the relationship to other policies section. The first two criterion of the policy are not necessary as they duplicate existing development plan policy as set out in the South Downs Local Plan and Joint Core Strategy. Criterion 4 of the policy is not necessary if the modifications to policy 5 are made as set out above. Further consideration should be given as to whether the remaining policy is necessary. If there is inadequate provision for parking at Links Close (Criterion 3) further consideration could be given to allocating land to meet that need</p>	<p>The South Downs Parking Supplemental Planning Document has been included in the relationship to other policies section. The consultations identified insufficient parking in the Village Centre as a key concern, both from retail shops and their customers. It was also considered to be critical in maintaining a successful and vibrant village centre. The aim of this policy is also to protect existing public parking provision.</p>	<p>None proposed.</p>
<p><u>Policy 11:</u> As currently drafted Criterion 2 of the policy is not clear. If the policy is seeking to encourage new and improved links to the Shipwrights Way, Monarchs Way, Staunton Way, Sussex Border Path and E9 (European long-distance path) the word ‘promote’ in the policy criterion is unnecessary. Criterion 3</p>	<p>We agree with the comment relating to Criterion 3</p>	<p>Policy 11 amended accordingly.</p>

<p>of the policy seeks to require all developments to protect and where possible enhance the existing rights of way network. This seems excessive as some forms of development, small household extensions for example, would not be expected to enhance the right of way network. The addition of the term 'where appropriate' could be applied as in other policies in the RCNP. Appendices recommend removing the appendices and presenting these as separate documents. References in the supporting text of policies can be used to signpost to relevant information where appropriate.</p>		
<p><u>Appendix 1 Aspirations</u> This part of the plan is clearly setting out important local matters which cannot form part of the development plan. It is possible to include aspirations or community actions within the neighbourhood Plan as long as they are clearly identified as community aspirations or actions. It may be possible to include some of these matters in the main body of the neighbourhood plan at the relevant section. However, many of the points listed are not community aspirations or community actions and would be better included in a community feedback section or an analysis of community issues which led to the formation of the vision and objectives. Many Neighbourhood Plans have incorporated these types of issues in the introductory part of their neighbourhood plan, to reflect community feedback. Appendix 1 should be reviewed to identify any specific community actions / aspirations which could be included in the RCNP (clearly identified as community aspirations or actions and not policies) and other matters removed or included in a more appropriate section of the RCNP.</p>	<p>We agree with these comments.</p>	<p>We have created a separate Community Feedback Report which is not now part of the Draft Neighbourhood Plan.</p>

Natural England (Sally Wintle) consultations@naturalengland.org.uk

Comment	Response	Changes to the Draft Plan
<p>Natural England does not have any specific comments on the draft Rowlands Castle Neighbourhood Plan.</p>	<p>No response required.</p>	<p>No changes required.</p>

Comment	Response	Changes to the Draft Plan
<p>Policy 2: We welcome the identification of key views and we support the intent of Policy 2 to promote development that maintains or enhances these views. We would encourage the Parish Council to include a summary of key positive or negative features about each view within the Policy’s supporting text or to include the Locally Significant Views Report (Jan 2021) as an appendix within the plan document to ensure the Policy is clear and implementable. This is an opportunity to clarify why the views are special for the local community and provide enough detail to guide development. Paragraph 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework requires that plans “contain policies that are clearly written and unambiguous, so it is evident how a decision maker should react to development proposals”.</p>	<p>Information relating to views and the justification for selection are now included in the supporting views report.</p>	<p>The views report is now included as part of the plan documents</p>
<p><u>Policy 4: Historic Environment.</u> This policy should provide a similar level of detail to guide development proposals and we recommend including a reference to the Rowlands Castle Village Design Statement (2000, 2019 1st Rev), Rowlands Castle Settlement Character Assessment (2020), Rowlands Castle Conservation Area guidance leaflet (EHDC) and Rowlands Castle Local Landscape Character Assessment (2012) in the Policy’s text.</p>	<p>All included with exception of Rowlands Castle Local Landscape Character Assessment (2012)</p>	<p>Policy 4 wording amended to include recommended reference.</p>
<p>We feel that Policy 4’s Objective to “conserve and enhance the heritage assets, both designated and non-designated” is not reflected within the Policy’s text which only refers to non-designated heritage assets. We suggest that the wording of the Policy is amended to include both non-designated heritage assets and designated heritage assets, such as listed buildings, scheduled monuments and conservation areas</p>	<p>The aim of the policy is to provide protection for Heritage Assets that are not currently protected and therefore it refers to non-designated heritage assets only. It is believed that existing designated assets are already suitably protected such that a policy including those assets is not required.</p>	<p>None proposed.</p>
<p>We support the inclusion of a list of non-designated heritage assets within Policy 4. We recommend that the formal identification of such non-designated heritage assets is informed by testing against criteria set locally and a brief examination of each site’s heritage interest in order to ensure they merit consideration in planning for their significance and to inform future decisions to sustain or enhance this significance. We refer you to our advice on local heritage listing for further information: https://www.historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/local-heritage-listingadvice-note-7</p>	<p>A brief description of each site is included in the document Non-Designated Heritage Assets (November 2022) which is referenced in the policy and is intended to be read in conjunction with the policy to inform consideration of planning applications.</p>	<p>None proposed.</p>

Avison Young (Matt Verlander) on behalf of National Grid nationalgrid.uk@avisonyoung.com

Comment	Response	Changes to the Draft Plan
An assessment has been carried out with respect to National Grid's electricity and gas transmission assets which include high voltage electricity assets and high-pressure gas pipelines. National Grid has identified that it has no record of such assets within the Neighbourhood Plan area.	None required.	No changes required.

SSE (Rosie Shepperd) connections.engineering@sse.com

Comment	Response	Changes to the Draft Plan
Is the land where our asset is located at Whichers Gate Road, going to be developed into housing? If there are no plans to change that land into a new development then SSEN will have no issue. SSEN would only object when the equipment is being interfered with or there is a possibility the equipment could be blocked or damaged.	The aim of Policy 1 'Gaps between Settlements' in the draft Rowlands Castle Neighbourhood Plan is to retain the gap of land identified on Map 2 free from housing development in the future, in accordance with the policy. There are no known current plans for such housing development in this gap at present.	No changes required.

Southern Water (Charlotte Mayall) planning.policy@southernwater.co.uk

Comment	Response	Changes to the Draft Plan
Southern Water is the wastewater undertaker for Rowlands Castle and as such is responsible for any flood risk associated with its foul drainage network. We support the need in this policy for drainage requirements to be 'fully met' by development. If surface water is allowed to enter the foul or combined sewer network, this can increase the risk of foul flooding, which could lead to pollution. Therefore, we would additionally support any policy provision that prevents new development from connecting surface water drainage into the foul or combined sewer network.	This is a matter for the Local Plan and has been passed to the EHDC who have advised it will be considered as it prepares proposals for the new Local Plan but we consider it appropriate to amend the policy by adding a note on foul water drainage.	Policy amended accordingly.
Other comments: Southern Water is the statutory wastewater undertaker for Rowlands Castle and as such has a statutory duty to serve new development within the village. We would recommend an additional policy which supports the provision of wastewater infrastructure. Although there are no current plans, over the life of the Neighbourhood Plan, new or improved infrastructure may be required either to serve new development and/or to meet stricter environmental standards. It is therefore important to have policy provision in the Neighbourhood Plan which seeks to	This is a matter for the Local Plan and has been passed to the EHDC who have advised it will be considered as it prepares proposals for the new Local Plan but we consider it appropriate to amend the policy by adding a note on foul water drainage.	Policy amended accordingly.

<p>ensure that the necessary infrastructure is in place to meet these requirements.</p> <p>We could find no policies to support the general provision of new or improved utilities infrastructure.</p> <p>The NPPF (2019) paragraph 28 establishes that communities should set out detailed policies for specific areas including 'the provision of infrastructure and community facilities at a local level'. In addition, the National Planning Practice Guidance states that 'Adequate water and wastewater infrastructure is needed to support sustainable development'.</p> <p>Although the Parish Council is not the planning authority in relation to wastewater development proposals, support for essential infrastructure is required at all levels of the planning system.</p>		
<p>Should consider including a policy relating to new and improved utility structures to facilitate sustainable development.</p>	<p>This is a matter for the Local Plan and has been passed to the EHDC who have advised it will be considered as it prepares proposals for the new Local Plan but we consider it appropriate to amend the policy by adding a note on foul water drainage.</p>	<p>Policy amended accordingly.</p>

Portsmouth Water (Caroline Parker) catchment.management@portsmouthwater.co.uk

Comment	Response	Changes to the Draft Plan
<p>Portsmouth Water is responsible for water supply and distribution in the Portsmouth region. Portsmouth Water is also undertaking the development of Havant Thicket Reservoir to provide vital water resource to the South East of England. Havant Thicket is the first major reservoir to be developed in the UK since the 1970s and will play a key role in reducing abstraction from the South East's internationally renowned chalk streams, the River Itchen and River Test.</p> <p>As part of our Section 106 Agreements, Portsmouth Water has committed to delivering a package of offsite compensation and enhancement measures to provide long term ecological benefits which includes the long-term management plan for 72 hectares of habitat restoration in Southleigh Forest. A plan showing Portsmouth Water ownership of Southleigh Forest has been attached to this letter. The purpose of East Hampshire District Council's Local Plan Joint Core Strategy (2011 to 2028) Planning Policy CP23 – Gaps between Settlements it to safeguard the gaps</p>	<p>We considered this proposal carefully discussed the issue with the Environment Manager for the Havant Thicket Reservoir. The main objective of this policy is to maintain a space between the settlements of Rowlands Castle and Havant, and the Strategic Gap has been defined on that basis. The important ecological requirements of the Havant Thicket Reservoir Project associated with Southleigh Forest are protected through a s106 agreement for 80 years for that project; this is considerably longer than the proposed life of the Draft Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>We did not feel that there was a satisfactory evidential basis on which we could vary the reasons for defining the Strategic Gap. Accordingly, it is not appropriate to vary the area covered by the Gap in the Draft Neighbourhood Plan.</p>	<p>None proposed.</p>

<p>between settlements and “have helped guide where new urban development should be built and ensured the maintenance of open land between settlements”.</p> <p>Reviewing East Hampshire District Council’s Interactive Map, Portsmouth notes that an area allocated as a Strategic Gap is located to the west of Southleigh Forest, with a small area extending into Southleigh Forest.</p> <p>To preserve the integrity of Southleigh Forest and secure the long-term ecological benefits for the life of the Havant Thicket Reservoir Project, Portsmouth Water would welcome the current strategic gap north side of Emsworth Common Road to remain as the ‘Gap’ between Rowlands Castle and Havant, and to be extended to include all of Southleigh Forest that falls within the East Hampshire District Council boundary.</p>		
---	--	--

St John the Baptist Church (Terry Monahan) admin@saintjohnschurch.org.uk

Comment	Response	Changes to the Draft Plan
<p>I realise that the churchyard at St John’s cannot be designated as a Green Space under Policy 3 but was surprised that there was no mention of the particular historical aspects of the graveyard at St John’s Church. There are several War Graves identified by the War Graves Commission and also graves associated with Jane Austen in the churchyard which would be worth mentioning. It also seems an oversight that there is no image of St John’s Church included here.</p>	<p>This is a relevant comment. These graves were not identified in the RC Historical Society report but are of local historical relevance and merit inclusion as part of the St John’s Church entry in Policy 4. The omission of an image was due to timing pressures to have the policy completed for reg 14 consultation.</p>	<p>Policy 4 wording amended and expanded to include references to the historic graves and an image of the church added.</p>

Highways Agency (Jenny Peart) PlanningSE@highwaysengland.co.uk

Comment	Response	Changes to the Draft Plan
<p>Asked for further information</p>	<p>Same response from Mark Housby, from same organisation, so response was sent to him.</p>	<p>None proposed.</p>

No Responses from the Following Consultees

Chichester District Council vdobson@chichester.gov.uk	Stoughton Parish Council clerk@Stoughtonpc.org.uk	Coast to Capital LEP ron.crank@coast2capital.org.uk
Chichester District Council Neighbourhood Plan neighbourhoodplanning@chichester.gov.uk	Westbourne Parish Council (17m border) clerk@westbourne-pc.gov.uk	Enterprise M3 info@enterprisem3.org.uk
Havant Borough Council Policy.design@havant.gov.uk	Minerals and Waste Planning Authority neighbourhood@southdown.gov.uk	Local Business South East info@businesseasthants.org.uk
Clanfield Parish Council Clerk@clanfieldpc.org.uk	Homes and Communities Agency mail@homesandcommunities.co.uk	Rowlands Castle Historic Society contact@rowlandscastlehistorical.com
Horndean Parish Council contact@horndeanpc-hants.gov.uk	The Environment Agency SSD@environment-agency.gov.uk	Rowlands Castle Association chair@rowlandscastle.com
Buriton Parish Council (58m border) buritonparishcouncil@hotmail.co.uk	The Highways Agency PlanningSE@highwaysengland.co.uk	Rowlands Castle Scouts Group leaders@1strcsg.co.uk
Harting Parish Council clerk@harting-pc.gov.uk	Marine Management Organisation consultations@marinemanagment.org.uk	Rowlands Castle Women's Institute (President) rowlandscastlepres@hampshirewi.org.uk ;
Compton Parish Council clerk@comptonwestsussex-pc.gov.uk	Virgin media / EE newsite.southdowns@openreach.co.uk	Rowlands Castle Women's Institute (Secretary) rowlandscastlesec@hampshirewi.org.uk
Network Rail Infrastructure TownPlanningSouthern@NetworkRail.co.uk	National Health Service ssehccg.enquiries@nhs.net	
Southern Gas Networks customer@sgn.co.uk	Hampshire Wildlife Trust feedback@hiwwt.org.uk	Rowlands Castle Good Neighbours gneighbours97@gmail.com
St Huberts Church, Idsworth By post	United Reformed Church By post	

Part 2 – Landowners

George Ewen Ltd (Giles Wheeler-Bennett, Land Agent for George Ewen Ltd)

Comment	Response	Changes to the Draft Plan
<p>The only area of land that appears to be designated as a ‘gap’ between the settlements of Rowlands Castle and Havant belonging to George Ewen Ltd is that coloured blue on the attached plan known as Comley Bottom, OS No. 5387, extending to 2.36 acres.</p> <p>Bearing in mind with the exception of Comley Bottom which can best be described as permanent pasture with an overstorey of Poplar in part, all the ‘gap land’ is designated as Ancient Semi-Natural Woodland. I wonder whether the land coloured blue should be excluded from its current designation – gap land.</p> <p>For the records the Poplar are overaged and as such will become dangerous and will need felling in due course, following which the area coloured blue will wholly be permanent pasture.</p>	<p>The policy is to protect the village of Rowlands Castle from coalescence. Although certain land in the “gap” may have some form of protection its inclusion ensures it remains part of the protected area.</p>	<p>None proposed.</p>

Brian Jezeph Consultancy

Comment	Response	Changes to the Draft Plan
<p>We were not aware of the proposed Neighbourhood Plan. We would welcome more information so would it be possible to direct me to the emerging Neighbourhood Plan, please, as you are obviously formulating policies and I have been unable to trace the Plan in the public domain? Thank you for including the copy of Map 10 which shows the proposed Local Green Spaces. You are correct that the eastern strip of green shown on your plan to the east of the Bridleway 24 is partly within the control of my clients. However, this notated area is already substantially covered with trees which were planted by my clients in about 2009/2010. We have no objections to the proposal of the Neighbourhood Plan to create a “Local Green Space” here. This is not an area of land where we have any development proposals. Indeed, we are proposing the use of most of the farmland for “off-setting of nitrates and re-wilding”. We are promoting a small part of the farm further to the east for limited development. An area close to the road is being proposed for individual custom build housing with the required percentage of affordable units.</p> <p>You are no doubt aware that the Government has required local planning authorities to provide for self-build and custom build</p>	<p>Thank you for confirmation that there is no objection to inclusion of the strip of green land to the east of Bridleway 14 as a designated ‘Local Green Space’, which has assisted with development of the Plan.</p> <p>We are ready to provide further information on the content of the draft Plan, perhaps via a telephone call if that would be of any assistance.</p> <p>The draft Plan has now been published for the Public Consultation so full details are available.</p> <p>It was interesting to hear of potential proposals for future development of part of the farm. Thank you for the offer to meet to discuss your embryonic scheme, but it would seem better for you to discuss this with Rowlands Castle Parish Council, rather than with the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group. Parish Councillors also participating in development of the Plan are aware of your letter, and I would suggest that you arrange a meeting with the Parish Council, if that would be of assistance.</p>	<p>None proposed.</p>

<p>housing units to meet identified local requirements. The Council is required to keep a register of people interested in self-build and custom build and there are around 40 people seeking plots in Rowlands Castle. The area of land which has been considered suitable for such housing lies close to Whichers Gate Road on the eastern and lower slopes of the farm and as such it is more easily screened from the countryside to the north and east. We are having discussions with Council Officers and it is proposed to submit our emerging proposals to the Council's Development Management Team as a pre-application consultation for discussion purposes shortly.</p>		
--	--	--

Matplan Ltd (Matthew Utting)

Comment	Response	Changes to the Draft Plan
<p>The land described in your letter is indeed owned by one of my clients, Mr John Hooper; and you are correct in that it is designated as a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC) under ref. EH/0247 and known as 'Oaklands Woodland'. This woodland lies next to land also owned by my client, which is proposed as an allocation ref. SA39 for circa 50 dwellings in the Reg. 18 East Hampshire District Draft Local Plan 2017-2036. I have discussed your letter dated 3 February 2022 with my client and am instructed to confirm that he would not object to the Oaklands Woodland SINC ref. EH/0247 (as shaded in green on the plan included with your letter) being designated as a 'Local Green Space' and/or a 'Protected Open Space' in the Neighbourhood Development Plan. I hope this confirmation is of assistance; and would also like to put on record my client's wish to work with your Parish Council and East Hampshire District Council to deliver an appropriate development of proposed housing allocation ref. SA39, on the assumption that it passes into the adopted version of the emerging Local Plan.</p>	<p>Thank you for your email below, and for confirming ownership of the land west of Bridleway 24 identified in our letter dated 3 February 2022. Also, thank you for obtaining Mr John Hooper's agreement to inclusion of this land as a designated Local Green Space in the emerging Rowlands Castle Parish Neighbourhood Development Plan.</p> <p>The comments are noted with regard to the site proposed as an allocation for housing ref. SA39 in the Reg. 18 East Hampshire District Draft Local Plan 2017-2036, and your client's wish to work with Rowlands Castle Parish Council and East Hampshire District Council should this site pass into the adopted version of the emerging Local Plan.</p>	<p>None proposed.</p>

Southern Co-op (William Salvetti, Land Manager)

Comment	Response	Changes to the Draft Plan
<p>We can confirm Southern Co-op does own a 2ha woodland plot immediately East of The Oaks Crematorium. We acknowledge the Strategic Gap and can confirm we have no plans to develop on this site and it will remain as woodland.</p>	<p>Supportive of policy.</p>	<p>None proposed.</p>

Southern Co-op does not own any other land within the Strategic Gap.		
--	--	--

Montague Green (Rowlands Castle) Management Company Limited (Dan Channon)

Comment	Response	Changes to the Draft Plan
Comments given over telephone with Chairman Ian Young. Subsequently sent a copy of the Management Plan for Montague Green	Supportive of policy.	None proposed.

Responses not received from

Portsmouth City Council (Chris Wootton)	ABRI Group	EHDC Property Services
Fernhills Residents Management Company	Forest Gate (RC) Limited c/o Gh Property Management	Southern Electric Power Distribution Plc
Brockhampton Property Investments Ltd	Redhill Rd (Rowlands Castle) Management Co Ltd	Havant Rifle and Pistol Range (Messrs Watts, Powell, Syms & Syms
Veolia Es Landfill Limited	In addition, no replies were received from 5 individual owners of land within the 'gap'	

Part 3 – Non-Designated Historical Assets

Portsmouth Diocese (St Johns Church)

Comment	Response	Changes to the Draft Plan
<p>Policy 3: Portsmouth Diocesan Board of Finance (PDBF) wish to formally object to the proposed inclusion of the cemetery at St John’s Church and St Hubert’s Church within the draft Neighbourhood Plan as Local Green Spaces and Protected Open Spaces. The areas of land in question are both churchyards and as such are consecrated land. Such land is vested in the incumbent for the parish, with PDBF as custodian trustees. Both of the churchyards remain open burial sites and as the land is consecrated it is “set apart for ever from all common and profane uses”. Therefore, use other than as a burial ground is not be possible. The draft policy provides for ‘recreation use’ which directly conflicts with the purpose of consecrated ground. As these sites are protected by other legislation there is no reason for the sites to be included in the proposed policy. Other local plans, including South Downs National Park and Winchester City Council have included similar policies and neither have seen fit to include our churchyards in these policies.</p> <p>I would be grateful if you could confirm that both sites will be removed from the policy.</p>	<p>We agree and accept the proposal.</p>	<p>Cemetery at St John’s Church and St. Hubert’s church removed from Policy 3.</p>

Revd Morgan St John’s Church, 120 Redhill Road (comments received from Terry Monahan on behalf of St. John’s)

Comment	Response	Changes to the Draft Plan
<p>I realise that the churchyard at St John’s cannot be designated as a Green Space under Policy 3 but was surprised that there was no mention of the particular historical aspects of the graveyard at St John’s Church. There are several War Graves identified by the War Graves Commission and also graves associated with Jane Austen in the churchyard which would be worth mentioning.</p> <p>It also seems an oversight that there is no image of St John’s Church included here.</p>	<p>Many thanks for sending us your reply to our Regulation 14 consultation on the draft Rowlands Neighbourhood Development Plan, and your particular comments on the graveyard at St John’s Church. We had not included designated heritage assets such as listed buildings, scheduled monuments and conservation areas on the basis that such assets are already well protected under existing legislation, and of course War Graves would fall into this category.</p>	<p>Amendment to Policy 4 to include historic aspects of Churchyard and a photograph.</p>

77 Bowes Hill

Comment	Response	Changes to the Draft Plan
<p>We are delighted that our property is being considered by the Society to be valued for its historical aspects. However, could you possibly provide a little more information regarding this - particularly as regards any impact or limitations this may pose in the future regarding further development and indeed future sale of the property.</p>	<p>The inclusion of your property in the Plan would still allow future development of the property, if proposed, subject to the usual planning application process. The Policy in the Plan which covers this historic aspect means that any development would need to show that it conserves or enhances the existing historic aspect, character and nature of the property. As has been seen with application for development recently for another property of character in the Parish assessed to be a Non-Designated Heritage Asset, this is equivalent to the current criteria applied to planning applications for properties by EHDC as the Local Planning Authority. That application was successful as it was deemed to be in keeping with the heritage assets of the property. In this respect, inclusion of the property in the Plan should not affect future sale of the property as it includes equivalent requirements to those currently applied to planning applications for such properties. The Plan serves to identify particular heritage assets that are valued in the Parish.</p>	<p>None proposed.</p>

55 Bowes Hill

Comment	Response	Changes to the Draft Plan
<p>We are strongly opposed to the inclusion of our property, 55 Bowes Hill, to support the policy. Any policy that could restrict our freedom to alter, develop or sell our property is not acceptable to us. Any conditions imposed by the Plan would have to be passed to a potential purchaser. We are sympathetic to your efforts to maintain the existing historic aspect of the village as our recent works to the property show, i.e. new roof tiles, wooden framed windows.</p>	<p>Thank you for your letter dated 26 February 2022, regarding the proposal to include 55 Bowes Hill in the list of Non-Designated Heritage Assets in the Historical Environment Policy of the emerging Rowlands Castle Parish Neighbourhood Plan, as recommended by the Rowlands Castle Historical Society. Respecting your wishes, the property has been removed from the list. Thank you for your support for the aim of the Plan to maintain the existing historic aspects of Rowlands Castle. Also thank you for your support for maintaining the character of the area with your recent works to the property, as this is another main aim of the Plan.</p>	<p>Removal of 55 Bowes Hill from list of NDHA.</p>

Flint Cottage, 80 Bowes Hill

Comment	Response	Changes to the Draft Plan
<p>Could I kindly request that the picture of our property and reference to it be removed from the Neighbourhood plan before its submission.</p>	<p>Thank you for responding to the Public Consultation on the draft Rowlands Castle Parish Neighbourhood Plan with respect to not wishing for your property (Flint Cottage, 80 Bowes Hill) to be included as a Non-Designated Heritage Asset. As noted in our earlier letter:</p> <p>'The policy includes your property as being considered by the Rowlands Castle Historical Society to have valued historical aspects because it is thought to be the oldest surviving house in Rowlands Castle, said to date back to Queen Anne's reign. The inclusion of your property in the policy as a significant historical asset will mean that any development will need to show that it conserves or enhances the existing historic aspect, character and nature of the property.'</p> <p>By way of further explanation of the last sentence above, this still allows development of the property to go ahead, providing this is in keeping with the character and appearance of the property. This has been the case recently with another property in the Parish considered to be a Non-Designated Heritage Asset, where planning permission was granted for an extension to the property because it was in keeping with the overall character and appearance.</p> <p>In view of the historical aspect of your property, with your agreement it would be good for it to be included in the plan, and I would be very ready to discuss any concerns further if that would be of assistance.</p>	<p>None proposed.</p>

Glen House, Woodberry Lane

Comment	Response	Changes to the Draft Plan
<p>Would not wish to have the Glen House property included in the list but on further information received will agree to inclusion of the pillars at the entrance to the property's driveway</p>	<p>Chairman offered further information over the telephone.</p>	<p>Removal of Glen House from Policy 4 list of NDHA, but retention of gate pillars.</p>

74 Redhill Road

Comment	Response	Changes to the Draft Plan
<p>The letter we received on 10th February states that our house is considered "<i>to have valued historical aspects because of the age of the property and the incorporation of products (and in particular</i></p>	<p>The inclusion of this property as a Non-Designated Historical Asset relates to its connection to the Rowlands Castle</p>	<p>None proposed.</p>

<p><i>decorative tiling) from the former Rowlands Castle brickworks".</i></p> <p>Now we can see the Non-Designated Heritage Assets report provided as a part of the formal consultation, this lists our house as having multicoloured brickwork, but <u>no terracotta tiles.</u></p> <p>Q1 In order for us to respond to the consultation, please could the Steering Group confirm on what basis our house has been selected for inclusion as these two documents do not correlate?</p> <p>This is important as, the draft RCNP (p.30) states: <i>"A description of the historic feature of each asset is contained in the Rowlands Castle Neighbourhood Development Plan: Non-Designated Heritage Assets Report that may be used to help in assessing the impact of new development."</i></p> <p>Q2 If our house does not have decorative tiles, as stated, on what basis will planning decisions be made (i.e. how will any committee determine the definition of historical significance as it relates to our house)? We need to understand this in order to understand how we would demonstrate that any proposals would <i>"conserve or enhance the historic significance of the asset and its setting"</i> as the policy would require.</p> <p>If the historical significance is based on the two colours brickwork on the front elevation, presumably just painting the property (not that we have any intention to do so!) would be deemed to impact negatively on the historical significance of the house - and we would not require planning permission to do this? With 20% of the housing stock in the country dating before 1919, I don't agree that the building material of the property is sufficient reason to impose potential planning restrictions.</p> <p>Q3 Would it be possible to know the terms under which #55 Bowes Hill and Glen House were removed from the Policy? As Glen House was owned by the manager of the Brick Works and therefore arguably has greater significance it seems that any objections raised in relation to these properties should be considered in relation to all of the properties on the list, when considering their continued inclusion.</p> <p>I'm happy to respond to the public consultation, but require answers to these questions in order to be able to do so effectively. I am sorry for not contacting you earlier, my parents have been very ill and with no access to the associated documents, it was hard to know how to comment.</p>	<p>Brickworks and it's the features that use bricks from these brickworks that are being referenced.</p> <p>The changes mentioned were due to owners raising objections to their inclusion which were accepted by the SG</p>	
---	--	--

39 Bowes Hill

Comment	Response	Changes to the Draft Plan
<p>I'm very interested to learn of the inclusion of my property in the policy as a significant historical asset. In addition to the property aspects mentioned in the letter I would add that there is also a second world war air raid shelter. This has been reviewed by Brian Tomkinson, of Rowlands Castle Historical Society, who stated that it is interesting as larger than the standard Anderson Shelter. Having recently purchased the property to restore original character I am interested to learn more about the policy and assist where appropriate.</p>	<p>I would be pleased to provide further information on inclusion of this policy in the draft Neighbourhood Plan. Chairman subsequently provided further information over the telephone.</p>	<p>None proposed.</p>

Responses not received from owners of the following properties:

Responses not received from owners of the following properties:		
The Ice House, Idsworth Garden, Old Idsworth	1 College Close	94 Redhill Road
Idsworth Lodge, Idsworth Park	21 Redhill Road	96 Redhill Road
37 Bowes Hill	70 Redhill Road	101 Redhill Road
United Reformed Church, The Green	72 Redhill Road	Old School House, 117 Redhill Road
82 Durrants Road	Whichers Gate Cottage, Whichers Gate Road	92 Redhill Road

Part 4 – Individuals Living in the Parish

Policy 1

119 Agree with the Policy

2 Disagree with the Policy

Comment	Response	Changes to the Draft Plan
This is a most important policy to ensure the future of the village of Rowlands Castle as a separate identity. (32)	Supportive of policy	None proposed
Wording could be strengthened to ensure intent of the policy (3)	<p>This does not suggest how the intent of the policy could be strengthened. The 'Policy Objectives' show the intent of the policy.</p> <p>Following comments from SDNPA, considered the following changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add to Policy objectives references to preserving landscape features and views. <p>Amend policy to include reference to protecting landscape setting and protecting designated views.</p>	Policy amended accordingly.
I note that the area of Mays Copse Farm is not included in the Plan. This area is at risk of development and should be protected as an important gap between development of Emsworth. (2)	<p>Mays Coppice Farm cannot be included in the gap for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is categorised as 'developable' in the EHDC Land Availability Assessment (2021) • It is separated from the currently defined gap by the land south-east of the railway known as 'Comley Hill'. This is subject to Regulation 4 planning regulations and it consists of plots which already have stables etc. Because Mays Coppice Farm would not be contiguous with the gap, it could not be argued that it would prevent coalescence with Havant. • It would very probably be regarded as an extensive tract of land and, therefore, could not be included in the gap. 	None proposed
<p>There should be a gap between Rowlands Castle and Horndean too. (2)</p> <p>Similarly, the area north of the B2148 and west of the railway (and east at Mays Coppice Farm), especially where there are Ecological Network opportunity areas (Map 3) – these would be much eroded should development occur here.</p>	<p>There could not be a gap between Rowlands Castle and Horndean for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Land East of Horndean development which has planning permission, includes land in the Rowlands Castle Parish immediately adjacent to land in Horndean • The area of land known as 'Blendworth Common' which is immediately south of Land East of 	None proposed.

	Horndean and to the west of the B2149 is designated as 'developable' in the EHDC Land Availability Assessment (2021)	
Absolutely essential. Fundamental to fabric of region. A critical-critical health space and water conservation.	Supportive of policy	None proposed
Green space is important for well-being.	Supportive of policy	None proposed
These are known bat / nature corridors as an example.	The 'gap' includes 'Ecological Network Opportunity Areas'	None proposed
My concern is that due to poor planning decisions lack of vigilance, or enforcement of planning rules by EHDC, the land between Whichers Gate Rd/Comley Hill and Woodberry Lane (Comley Hill Plots) will continue to suffer from "stealth" development, occupation and degradation of the environment.	The Comley Hill Plots are subject to Article 4 planning regulations, so permission is required for development. It is acknowledged that some unauthorised developments have been undertaken, and we are informed that the EHDC Enforcement and Environmental Health teams, Hampshire County Council and the Environment Agency are taking some action.	None proposed
Policy says visual separation ... however a lot of that area is already "hidden" from everyday traffic by hedges and growth etc. So a developer might be tempted to say that the "visual" sense of separation is not affected by building away from the roads and out of sight or everyday traffic etc.	By designating and including land on a plan in a policy we believe this should give adequate protection.	None proposed.
The area north of the B2148 which lies outside the Settlement Boundary should be included in the gap to ensure separation of the village from Havant (Emsworth) is enhanced. (2)	This describes a very large area and so it is unlikely that it would be acceptable to include all of it in the 'gap'. The southern part of it, extending close to Emsworth Common Road, is included in the 'gap' currently defined by EHDC, and in the gap defined in this Neighbourhood Plan policy. The northern part of it which is not included in the 'gap' includes Mays Coppice Farm to the north of the railway line, which is categorised as 'developable' in the EHDC Land Availability Assessment (2021), and to the south of the railway line, the plots of land collectively referred to as 'Comley Hill. These plots are subject to Article 4 planning regulations. For these reasons, it would not be acceptable to include Mays Coppice Farm and 'Comley Hill' in the 'gap'.	None proposed
This should be capable of rigorous enforcement – the gap beside Durrants is already too small.	In wording the policy, professional advice was followed. The EHDC Enforcement organisation would be responsible for taking any action if any planning requirements were not adhered to.	None proposed
This is a critical policy to ensure that there is no coalescence between RC village and Havant. There is great danger of further development along Prospect Lane towards Whichers Gate Road and this must be resisted.	The EHDC Land Availability Assessment (2021) categorised an area of land adjacent to the southern end of Prospect Lane and Ken Berry Court as 'developable' so this is not included in the 'gap' defined in this Neighbourhood Plan policy. No other	None proposed

	land along Prospect Lane to the north of this area and leading to Whichers Gate Road, has been categorised as 'developable' and it is included in the 'gap' defined in this policy.	
Is there an opportunity to extend the land in the gap area to the West of Durrants Road to the edge of the planned reservoir.	This area is included in the 'gap' currently defined by EHDC. On the advice of our planning consultant we have not included this area in the 'gap' defined in the Neighbourhood Plan because it lies within Staunton Country Park (owned by Hampshire County Council) and does, therefore, enjoy a high level of protection from development.	None proposed
Regret Havant have removed the "Gap" from within its own northern boundary from its plan.	The 'Gaps between Settlements' Evidence paper demonstrates that developments have taken place or sites have been given planning permission or have been allocated, immediately adjacent to the boundary of the 'gap'.	None proposed
Encourage RCPC to purchase as much land in "Havant gap", as possible, including for allotments, to ensure it is undeveloped.	This cannot be addressed in the Neighbourhood Plan, but the comment will be passed to Rowlands Castle Parish Council.	None proposed
Proposals are insufficient to protect the gaps or ensure development that is undertaken enhances the environment. All that will happen with our proposals consultation is more development and a degrading of the living conditions with no control.	The wording of the policy follows the advice given by the planning consultant engaged by the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group planning consultant and restricts development in the 'gap' by the greatest extent possible.	None proposed
To achieve the vision to "conserve and enhance the Parish of Rowlands Castle as an attractive community, whilst maintaining its separate identity, character and distinctiveness", and to preserve the individual identity of Rowlands Castle and the integrity of the predominately open and undeveloped land between it and Havant by preventing coalescence, it is essential that the remaining area of the gap defined about 15 years ago, is retained and not eroded further. Since the gap was then defined, it has been significantly eroded by some very significant developments within it, and it appears very likely that more of it will be given planning permission, and allocated in an emerging EHDC Local Plan.	Supportive of the policy.	None proposed
Fear of being a step to be incorporated into Havant.	Supportive of the policy	None proposed
The temptation to "nibble" away at the edges of the green separation between this village and Havant must be resisted. It represents an identifying strip as well as a "green long" and if protected will prevent a conurbation forming.	Supportive of the policy	None proposed

<p>In addition to the National Park, there are several largely undeveloped sites/areas within the Neighbourhood Plan area which appear not to be the subject of any policies or even comments. I would suggest that these sites/areas should be the subject of supplementary reports outlining the possible impacts of the development on these sites/areas on the village. Policies could then emerge for these findings although I appreciate that relevant local plan policies take precedence.</p>	<p>It is not specifically stated where these largely undeveloped sites are, so it is difficult to respond. It is acknowledged that the EHDC Land Availability Assessment (2021) categorised 9 sites within the Neighbourhood Plan area as ‘developable’. Of these,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 has outline planning permission. While being consulted on this application, the Parish Council commented on the impact this would have on the village, but it would not be accepted to specifically refer to these in the Neighbourhood Plan. • 1 is subject to an as yet undecided planning application. While being consulted on this application, the Parish Council commented on the impact this would have on the village, but it would not be accepted to specifically refer to these in the Neighbourhood Plan. • 2 are in the ‘gap’ currently defined by EHDC, but they are excluded from the ‘gap defined in the Neighbourhood Plan. It would not be accepted to include comments or speculation about the possible impacts these may have on the village, in the Neighbourhood Plan. • 5 have not been subject to any planning application and were not allocated in the previous emerging EHDC Local Plan. The LAA does not contain sufficient information (e.g. possible access) to even speculate on the impact these might have on the village. It is only if and when any of these sites are allocated in an emerging EHDC Local Plan, that comments could be made about any impact development might have on the village. <p>If reports were prepared before any planning application is submitted, the Parish Council may be prevented from commenting on any application because of possible ‘pre-determination’.</p> <p>Policies in adopted Neighbourhood Plans carry the same weight as Local Plan policies.</p>	<p>None proposed</p>
--	--	----------------------

<p>Map 1 indicates the extent of the South Downs National Park Area. However, there appears to be no report on the likely impact of the National Park on the Neighbourhood Plan Area and whether any policies/strategies should be introduced to address any issues raised. Again I appreciate that the plan may not be able to have policies relating to the National Park area, but at least the Plan could consider and note the likely impact of the National Park on the village and the rest of the Plan Area.</p>	<p>Unless they relate solely to areas outside the National Park (e.g. Policy 1 (Gaps between Settlements) and Policy 7 (Rowlands Castle Village Centre), the Neighbourhood Plan policies would apply to the South Downs National Park Area. Neighbourhood Plans can consider only 'land use and development' so it would not be permitted to include an assessment of the impact the National Park may have on the village.</p>	<p>None proposed</p>
<p>There are two major planning permissions that have been granted within the Neighbourhood Plan Area. Firstly I am surprised that there appears to be no significant reference made to the Hazelton Farm planning permission, a major proposed development within the Neighbourhood Plan Area. I would suggest a report should be prepared on the likely impact of this development on the village and the whole Plan Area, which could then result in relevant policies to address any issues identified.</p> <p>Secondly, the Havant Thicket reservoir development will have a significant impact on the village and again I consider that a report should be prepared on the likely impact of this development on the village and Plan Area. Again the findings my lead to the formation of relevant policies, including the consideration of any possible future changes to the overall reservoir proposal, such as a reduction in leisure facilities or the introduction of commercial and residential developments.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is assumed that the 'Hazelton Farm' planning permission refers to the EHDC Outline Planning application 55562/005 ('Land East of Horndean (LEOH)') which was approved on 23rd December 2021. Part of this area is within the Neighbourhood Plan area, and would include about 150 dwellings. The other much larger part is within the Horndean Parish. It is not known to which other 'major planning permission' this comment refers. • Rowlands Castle Parish Council made extensive comments (which can be seen on the EHDC Planning web site) on this LEOH planning application and an earlier one submitted for the same site. These comments included the impacts the development would have on Rowlands Castle (e.g. additional traffic and parking in the village). It is not thought that there could be any additional Neighbourhood Plan policies that could address any specific issues arising from a permitted planning application. Neighbourhood Plans cannot consider highways (e.g. traffic) issues. • EHDC Hybrid Planning application 51680/001 for the Havant Thicket Reservoir was approved on 15th October 2021. During the consultation on this planning application, the Parish Council again made extensive comments including the impacts it would have on the village. There will also be public consultation on any subsequent applications for this project. 	<p>None proposed</p>

<p>The rest of the Havant Thicket is not directly affected by the reservoir proposal but it would be useful for a statement in the Plan concerning which legislation/local plan proposals hopefully protects this land from any future development.</p>	<p>Havant Thicket is designated as a 'Site of Important Nature Conservation' (SINC) (EHDC reference EH0194), and is, therefore, subject to a high degree of protection from future development. It could not be given any additional protection by categorising it in the Neighbourhood Plan as a 'Local Green Space' because it would be regarded as an extensive area of land and would not, therefore, comply with the National Planning Policy Framework (2022) paragraph 102 c). It is not permitted for Neighbourhood Plans to duplicate Local Plan policies.</p>	<p>None proposed</p>
<p>There are three significant undeveloped sites/areas within the Plan area, about which I am surprised to note there appears to be no reference in the Plan, even though the development of these sites could have a major impact on the village and wider Plan Area. Supplemental reports could be prepared for on each of these sites indicating no development/development preferences. I appreciate any policies emerging from this process would be required to conform with current planning legislation, guidance, and existing local plan policies, but at least any potential issues concerning these sites would have been raised and considered in the Plan. The three sites in question are land to the south of Hazelton Farm development and to the north of Havant Thicket, land to the north of the proposed Havant Gap Area and east of the railway and also land to the west of the railway (Mays Coppice Farm). An investigation and comments on the possible development of this latter site is particularly important as it could possibly be the next major proposed residential development site on the outskirts of the village if issues like road capacity and potential flooding can be resolved.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Land to the south of Hazelton Farm development and to the north of Havant Thicket. This land is also known as 'Blendworth Common'. The EHDC Land Availability Assessment (2021) categorised this land as 'developable' so it could not be designated in the Neighbourhood Plan as Local Green Space or Protected Open Space. Neither would it comply with the NPPF criteria for such designations. It could not be included in a 'gap' because it would not result in coalescence between Rowlands Castle and Havant, and it would not result in coalescence between Rowlands Castle and Horndean because immediately to its north is the area of land in the approved Land East of Horndean application which is in the Rowlands Castle parish. In 2019, EHDC conducted a 'Large Sites' consultation, and Blendworth Common was one of the 10 such sites. The Parish Council commented extensively on the impact development on this site would have on the village. The site was not subsequently allocated in the then emerging Local Plan. It would not be permitted to refer to these comments in the Neighbourhood Plan. 2. Land to the north of the proposed Havant Gap Area and east of the railway. It is assumed that this may refer to the land which is subject to EHDC planning application: 53322/007 - Development of 61 dwellings, Land North of Bartons Road, Rowlands Castle, which was submitted in February 2022, but which was undecided as at 1st October 2022. This land is in the 'gap' currently defined by EHDC, but not in the 'gap' defined in the Neighbourhood Plan. The Parish Council commented 	<p>None proposed</p>

	<p>extensively on this application, but it would not be accepted to include these in the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>3. Land to the west of the railway (Mays Coppice Farm). This land was categorised as ‘developable’ in the EHDC Land Availability Assessment (2021), and would not meet the NPPF criteria for designation as Local Green Space or Protected Open Space. It could not be included in the ‘gap’ because immediately to its south are the plots of land collectively referred to as ‘Comley Hill. These plots are subject to Article 4 planning regulations. These are to the north of the boundary of the ‘gap’, so development on Mays Coppice Farm would not lead to coalescence between Rowlands Castle and Horndean. If this land is allocated in the emerging EHDC Local Plan, the Parish Council would be permitted to comment on its potential impact on the village, but such comments would not be within the permitted scope of the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>	
<p>Respect importance of the National Park environment and is defence of protecting our village. Approve development but remember to look at the “big picture” schools, surgery, support facilities.</p>	Supportive of the policy.	None proposed
<p>Blendworth Common does not appear to have been considered as a key settlement gap.</p>	<p>The EHDC Land Availability Assessment (2021) categorised this land as ‘developable’ so it could not be designated in the Neighbourhood Plan as Local Green Space or Protected Open Space. Neither would it comply with the NPPF criteria for such designations. It could not be included in a ‘gap’ because it would not result in coalescence between Rowlands Castle and Havant, and it would not result in coalescence between Rowlands Castle and Horndean because immediately to its north is the area of land in the approved Land East of Horndean application which is in the Rowlands Castle parish.</p>	None proposed

Policy 2

120 Agree with the Policy

1 Disagree with the Policy

Comment	Response	Changes to the Draft Plan
The policy captures well the varied rural nature of Rowlands Castle which it is so important to preserve. (20)	Supportive of policy	None proposed.
Wording could be strengthened to ensure intent of the policy (1)	The wording has been reviewed by multiple groups and is considered to be as explicit as policy allows.	None proposed.
The views in and around the Rowlands Castle Village Green are highly valued, and in particular the outlook to the wooded areas to the south of the Green.	Supportive of policy.	None proposed.
Really important to existing habitats, that property being built does not ruin existing character/views etc.	Falls within scope and intent of the policy.	None proposed.
The views from the Sussex Border Path at the end of Wellsworth Lane are glorious stretching from the vicinity of St Hubert’s Church Idsworth across Stanstead Forest and over to Emsworth Common and Comley Hill to the South.	Supportive of policy.	None proposed.
Enforcement of TPO and limit on maximum height of new building – building line etc. Garages becoming offices in Bowes Hill hence with more parking of commercial vehicles	Enforcement of planning policy is not a matter for Neighbourhood Plans	None proposed.
Wording needs more clarity to prevent fluid misinterpretation e.g. should read “must ensure the retention etc”	The wording has been thoroughly reviewed and is as prescriptive as is possible within the scope of allowed planning policy.	None proposed.
Maintenance of trees and footpaths also important	Within scope of policy where appropriate.	None proposed.
The approach through dense woodland, along the B2149 from Horndean is also a part of the landscape character. The SDNP area to the NE is probably secure from development. The Blendworth Common area to the SW of the road also needs protecting.	The policy applies to all landscape within the parish.	None proposed.
On Map 3 (copied from the EHDC Infrastructure Strategy, May 2019) “Core Non-Statutory Areas” are identified. I believe there are SINC’s and the and the abbreviation and the value of these areas should be explained with the Neighbourhood Plan.	The purpose of Map 3 is solely to show the location of Network Opportunity Areas and not all non-statutory areas. However responses from Statutory Consultees have questioned the rationale for including these NOA’s and reference to these have been removed.	Network Opportunity Areas removed from the policy.
It is apparent that there is no mention of the views across Gypsies Plain. Obviously, this will be lost when the reservoir is built, nonetheless, it is a lovely view, characteristic of the village, deserved protection. There is not a single mention of the reservoir and the impact on the landscape, public rights of way, biodiversity and in the entire summarized document. (2)	There is no rationale for conserving a view which will be lost to development which is permitted and commencing. Similarly with regard to other impacts of the reservoir. This were extensively reviewed as part of the planning process and the reservoir development is now underway.	None proposed.

Part 1b of the policy “Respect Natural Features” is too weak and should be strengthened. Small features, when disregarded can have a disproportionate impact. Part 2 should add “either alone or in combination”	“Respect natural features” is a phrase used in SDNP landscape policy and provides for flexibility in considering planning applications. Not clear what adding “either alone or in combination” achieves.	None proposed.
With increased development a retention of a rural feel needs to be kept.	Supportive of policy.	None proposed.
In the Policy 2 nd para line 3, suggest replace “permitted” with “considered” to reinforce the message that any development will be looked at very carefully.	As a planning term considered is meaningless. Adding this would not have the effect that the respondent desires.	None proposed.
Would like to see a view included in Policy 2 Table 1, taken from the south of Finchdean Rd, showing the valley bordering Stanstead Forest and the road itself. This area has in the past been designated an “Area of Outstanding Beauty”.	A view of this was previously proposed and considered. However, the land bordering Stanstead Forest lies within West Sussex and is outside of the NP boundaries.	None proposed.
General principles are correct but what is proposed will not yield the result required, to maintain acceptable living conditions the controls need to be both higher quality, more rigid and ensure changes are carried out sympathetic and in keeping with the environment.	The respondent appears to be asking for a more prescriptive design policy. This is not the intent of the policy which is to provide broader guidelines.	None proposed.
Make residents more aware about what they see and indeed what they do not see. Sand, gravel, clay, flint, chalk and others make the landscape, as well as trees and footpaths.	Believe this to be supportive of the policy.	None proposed.
In the wider context of preserving habitats for nature, we believe this policy is essential. It is worth observing that of necessity we have already lost a considerable number of mature trees in Havant Thicket due to the construction of the reservoir. All remaining mature trees are very precious in this area.	Believe this to be supportive of the policy.	None proposed.
Whilst I understand the thinking behind rewilding sometimes it appears that it is an excuse to not cut the grass. I chose not to walk down a pavement as both sides of the pavement had grass on either side that was completely uncut and tall, I wouldn’t walk down the middle because it is tick season and this is a hot spot for ticks.	Appreciate that ticks are of concern to members of the public but this beyond the intended scope of the policy.	None proposed.
It is important to preserve the parish landscape tougher with the setting of each of the main residential centres of Rowlands Castle, Finchdean and Idsworth, and to maintain the landscape vistas and the visual connectivity between the surrounding countryside and the built environment.	Supportive of policy.	None proposed.
Does the view A9 include the view towards Finchdean Road from the footpath between the end of Wellsworth Lane to Finchdean Road? The two fields which border this path are beautiful at all	Basically, yes.	None proposed.

times of the year and are the easiest place locally to view (and educate children on crop rotation and grain growth.		
All developments should enhance the environment that we live in – tree planting, street furniture, playgrounds etc.	Supportive of policy?	None proposed.
The Comley Hill plots have altered the landscape character and views for the worse. Some of them are over-developed, with caravans and large areas used for truck, lorry and car parking. The original farm track and bridleway has been badly affected by over-use.	It is intended that the policy will help regulate such over development in the future.	None proposed.

Policy 3

119 Agree with the Policy

2 Disagree with the Policy

Comment	Response	Changes to the Draft Plan
This is an important policy for preserving the essential green character of the village. It is important to ensure that no further development on these green areas is allowed. (16)	Supportive of policy	None proposed
Wording could be strengthened to ensure intent of the policy (1)	The wording has been discussed with the Steering Group's Planning Consultant and the wording is believed to be the best that can be produced to achieve the desired intent.	None proposed.
Protection required for environmental and recreation reasons as well as being an essential part of the village and character.	Supportive of policy	None proposed
Create more green space?	We believe all the important green spaces that can be included in the policy have been listed. If there are other opportunities to have further green spaces these can be considered when the plan is reviewed at a later date.	None proposed.
Open spaces are the lungs of the environment and provide areas where polluted air can be diluted with fresh air providing respite zones, space for health and even places for water retention.	Supportive of policy	None proposed
Loss would destroy the area.	Supportive of policy	None proposed
Conflict with policy 10 which says "any improvements would be supported whereas policy 3 states "only if appropriate"	We agree policy 3 states "if appropriate" and policy 10 has been amended to separate the amenities from the Recreation Ground as a Local Green Space, and wording amended to 'will be supported subject to amenity conditions being satisfied'. With the amendments made to these policies, we do not believe there to be any material inconsistency between the two statements which may be considered together.	Amendments have been made to ensure that Policies 3 and 10 are consistent.
Maintenance of trees important in keeping character intact. Areas overgrown with long grass and weeds all too common at present.	Supportive of policy, but the Neighbourhood Plan cannot address the issue of areas being overgrown.	None proposed

<p>Will the protected green spaces to the south of Woodberry Avenue be retained to deter/prevent further development on the open space to the south of Woodlands Avenue? i.e. A fourth exit should be added to the existing roundabout at the junction of Woodlands Avenue and Oak Tree close to provide access to any future developments in the field to the south of Woodlands Avenue.</p>	<p>Map 12 shows that this area ('Woodlands Avenue 1') is designated as a Protected Open Space'. The land to the south of this area is categorised as 'developable' in the EHDC Land Availability Assessment (2021) (site reference LAA/RC001), but the access to the site is not specified.</p>	<p>None proposed</p>
<p>It should be emphasised that protection of the designated local green spaces is key to preserving the character of the village; this protection must be given the highest priority in this Plan; the policy statement must be strengthened to make clear that invasion of, or change to, the rural/character nature of the existing spaces will not be allowed. The Statement should be amended to indicate that this requirement to preserve the green spaces is a "red line"; "should not" should read "must not"</p>	<p>The wording has been agreed on the advice our Planning Consultant and it is believed to be as strong as can be made in a Neighbourhood Plan.</p>	<p>None proposed.</p>
<p>The area on the B2149, opposite St John the Baptist Church, which was recently the subject of a planning application, albeit rejected, is missing from the protected space. If this was included, it would deter other future applications to develop the land. (2)</p>	<p>This area is referred to in the EHDC Land Availability Assessment (2021) as 'LAA/RC-008 – Land at Manor Lodge Road' and it is categorised as 'rejected' (for development). EHDC Planning application 58024 for this site was refused in February 2022, but in September 2022 an appeal was lodged. Therefore, this site cannot be protected from development in the Neighbourhood Plan. The site does not meet the criteria in the National Planning Policy Framework for being designated as a Local Green Space or Protected Open Space. The site is included in the 'gap' between Rowlands Castle and Havant as currently defined by EHDC. However, it cannot be included in the 'gap' defined in this Neighbourhood Plan, because it is adjacent to Havant Thicket Reservoir, and so it would not prevent coalescence between Havant and Rowlands Castle.</p>	<p>None proposed.</p>
<p>The sentence "Protected Open Space should be amended as follows: should not be built upon unless it has been shown to be surplus to requirements, or the loss resulting from the proposed development would be replaced by desired facilities of equivalent or better quantity and quality in an equally suitable location within a short timeframe. This is to avoid e.g. woodland being felled with replacement tree planting which will not deliver the same amenity for decades.</p>	<p>Any changes would require a planning consent and depending on the circumstances appropriate conditions can be built into any consent.</p>	<p>None proposed.</p>
<p>All of these spaces, both large and small needs protection.</p>	<p>Supportive of policy</p>	<p>None proposed</p>

EHDC owned plots like KME7 are in need of better management. (KME7 overgrown with invasive horsetail weed. Reported many times to EHDC but no action forthcoming)	The Neighbourhood Plan cannot address this issue	None proposed
Under Local Green Spaces, line 4, suggest replace “no alternative site is available” with “no alternative site is proven as available”. This will require utility companies to make it clear why they need to insert infrastructure on/under a local green space.	The policy is believed to be sufficiently robust to challenge any proposal if alternative sites were available.	None proposed.
Insufficient measures to achieve the desired outcome, current proposal is ineffectual.	Not supportive of Policy, however, it is not suggested how the policy could be made more effective. The current wording follows advice from the planning consultant, and is similar to that used in other adopted Neighbourhood Plans.	None proposed
It is important to protect the Local Green Spaces which are important to, readily accessible by, and very visible to, the whole of the Rowlands Castle Community. It is also necessary to protect the Open Spaces which are within areas of housing developments where they are important green areas for the residents of those developments.	Supportive of policy	None proposed
Further “greening” for climate and nature.	Supportive of policy.	None proposed
All well set out in the draft plan. Traffic and car parking is a problem around the village green but solving the issue of more parking appears to be impossible without taking away part of the green itself or the kerb alongside Deerleap.	Supportive of policy. The Neighbourhood Plan designates the village green as a Local Green Space, so this could preclude any of it being used for parking. The area adjacent to Deerleap is also part of the village green and so it is also Local Green Space. The village green was legally registered as a ‘village green’ so it is subject to Acts of Parliament which might preclude it from being used for car parking. It is also in the Rowlands Castle Conservation Area.	None proposed
Management tree planting/hedging etc (e.g. Whichers Gate Common) should be actively encouraged by both residents and authorities.	The ‘Local Green Spaces and Protected Open Spaces’ Evidence paper refers to the project undertaken: ‘Residents of Rowlands Castle to plant a small number of native trees and a wildflower meadow on part of Whichers Common, put up bird and bat boxes, whilst retaining a suitably sized area of the green for sports and recreation.’	None proposed
I wish to see the golf course indicated as a Protected Open Space, albeit in private ownership.	The golf course receives protection by being included in Policy 10 (Sports and Community Facilities). It is also designated as a Site of Important Nature Conservation (SINC), and a large part of it is in the South Downs National Park. It cannot be designated as a ‘Local Green Space’ because it is an extensive area, and so would not comply with the National Planning Policy Framework (2021), paragraph 102 c). Neither	None proposed.

	can it be designated as a Protected Open Space because it does not meet the NPPF criteria.	
But concerned what “Essential utility infrastructure” really amounts to.	The wording is to cover essential infrastructure whatever that may be, it does not seek to identify what is “essential” which would be determined by any planning application.	None proposed.
The Rowlands Castle Village Green and Recreation Ground are particularly highly valued for use by the Community.	Supportive of policy	None proposed
Living on the Green I see a lot of people picnicking. 2 or 3 deciduous trees along the edge of the Green would improve it, be beneficial to users.	The planting of additional trees cannot be addressed by the Neighbourhood Plan but this comment will be passed to Rowlands Castle Parish Council	None proposed
Agree but to also include. Map 10 – where there are Ecological Network opportunity areas (ref Map 3) - Area (with path across it) to the north of “Allotments – Durrants Road” and - Along the Drain towards/from Whichers Gate Farm. These known Ecological areas would be eroded should development occur here. These are known bat/nature corridors as an example.	Supportive of Policy. The Ecological Network opportunity area referred to in Map 3, is included in the ‘gap’ defined in Policy 1 (Gaps between Settlements) which will afford it protection. This Map 3 will be included in the Evidence paper for Policy 1.	None proposed
Can we add the fields between Woodberry /Glen Dale/Whichers Gate.	This area is referred to as ‘Comley Hill’ and it consists of about 20 plots, many of which are now designated for ‘equestrian’ use and contain stables. The area is subject to Article 4 planning regulations, so permission is required for development is required. It cannot be designated as a ‘Local Green Space’ because it is an extensive area, and so would not comply with the National Planning Policy Framework (2021), paragraph 102 c). Neither can it be designated as a Protected Open Space because it does not meet the NPPF criteria.	None proposed

Policy 4

Agree with the Policy

Disagree with the Policy

Comment	Response	Changes to the Draft Plan
There are many historical features of this village which must be enhanced and promoted. (8)	Supportive of policy.	None proposed.
My only concern would be that the owners of the identified properties were burdened with significant additional requirements should they wish to renovate/refurbish their properties. I assume that it is the specific features shown in the photographs that	There has been dialogue with the owners of affected properties. In addition, the policy does not prevent renovation or refurbishment but merely aims to conserve, where possible, the particular historic features.	None proposed.

would be the focus of need to conserve. I would hope that there would be constructive dialogue with home owners that did not prevent them making their homes as they wish, e.g. moving specific examples of decorative brickwork to another site within the building, or preserving as separate “art work”. There is a danger that overzealous conservation can stifle needed modernisation. (2)		
If this had not been referenced by earlier residents in the village, we would not enjoy it in its present form now.	Supportive of policy.	None proposed.
Wonderful history from Roman times is well established and must be maintained.	Supportive of policy?	None proposed.
Not made enough of history of the area. I have been asked a hundred times why it is called Rowlands Castle – plaque/board?	Valid comment but outside the remit of this policy.	None proposed.
Important part of the village “history” looking back helps looking forward.	Supportive of policy.	None proposed.
Retention of footpaths enable adults and children to have an alternative to walking along traffic polluted roads. Signage: Written or displayed should be in appropriate letting to merge with the Historical Environment.	Comment does not really link to Policy 5. No signage is being proposed.	None proposed. None proposed.
I had no idea there were so many properties of historical interest / heritage interest in the village!	Supportive of policy.	None proposed.
Not wholly successful I believe as Stein Cottage, Links Lane is unrecognisable.	The policy will still protect the remaining features.	None proposed.
How can we plan the future if we don’t know the past.	Supportive of policy.	None proposed.
Other older properties could be included as non-designated assets.	Inclusion solely on the basis of age would not be supportable. The assets included are mainly those identified by the RC Historical Society as of heritage interest.	None proposed.
Our history is Deerleap and the Old Castle of great historical value.	This is a relevant comment. Both Deerleap and the Motte & Bailey Castle are within private property and neither accessible by nor visible to the general public. As such it was felt that, excepting Deerleap Wall, they were not a good fit within this policy.	None proposed.
I realise that the churchyard at St John’s cannot be designated as a Green Space under Policy 3 but was surprised that there was no mention of the particular historical aspects of the graveyard at St John’s Church. There are several War Graves identified by the War Graves Commission and also graves associated with Jane Austen in the churchyard which are worth mentioning. It also seems an oversight that there is no image of St John’s Church included here.	This is a relevant comment. These graves were not identified in the RC Historical Society report but are of local historical relevance and merit inclusion as part of the St John’s Church entry in Policy 4. The omission of an image was due to timing pressures to have the policy completed for reg 14 consultation.	The description has been expanded to include references to the historic graves and an image of the church added.

<p>It would be great to make more of this – e.g. information about the Roman Villa located in the village would help to create a stronger image of the village through history.</p>	<p>Valid point. Provision of public information is beyond the scope of this policy but could be considered for inclusion in Aspirations’ and be a topic for consideration by the parish Council.</p>	<p>None proposed.</p>
<p>Cottages 8,9,10,11 Woodberry Lane are also built of Rowlands Castle brick and tiles.</p>	<p>The assets included are mainly those identified by the RC Historical Society as having specific features heritage interest. These properties were not included and it is likely that many properties in the parish will have used Rowlands castle brick in their construction.</p>	<p>None proposed.</p>
<p>Why no mention of our house the former residence of Lt Cdr Lionel (Buster) Crabbe and dating from 1738, one of the oldest.</p>	<p>Interesting comment. Web search from 2018 suggests that more support for the Wiki entry is needed. Also some uncertainty with Wikipedia suggesting residence in Whichers Gate Road and MHRA in Durrants (note MHRA web link appears ‘dead’). The age of the property combined with a famous past resident suggests this could be a potential NDHA. Needs more research to justify inclusion. It should be considered as part of updates for the plan.</p>	<p>None proposed.</p>
<p>We understand there may have been a Roman Tile Factory on the fields behind Glen Dale.</p>	<p>Of archaeological interest but unless there were physical and viewable remains this is beyond the scope for inclusion in the policy as current applied.</p>	<p>None proposed.</p>
<p>Whilst I agree with the principle of identifying, conserving, and enhancing heritage assets, the identification of the non-designated historic assets in section 9 of the Non-Designated Assets Report is based on historic features. The historical significance of the proposed assets (the criteria stated to be under consideration by the planning committee) is inadequately described. For example, in the case our property (74 Redhill Road), this significance is not described – but the use of two colours or brick and date inscription are identified as a feature. There is therefore insufficient guidance to show how the planning committee will assess a planning application in relation to the “historic significance” of the asset and I would suggest that the terminology of “feature”, “significance” and in the letter of 10th February “historic aspects” requires more thought and specific application across all the documents included in the plan. For example, if the consideration for 70-74 Redhill Road is to ensure that the inscription remains visible from the street as well as the use of two colours of brick on the front elevation as identified in the Non-Designated Heritage Assets Report, I would expect the</p>	<p>The inclusion of this property as a Non-Designated Historical Asset relates to its connection to the Rowlands Castle Brickworks and it’s the features that use bricks from these brickworks that are being referenced. The changes mentioned were due to owners raising objections to their inclusion which were accepted by the SG</p>	<p>None proposed.</p>

<p>Report to clearly state the relationship between the identified features and the historical significance of the property and to specify that it is the maintenance of these features that is under consideration. There would ensure clarity for a future planning committee applying the policy: “Development proposals that affect any of the non-designated heritage assets listed in Table 3 below must demonstrate how the proposal will conserve or enhance the historic significance of the asset(s) and its setting(s), proportionate to the asset’s importance and in sufficient detail to indicate the potential import of the proposal on their significance”</p> <p>My concern is that for some properties, there is a lack of definition of “historic significance” (reinforced by the fact the Report is stated as a document that “may be used” to help assess the impact of future development). This could lead to varying applications of the policy and this ambiguity may impact on the future sale of the property.</p> <p>It should also be noted, that this status would not prevent an owner of the property from painting the front elevation and concealing the two colours of brick...</p> <p>The rationale for the removal of properties from the list of proposed non-designated historical assets between the private consultation with home owners (Feb 2022) and the public consultation (June-August 2022) has not been shared, and therefore appears inconsistent. For example, 55 Bowes Hill /Glen House (the residence of the manager of the brickworks - and thus arguably of greater significance – both with decorative terracotta tiling) have both been removed from the list of proposed non-designated assets. No explanation has been given to evidence that the criteria applied in these cases have been applied to all properties proposed to be included in section 9.</p>		
--	--	--

Policy 5

120 Agree with the Policy

1 Disagree with the Policy

Comment	Response	Changes to the Draft Plan
Need to be able to refuse permission to houses that do not fit the shades of red brick in the village, particularly the “grey” houses that are popping up, e.g. on Greatfield Way and Bowes Hill.	This would be very restrictive in practice given that the shade of brick produced in Rowlands castle was quite distinctive and no longer readily obtainable. In general terms Policy 5 would apply to development that was clearly out of character.	None proposed.
Requires even stricter control to offset change of character by developments & redevelopments e.g. extensions.	Would probably be considered overly restrictive.	None proposed.
Not enough emphasis on mandating energy efficient housing – insulation, Solar panels, heat pumps etc + electric charging provision for each home.	It was not the intent of this policy to set detailed building standards; these are covered in national guidance.	None proposed.
Housing should be “eco-friendly” in terms of energy and water use.	Covered in national guidance.	None proposed.
Strongly agree.	Supports policy.	None proposed.
Recent extensions have changed the original character of a number of houses especially loss of garages. Especially now planning application for Tower Block @ 3 The Peak.	The NP cannot act retrospectively.	None proposed.
Many times it is mentioned that the design of housing in the parish should respect the character of the village. This is wholly incompatible with the design/type of houses provided by national builders that build the same house designs across the entire country. By allowing them to provide the new housing in the village, it will lead to the loss of character as the same houses can be found anywhere. (2)	This appears to be arguing for no new housing, a position which is not in accord with National planning policy.	None proposed.
This no doubt will be in line with potential redevelopment of existing properties.	Supports policy.	None proposed.
With reference to “Rural Guidelines that I proposed some time ago, please include the request that “in seeking to retain the overall rural ambience of the developed area of the Village residents are encouraged to retain green features – verges and hedges – and discouraged from introducing urban or suburban features such as high brick walls or gates”	Rural Guidelines were taken into consideration when producing the Settlement Character Assessment for the Parish, referred to in the Policy. This reference document provides guidance for consideration of future planning applications, and it is not considered possible to mandate the specific aspects raised, further than already covered by the Plan.	None proposed.
Recent developments in the area last 15 years do not reflect the open and green feel the rest of the village enjoys. Developers concentrating on density and not providing enough space for cars.	Matter such as housing density are set by National Planning Policy. It is intended that this policy will lead to new developments better respecting the character of their surroundings.	None proposed.

<p>Woefully short of what is needed, recently development undertaken has been poor quality and or no architectural merit. It does not even achieve reasonable levels of energy efficiency, or any consideration for carbon neutrality over the expected service lives of the dwellings erected or modified.</p> <p>The village is blighted by cars and the roads to the west (Whichers Gate) are not fit for purpose Emissions at this point exceed safe limits (and yes I have measured , DSL PM2.5 & Nox). The roads are “B” but carry the design level of “A” roads/truck.</p> <p>20 mph needed on all roads north and south of Whichers Gate for approximately 400 metres in each direction with single lane access at the limits of the speed restriction. Traffic calming as Selbourne, present to do this already exists.</p> <p>ULEZ zone is needed and a total ban on all vehicles in excess of 7.5t GVW, except for access.</p> <p>Havant Thicket reservoir when built will exacerbate the issue, access to this needs a dedicated link directly from the A3. Unless vehicular access during construction is limited to going via Horndean only, life for anybody near the B2149 will be intolerable.</p>	<p>The comments are beyond the scope of the policy.</p>	<p>None proposed.</p>
<p>Ensure that the three main residential centres – Rowlands Castle, Finchdean and Idsworth/Park – retain their distinct settlement characteristics. It seems that planning permissions in Castle Road in particular seems to have allowed development of dwellings of many differing styles – we need to ensure that this does not happen to the rest of the village, particularly on The Green which provides the village with so much of its character.</p>	<p>It is intended that the policy will meet these aims.</p>	<p>None proposed.</p>
<p>Insofar as there is any room for more housing it must be built to preserve the character of the village and discrete with adequate parking.</p>	<p>It is intended that the policy will meet these aims.</p>	<p>None proposed.</p>
<p>Agree in principle although there should be room for designs which benefit from new ideas and technologies.</p>	<p>Supportive of policy.</p>	<p>None proposed.</p>
<p>If people want to look at house that are of interesting merit and contribute to the look of the village and surrounding estates e.g. mid-century houses then this should be supported by decent pavements not only for SAFETY reasons but to enhance the look of the estate and this is cared for, this should include weed control which has contributed to undulating pavements, holes appearing and a general ugly look to the road e.g. Wellswood Gardens.</p>	<p>The comment on pavements is largely addressed by Policy 11. Weed control is outside the scope of NP policies.</p>	<p>None proposed.</p>
<p>Very important to me as this is what I bought into.</p>	<p>Supportive of policy.</p>	<p>None proposed.</p>

The “look” of the village important, adds to the feel, makes village an attraction to live in.	Supportive of policy.	None proposed.
I personally and not in favour of the walls and fortified gates that seem to be appearing in the village, especially on Links Land. I believe that they detract from the “village” feel, which used to be more of a leafy /wooden fences and gates. I think clause 2 have could be more vigorously upheld.	It is intended that the policy will ensure that development does not detract from the character of its surroundings.	None proposed.
Strict control on this Policy is essential to prevent or limit extremes for ultra-modern designers.	It is intended that the policy will meet these aims.	None proposed.
Only houses of modern character should be built and not ULTRA MODERN house with no character. That would not be in keeping with our village.	It is intended that the policy will meet these aims.	None proposed.
I agree that Rowlands Castle has a particular character and identity, and although most buildings are not listed, this overall character should be conserved. (3)	Supportive of policy.	None proposed.
Individuality is quintessentially English.	Supportive of policy.	None proposed.
Support the Settlement Character Assessment and its use as a reference for implementing this policy. The other key supporting documents remain valid as important reference documents for RC Parish.	Supportive of policy.	None proposed.
This is very important and neglected area of planning. All too often new developments and modifications to existing structures are not in keeping with their surroundings.	Supportive of policy.	None proposed.
Too many properties now have high walls /gates and inappropriate plastic cladding. Bowes Hill and Links Lane especially. Refurbs need as much monitoring as proposed new developments.	It is intended that the policy will ensure that development does not detract from the character of its surroundings.	None proposed.
We can also influence by petition (the newest houses in Uplands Road were to be of yellow bricks but WE stopped that).	It is intended that the policy will meet these aims.	None proposed.
The new developments tend to deteriorate in some areas where the Developer has not provided any off- road parking or sufficient outside storage, for example unsightly wheelie bins.	It is intended that the policy will meet these aims.	None proposed.

Policy 6

120

Agree with the Policy

1

Disagree with the Policy

Comment	Response	Changes to the Draft Plan
Housing - encourage for all age groups – especially need for the young families to create new generations for the village. Whilst I agree, I don’t understand why other groups have not been identified, e.g. key workers – accommodation in RC is not	EHDC has responsibility for Strategic Housing Allocations and considers the type of housing provided in that allocation. The Rowlands Castle Parish Housing Needs Survey highlighted a large surplus of 4/5 Bed Houses becoming available and a	None required.

<p>affordable for the vast majority buying their first home – in order to enhance village life, presumably we also want to encourage young people /families to remain in the area? (2)</p>	<p>shortage of 1 and 2 Bed properties that would suit the over 55s. This policy responds directly to this by encouraging the large units released to be redevelopment as 1 and 2 Bed units suitable for the over 55s. Although no significant demand was identified in the Housing Needs Survey for other age groups these can be expected to be satisfied by the Strategic Allocation by EHDC in new developments outside the existing settlement policy boundary.</p>	
<p>It is relevant also that this same accommodation is suitable for young couples with small families whom we should encourage into the village; the requirement of space in these developments for off street parking is also worthy of a mention, to ease parking roadside.</p>	<p>The Policy encourages the redevelopment of the large 4/5 Bed properties to 1 and 2 Bed properties. These should be designed with wider doorways, level access, provision for electricity sockets at waist height and provision to allow installing a lift for instance, they are not however restricted to over 55s and would be suitable for occupation for all ages. It is the design that the policy focusses on not the age of the occupants. All developments would need to comply with normal planning car parking standards including off road parking in any planning application.</p>	<p>None required.</p>
<p>High demand for downsizing and/or community developments for retired people.</p>	<p>The Policy encourages development of the larger housing units that become available to provide for this demand.</p>	<p>None required.</p>
<p>Despite limited opportunities for development. Whilst I agree we need more over 55s housing I cannot see how it can be incorporated with the village as it stands at present. (2)</p>	<p>Opportunities for development, particularly within the existing settlement policy boundary are indeed limited. This policy does however provide for the larger houses that become available to be redeveloped to provide the necessary sites for these developments.</p>	<p>None required.</p>
<p>More needed! To release large family houses for families.</p>	<p>The provision of suitable 1 and 2 Bed units within walking distance of the village centre would indeed allow occupants of the larger village houses to downsize and releases their existing properties for other occupiers.</p>	<p>None required.</p>
<p>Is age really a requirement for housing.</p>	<p>We agree, age is not a requirement. The Policy is designed to provide accommodation that not only is suitable for over 55s but also under 55s. It could be occupied by someone who is say 25 and, as a result of the design, they should be able to occupy and not need to move even if they are wheelchair bound. The Policy is not designed to provide age restricted properties, rather properties that can be occupied by ALL ages.</p>	<p>None required.</p>

We need adequate provision. Many people retire to this area.	The Policy is designed to provide for this demand.	None required.
Disproportionate elderly pop well housed.	The Rowlands Castle Parish Housing Needs Survey 2018 identified a large number of 4/5 Bed units that would become available whereas the demand was for 1 and 2 Bed units. Given that occupiers of 4/5 Bed units are likely to be elderly releasing their accommodation makes it potentially available for other occupiers.	None required.
Residents often wish to move within the village after bringing up children in a family home. At present there are few small homes close to the village centre.	The need for downsizing was very clear from the housing needs survey undertaken. The Policy has been designed to generate more smaller units close to the village centre.	None required.
In moderation, taking other issues into account	In considering any planning application this needs to be done against all policies, both in the Neighbourhood Plan and the Local Plan and, where they conflict the latest policies are usually most relevant.	None required.
This is an important policy to encourage turnover of the family accommodation in the village while at the same time allowing older people to remain in the community.	The Policy encourages just that. It is designed to allow older people to release they large properties and redevelop to smaller units to allow them to stay in the community they know really well.	None required.
After the word encouraged add “where they do not conflict with other policies within this Plan”	Any planning application would, as a matter of course, be considered against ALL the existing Policies. Where there is a conflict with another policy then both policies would be considered and a balancing judgment made as to which is most important.	None required.
It is critical that any further developments within the RC parish recognise the need for such housing and make some provision for it, especially with infilling developments closer to the RC village is concerned.	The Policy specifically encourages this approach.	None required.
Consider adding: “In any future developments, bungalows and/or low single room apartment buildings should be included as starter homes for the elderly”.	The Policy encourages development of 1 and 2 bed units suitable for occupation by over 55s. these units can indeed be starter homes for the elderly.	None required.
However, I have not seen any specific mention covering the need for housing of the young from within the RC community. If we are not careful the demographics of the village will be biased towards the senior end of the spectrum! (3) To enhance community life, by enabling provision of housing for local needs, promoting local employment and supporting retail, community and sports provision, working with EHDC on housing allocations to meet local needs.	The Policy encourages the redevelopment of the large 4/5 Bed properties to 1 and 2 Bed properties. These should be designed with wider doorways, level access, provision for electricity sockets at waist height and provision to allow installing a lift for instance, they are not however restricted to over 55s and would be suitable for occupation for all ages. It is the design that the policy focusses on not the age of the occupants and these properties would also be suitable for the young within the RC community.	None required.

<p>General aims are fine, but the provision under the proposal will not be fit for purpose. However, the greater concern is the effective operation of the Doctor's Surgery, under the leadership of Dr Harrison it was a very effective practice that worked well and provided good provision to the older population. However, the practice is now failing the community and there is no effective leadership being exercised by the current practice partners.</p>	<p>The management of the Doctors Surgery is not within the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>	<p>None required.</p>
<p>I am less certain about this Priority. Although recognising that older members of the community may wish to down size to more suitable housing this should not be at the expense of providing housing suitable for young families. It would not be a good thing. The current age distribution is already skewed to over 40s and I think the character of the village would be compromised if there was too much encouragement of specific housing for this age group. I don't want to see us become a Retirement Village only.</p>	<p>The Policy encourages the redevelopment of the large 4/5 Bed properties to 1 and 2 Bed properties. It is the design that the policy focusses on not the age of the occupants and these properties would also be suitable for the young within the RC community.</p>	<p>None required.</p>
<p>Particularly important to cater for older residents who may wish to downsize whilst remaining in the centre of the village. This should include the ability to further develop existing sites (e.g. creating annexes) providing it does not detract from the appearance and character of the village.</p>	<p>The Policy does not preclude the use of annexes and encourages the redevelopment of existing properties into multiple units.</p>	<p>None required.</p>
<p>A new retirement housing policy is needed. I mean COMPLETELY NEW. Retirement homes (sic) costing £400,000 is not the answer (Fernhills behind Oaklands House).</p>	<p>The cost of housing is clearly a significant issue for many people, it is not within the scope of a Neighbourhood Plan to be able to control this.</p>	<p>None required.</p>
<p>I would like to see inclusion for affordable homes for younger people also.</p>	<p>Although no significant demand was identified in the Housing Needs Survey for affordable housing, these are very much part of the consideration on land allocated for development by the EHDC and SDNP Planning Authorities as part of the Strategic Policies they are required to carry out.</p>	<p>None required.</p>
<p>Age range seems low (even though I am 62). Understand the government initiative though.</p>	<p>The housing is to be designed to be suitable for over 55s but it should look like any other housing. The differences are wider doorways, level access, provision for electricity sockets at waist height and provision to allow installing a lift for instance. They are perfectly suited to younger occupiers, the difference being that if they become less able, they can remain in the property, and do not have to move to a new property to accommodate their needs.</p>	<p>None required.</p>

<p>Important, people living longer, chances of downsizing, so can still stay in village – family friends etc. Mixed developments, sizes, storeys. (2)</p>	<p>The Policy is designed to achieve this.</p>	<p>None required.</p>
<p>Age should be raised to 65 at least. I disagree with the title of this Policy. My experience leads me to believe that 55 years of age is too young for the downsizing intended. I am in my 80's and downsized in my late 70's as only then was I ready for this. I am aware that the state Pension age is now 67 years but younger working people buy these precious age-related properties as an investment and rent them out to younger people.</p>	<p>The housing is to be designed to be suitable for over 55s to accommodate physical changes in later life that might require they move to a property that would accommodate their needs.</p> <p>The differences are wider doorways, level access, provision for electricity sockets at waist height and provision to allow installing a lift for instance.</p> <p>They are perfectly suited to younger occupiers, but the design avoids the need to move if they encounter physical difficulties at any age.</p> <p>The use of the phrase "Over 55s" is to try and highlight the type of design required so that any properties are suitable for when occupiers become more elderly and less able.</p> <p>The properties will suit younger people as well and the policy is designed to encourage the building of as many of these type of properties within walking distance of the village as possible so that everyone that needs 1 or 2 bed units can be accommodated.</p>	<p>None required.</p>
<p>The number of properties in the village suitable for current residents to move to should they need to downsize with age are few. Relocation may be the only option. This is sad when a life has been made and very much enjoyed in the village.</p>	<p>We agree, the Policy is designed to enable as many residents as possible to continue to benefit from the village and community life they currently enjoy.</p>	<p>None Required.</p>
<p>But where? Within the green I can see no areas which could accommodate this type of housing.</p>	<p>The Rowlands Castle Parish Housing Needs Survey highlighted a large surplus of 4/5 Bed Houses becoming available and a shortage of 1 and 2 Bed properties that would suit the over 55s.</p> <p>This policy responds directly to this by encouraging the large units released to be redevelopment as 1 and 2 Bed units suitable for the over 55s within walking distance of the village centre.</p>	<p>None required.</p>
<p>Generally agree but should be over 60s in these times.</p>	<p>The use of the phrase "Over 55s" is to try and highlight the type of design required so that any properties are suitable for when occupiers become more elderly and less able.</p> <p>It is not an occupational requirement and indeed, the properties will suit younger people just as well.</p>	<p>None required.</p>
<p>The new Fernhills development together with the bungalow development in Castle Road and apartments in Greenside are</p>	<p>All types of properties suitable for occupation by over 55s are encouraged in the Policy.</p>	<p>None required.</p>

going in the right direction. In addition I believe the Highwood development is also aimed at more senior residents.		
Yes, as long as such developments follow the guidelines under Policy 5 to design and build so that they are aesthetically pleasing.	Any development would need to also comply with the other policies including Policy 5.	None required.
Would be helpful if there were more available- But how and where? There are many one senior occupied houses but nowhere to go!	This policy responds directly to this by encouraging the large units released to be redevelopment as 1 and 2 Bed units suitable for the current occupiers of the larger houses.	None required.
Map 16 – Rowlands Castle Settlement Policy Boundary appears only within the confines of Policy 6 – Over 55s housing, rather than any development. Do the supporting reports outline how this Settlement Policy Boundary was formulated? Often Settlement Policy Boundaries are drawn to limit the confines or any new development on the edge of settlements.	The Neighbourhood Plan is not proposing to change the Settlement Policy Boundary. Our understanding however accords with yours, the Boundary is usually drawn to show the limits of existing development.	None required.
A similar additional policy is needed for your people to buy “affordable” as a shared ownership houses.	Although no significant demand was identified in the Housing Needs Survey for affordable or shared ownership housing this can be expected to be satisfied by the Strategic Housing Allocation by EHDC in new developments.	None required.
The houses built for the over 55s off the road to Emsworth are a DISASTER. If people cannot drive they are not walking distance to the village so no good for disabled. Homes needed for the Elderly near centre of the village near transport, i.e. bus and trains and shops and the other facilities.	Opportunities for development, particularly near the centre of the village are limited. This policy does however provide for the larger houses near the centre of the village that become available to be redeveloped to provide the necessary sites for these developments.	None required.
But not to the detriment of the green spaces.	Any development would need to considered against all the other policies including those for green spaces.	None required.
This is very relevant to me as I have lived in the village for 40 years and don’t want to leave Rowlands Castle.	This is a common theme from many consultees.	None required.
Fully support provision if the right opportunities become available in suitable locations for such housing. (2)	Thank you.	None required.
But hard to envisage any further development “within walking distance”.	Opportunities for development, particularly near the centre of the village are limited. This policy does however provide for the larger houses near the centre of the village that become available to be redeveloped to provide the necessary sites for these developments	None required.
Development of existing sites only – no new sites. (2)	No developments of new sites are identified in the plan.	None required.
Shelter housing would enable villages to stay in the village.	This is a common theme from many consultees.	None required.

Deerleap would seem an ideal area to accommodate over 55s housing, as so near to all amenities. Recent new built bungalows at Oaklands (2) are unable to access via the bridleway to the village, which has not been cleared by the builders, although agreed.	Deerleap would be a suitable site for consideration under this policy. It has not been identified as being available in the next 15 years however, it cannot therefore be considered in connection with this policy in the current proposed plan.	None required.
Not necessarily around the Green, but with good access, wheelchair friendly paths to the village, or by small mini bus.	The Policy encourages developments within walking distance of the village centre but does not preclude developments designed for the over 55s further afield.	None required.
We must take care to provide housing for younger people too, as it could mean the village ages and becomes unattractive.	It is the design that the policy focusses on not the age of the occupants, the properties would also be suitable for the young within the RC community.	None required.

Policy 7

Agree with the Policy

Disagree with the Policy

Comment	Response	Changes to the Draft Plan
More consideration should be given to enforcing the conservation area status of the village centre and removing some of the ugly "infrastructure" such as cheap trellis and archway constructed at the front of the Fountain Inn and garish lighting.	The enforcement of the Conservation Area is outside the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan.	None required.
Excellent existing facilities (2)	Noted	None required.
Traffic calming on Redhill Road as majority of users do not abide by the 30-mph speed limit coming down or driving up the road. This results in vehicles approaching the village centre at a speed that is unsafe. In addition, a restriction on vehicle size would also be appreciated. I.E., weight restrictions to inhibit large lorries passing through the village centre.	Highway issues are a matter for Hampshire County Council but your comments will be passed to the Parish Council for any action they might be able to consider taking.	None required.
A reference is made to the Rowlands Castle Conservation Area guidance leaflet (EHDC), But the conservation area itself is not actually specified. Would this be helpful?	The document can be referenced separately and it is not considered necessary to include within the plan.	None required.
The issue of no alternative occupier is subjective. I am aware of cases where no effort has been made to find an alternative occupier. Perhaps amend to add "after suitable search".	The Policy requires any applicant to show there is no alternative occupier. It follows that unless there has been a suitable search this cannot be demonstrated. The Policy is believed to cover this point adequately.	None required.
Para 4 of the Policy. Suggest change "there is no alternative occupier" to there is no prospect of an alternative business/facility provider occupying the site within a year". This would provide the	This is a similar point to the above. Advertising the availability of the site for a reasonable period in appropriate media would be considered a necessary	None required.

opportunity for advertising the availability of such a site for business before losing the site to residential use.	requirement to demonstrate that there is no alternative occupier.	
It would be a good idea if the roads around the Green could be made one way as it is a nightmare trying to drive through the village without having to avoid idiotic drivers thinking they have the right of passing when they haven't got the right of way as parked cars are on their side of the road!	Highway issues are a matter for Hampshire County Council but your comments will be passed to the Parish Council for any action they might be able to consider taking.	None required.
During the 1990's, as part of the HCC County Villages Initiative Panel's work, a sum was voted to improve the appearance and safety of traffic in and around The Green. (Crossings with rumble strips and pathways across The Green were introduced, as was new street furniture. I would recommend that discreet "gateway" features are installed at near approaches, to encourage a cautionary and "shared highway" ambience (This would be indicative only, but not formally enforceable.	Highway issues are a matter for Hampshire County Council but your comments will be passed to the Parish Council for any action they might be able to consider taking.	None required.
Too many cars, we need active measures to make it difficult to access the "green" unless you live surrounding the "green" or need to access housing via roads leading from the "green". ULEZ is needed, parking provision is fine and needs to be reduced directly in front of the Londis Store due to impact on the safety of the junctions at the railway bridge. Whichers Gate roundabout is particularly dangerous for any vehicle wanting to go north to Horndean (poor visibility).	Highway issues are a matter for Hampshire County Council but your comments will be passed to the Parish Council for any action they might be able to consider taking.	None required.
The village centre is the envy of many and must be maintained. Better versions of the pubs should be encouraged. The village could easily accommodate a proper restaurant and classier pub.	The policy is designed to promote the viability of the village centre facilities and promote new businesses coming in.	None required.
Existing business should be supported, these serve the village well and add to its character and appeal. (2)	The policy is designed to promote the viability of the village centre facilities and promote new businesses coming in.	None required.
Monitor more closely illegal parking.	Enforcement of Parking Restrictions is a matter for East Hampshire District Council but your comments will be passed to the Parish Council.	None required.
I live in the heart so would agree.	Noted	None required.
The heart of the village, no building should be considered.	We are required to allow for development where appropriate. The Policy sets out to control what type of development is allowable.	None required.
Access to the village should be restricted to "Access Only" as the village is congested with oversized vehicles seeking to "rat run" through for a shorter access to trunk roads, A roads and Motorways. There are linking roads which circumnavigate the village.	Highway issues are a matter for Hampshire County Council but your comments will be passed to the Parish Council for any action they might be able to consider taking.	None required.

The land behind the Castle belongs to the Brewery – Perhaps as they are not prepared to sell the land they could consider loaning/renting to RCPC.	The site has been identified as being available for development and cannot therefore be included in the plan but we will pass your suggestions to the Parish Council so they can consider this further.	None required.
What about Finchdean? The light industrial units there are degenerating into scrapyards, detrimental to the village environment.	The policy relates only to the Rowlands Castle Village Centre. No policy is being proposed for the future of these units which are believed to be permitted uses under current planning legislation.	None required.
RC Village centre plus Dean Lane End, Idsworth and Finchdean – same principles apply.	The policy is restricted to the Rowlands Castle Village Centre. The other areas of the parish do not have a significant level of services that is considered necessary to have a policy relating to those areas.	None required.
The working heart of the village and therefore Parish on so many levels.	Thank you for your support.	None required.
Essential to retain in present form to maintain visual character and community spirit of the village. (2)	Thank you for your support.	None required.
I have huge reservations about increasing the amount of parking in the village centre. This will only encourage people to drive as opposed to walking or cycling.	There is a balance between ensuring we support existing business through adequate parking provision and encouraging walking or cycling. Arguably the difficulties of parking already should be providing the best incentive not to drive if there is an option. Existing businesses wish to see increased parking to support their viability. There are however no ready solutions to providing additional parking so this remains more an aspiration that a part of the policy that is likely to be implemented.	None required.
Best village in Hampshire - further promote via media.	We will pass your comments to the Parish Council, promoting the Parish is not within the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan.	None required.
We are very fortunate to have thriving businesses in the village and they should be supported as far as possible as they contribute to the enjoyment of living in Rowlands Castle as well as saving car journeys to other town centres.	Thank you for your support of the policy.	None required.
Police the double yellow lines/parking in front of the Londis is an issue.	Enforcement of Parking Restrictions is a matter for East Hampshire District Council but your comments will be passed to the Parish Council.	None required.
Agree the protection of what few businesses exist in RC, including the Vet and the GP practice.	Thank you for your support of the Policy.	None required.
The village is extremely vibrant with a wide variety of businesses well supported by the residents. We are especially fortunate to have a post office housed in the wonderful Home Hardware, a very	Thank you for your support of the Policy.	None required.

professional GP practice and Pharmacy and the exceptional Londis Store to name just a few.		
A suggestion and to enhance the “Quintessential village” feel – and as water is key to wildlife and will add an incredible feature for both residents and visitors alike – if it were possible a pond on the green (think Petersfield Lake only a lot smaller! And the pond at West Ashling). Appreciate a natural water source would probably be required but I thought I would mention it here.	This is not within the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan. However we will pass your comments to the Parish Council for their consideration.	None Required.
Improved communications always a plus.	Noted.	None required.
It is very important to maintain the current very good facilities in the RC Village Centre and provide more if appropriate and in the right location. Suggest exclude the Village Green from Map 17 as this is a Local Green Space.	Thank you for your support, we agree the Village Green can be removed from Map 17 as this is already a Local Green Space.	Village Green removed from Map 17 and therefore excluded from the policy.
The village desperately needs a proper crossing so that elderly and disabled residents do not have to run the gauntlet of speeding traffic when trying to access village businesses. Also, double yellow lines protecting entrances to lanes etc are routinely ignored by selfish visitors, thereby blocking or severely restricting access to houses and flats in the village. We could do with better policing of this and perhaps red instead of yellow lines to concentrate the minds of the inconsiderate.	Highway issues are a matter for Hampshire County Council but your comments will be passed to the Parish Council for any action they might be able to consider taking.	None required.
Preserve the Green at all costs.	The Village Green is already a Local Green Space and therefore already has very good protection.	None required.
A survey of need in terms of the village centre might be valuable to ensure villagers are able to make use of new businesses when they arrive. Not many used the wool shop – do we need a nail bar?	We will pass your comments to the Parish Council for them to consider further.	None required.
A second-hand antiques shop would be of interest to perhaps quite a few folk (I know there used to be one).	We will pass your comments to the Parish Council for them to consider further.	None required.
Essential -but Conservation must be enforced. Aka Fountain Inn - Encroachment onto public space.	The enforcement of the Conservation Area is outside the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan.	None required.

Policy 8

117 Agree with the Policy

4 Disagree with the Policy

Comment	Response	Changes to the Draft Plan
Any on street parking needs to discourage speeding in the village which is a worsening problem.	This cannot be addressed by the Neighbourhood Plan	None proposed
Encouragement of alternative transport (cycling public etc) to reduce need for parking. Disagree with any car park creation – it will damage the village	Policy 11 (Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding Access) encourages cycling provision. If a site for parking near the village centre were to be found, damage to the village would be avoided by the phrase in the policy which states: ‘...provided it is appropriately located having regard to the character of the area’.	None proposed
But policy should include something on enforcement which is currently not happening. (2)	This cannot be addressed by the Neighbourhood Plan. East Hants District Council is responsible for the enforcement of parking regulations.	None proposed
An increasing problem which needs more consideration in planning for new housing etc.	The Neighbourhood Plan cannot address this issue. New housing needs to provide on-site parking in accordance with the EHDC and SDNPA Supplementary Planning Documents for Vehicle Parking Standards. The EHDC and SDNPA Local Plans allocate sites for housing and in doing so, they might could consider the impact of any increase in on-street parking (e.g. in the village centre).	None proposed
Agree in part – may be the golf club could be encouraged to release piece of triangle between Redhill Road and Links Lane? Station builders’ yard if it becomes available.	The owner of the yard adjacent to the station has not offered it for use as a public car park. The triangle of land between Redhill Road and Links Lane which is owned by the Golf Club is designated as a Site of Interest for Nature Conservation (SINC) and it may be used by the Golf Club as part of their course.	None proposed
Whilst additional parking would be useful near the shops, I do not regard this as a priority. Parked cars on Redhill Road continue to cause congestion.	The policy encourages additional car parking in the village centre which could be near the shops. Restrictions on parking in Redhill Road were implemented after a public consultation conducted by EHDC on a Traffic Regulation Order in 2020. It is not known if any further restrictions would be considered.	None proposed

<p>Parking has been included in the plan, but there is no specific mention of the huge increase in traffic in recent times. The double roundabout near the Staunton Arms is positively dangerous, and frequently a site of road traffic accidents. (2)</p>	<p>The Neighbourhood Plan cannot consider matters relating to traffic. That is the responsibility of Hampshire County Council. It is becoming recognised by planning authorities that the double mini-roundabout near the Staunton Arms could be operating at, or above, its full capacity when developments such as that on the Land East of Horndean are constructed. That development would provide a contribution of about £460,000 towards improvements of the junction of Manor Lodge Road, Redhill Road, Durrants Road and Whichers Gate Road.</p>	<p>None proposed</p>
<p>A further point is required to cover the excessive development of houses which increases occupancy beyond the ability of the site to support the necessary vehicles.</p>	<p>The Neighbourhood Plan cannot address this issue. It is EHDC and SDNPA who allocate sites for development in their Local Plans in order to meet the increasing housing targets set by the UK Government. There is a public consultation while these Local Plans are being prepared. New housing needs to provide on-site parking in accordance with the EHDC and SDNPA Supplementary Planning Documents for Vehicle Parking Standards.</p>	<p>None proposed</p>
<p>In the Policy para 1 suggest insert “very” before “long term” because I believe that the facility to park vehicles at residential and business properties will always be needed. Our lives require the use of private cars for so many activities.</p>	<p>We agree with this comment.</p>	<p>The phrase ‘in the long term’ has been removed from paragraph 1 of the Policy.</p>
<p>Page 46 – spelling of “levants” incorrect.</p>	<p>Agreed.</p>	<p>Second line, 1st paragraph, corrected.</p>
<p>I don’t support the development of anymore parking spaces.</p>	<p>Policy not supported</p>	<p>None proposed</p>
<p>Something desperately needs to be sorted out about the parking and the mad motorists speeding through the village.</p>	<p>This policy would encourage additional car parking provision to serve the village centre provided it is appropriately located having regard to the character of the area. East Hants District Council is responsible for the enforcement of parking regulations, and the police are responsible for enforcing speed regulation.</p>	<p>None proposed</p>
<p>Parking around The Green should generally be discouraged, except for householders, but too much parking may only act to increase vehicle speeds (as it does to some extent up Redhill Road)</p>	<p>In addition to parking for householders on The Green, some parking spaces around The Green are required by customers of businesses and shops, and by visitors. On some of those spaces there are time limits.</p>	<p>None proposed</p>

<p>Comments or suggested changes: The proliferation of disabled parking spaces around the Green is making the parking situation worse. I'm not opposed in principle to disabled spaces but last time I was trying to park for a doctor's appointment there were 4 empty disabled spaces around the Green and nowhere else to park anywhere near the surgery. I believe even more disabled spaces are now being proposed which I feel will only make the situation more difficult.</p>	<p>EHDC conducted a public consultation on a Traffic Regulation Order for the village in 2020, and that resulted in additional spaces for disabled parking. Those spaces have now been marked out, and there is no indication that EHDC is considering implementing any further parking restrictions around the village.</p>	<p>None proposed</p>
<p>Level needs to be dramatically reduced to ensure that character of the "green" is preserved. Traffic speed reduction on all roads that extend out of the village needs to be imposed of at least 100 metres from the village limits and 400 metres on all roads from the Whichers Gate roundabout. Driving through Rowlands Castle needs to be made difficult so that traffic is forced to take other routes. We suffer as the A3 does not have an effective high-speed access to the east at Bedhampton.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The setting of speed restrictions is the responsibility of Hampshire County Council (HCC), and the Parish Council has had several meetings with an officer from HCC about this matter. However, HCC's funding for this is very limited • The Parish Council has used funding from Hampshire County Council to install signage and road markings to reduce speeding on roads leading to the village. • The Parish Council has supported the proposal by HCC to consider imposing a 20-mph speed limit on roads in built-up areas. • The policy encourages the provision of more parking at the railway station. • The owners of the telephone exchange, the yard adjacent to the station and the commercial plot at the bottom of Bowes Hill behind the garage are not willing to release their land for public parking. • The Parish Council does not have the authority to make a compulsory purchase. 	<p>None proposed</p>
<p>This may further cause problems for residents due to limited availability of on-street parking spaces in these areas. As residents of The Green, this is of particular concern to us. We regularly notice people parking outside or near our house who then travel by train, sometimes for periods of up to 2 weeks. There is a great need for more parking at the station particularly since the new housing developments have brought younger residents to the village who commute to London. It is essential to find suitable sites for more public parking as a matter of urgency. We would support the development of parking at Links Close but feel there is also a need for parking near the station.</p>	<p>We accept this is an issue. The policy is designed to ensure that current parking levels are maintained. Where there are opportunities to increase parking, particularly for users of the Railway Station these will be encouraged by the Parish Council. Currently there is no opportunity to designate new sites for parking although the Parish Council keep this under constant review.</p>	<p>None Proposed.</p>

<p>Is it possible that either the telephone exchange or the timber yard beyond the station could be relocated to free up land for more parking?</p> <p>It would also seem that the commercial plot at the bottom of Bowes Hill behind the garage would be a potential location for parking. It is always under-used. Also might it be possible for the Council to make a compulsory purchase of the car parks behind the Robin Hood and the Castle public houses so that they can be made available to the public as well as patrons</p>		
<p>No increase in housing should put further pressure on street parking which is already causing traffic flow issues.</p>	<p>The Neighbourhood Plan cannot address this issue. New housing needs to provide on-site parking in accordance with the EHDC and SDNPA Supplementary Planning Documents for Vehicle Parking Standards</p>	<p>None proposed</p>
<p>Where can you make additional car parking? But the Deerleap wall?</p>	<p>The land adjacent to the Deerleap wall is part of the village green which was legally registered in 1966 as a 'Village Green', and so it is subject to Acts of Parliament which greatly restrict what changes could be made to it. It is also in the Rowlands Castle Conservation area which also affords protection to trees. Policy 3 designates the entire village green as a 'Local Green Space'.</p>	<p>None proposed</p>
<p>Parking in the village can be very difficult, I rarely drive down but I have had my car damaged twice in the last year.</p>	<p>This cannot be addressed by the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>	<p>None proposed</p>
<p>Difficult to see where new parking areas near the centre can be developed without damaging other amenities. A difficult problem.</p>	<p>This is addressed by the wording in the policy 'provided it is appropriately located having regard to the character of the area.'</p>	<p>None proposed</p>
<p>Issues with people parking opposite Bowes Hill/Wellsworth Lane making exiting difficult and unsafe due to restricted view, exacerbated by people parking on pavement opposite junction at the same time.</p> <p>Clearer markings on the road needed as they have faded, maybe public notification that is an offence (rule 243 highway code).</p>	<p>The Neighbourhood Plan cannot address this issue. It is EHDC which arranges road markings.</p>	<p>None proposed</p>

There are options – we need to be bolder. Acquire/lease land (entrance to the Glendale off Woodberry Lane). Open up opposite wall and have this as the Stansted Park walker’s car park (relieve pressure on village centre and Finchdean Road).	Stansted Estate is outside the Rowlands Castle Parish and the ‘Designated area’ that be considered by the Neighbourhood Plan. The Policy would encourage the provision of additional parking to serve the village centre but the Neighbourhood Plan cannot allocate specific sites if the landowner has not offered the land.	None proposed
Increase in number of residents, more cars, consider one-way streets either side of the Green?	Hampshire County Council is responsible for arranging traffic flow directions, and so this cannot be addressed in the Neighbourhood Plan. This suggestion was considered many years ago. It will be recorded in the Community Aspirations report.	None proposed
Emphasis on banning parking with 2 wheels on the pavement.	This cannot be addressed by the Neighbourhood Plan. East Hants District Council is responsible for the enforcement of parking regulations.	None proposed
The land behind the Castle belongs to the Brewery – Perhaps as they are not prepared to sell the land they could consider loaning/renting to RCPC.	CCTV cameras have recently been installed at The Castle car park restricting the length of time that vehicles not belonging to customers can be parked there. The Neighbourhood Plan cannot refer to whether the land should be sold or rented to RCPC but this will be recorded in the Community Aspirations report	None proposed
Any suggestions as how to relieve the congestion around the village green to be welcome.	This cannot be addressed in the Neighbourhood Plan, but it will be recorded in the ‘Community Aspirations Report.	None proposed
Invest in parking.	Supportive of policy	None proposed
Increased walking and cycling provision would reduce the need for parking in the village.	Policy 11 would encourage more walking and cycling provision.	None proposed
If there were more frequent buses it would reduce the need for parking.	This cannot be addressed by the Neighbourhood Plan, but Hants County Council has undertaken a public consultation about the provision of bus services.	None proposed
Increasing parking at the Recreation Ground will have an adverse effect on the residents of the lower part of Links Lane and the Fairway.	This will be recorded in the Community Aspirations report, but it cannot be addressed directly in the Neighbourhood Plan	None proposed
With a growing demographic in the parish more parking is required.	Supportive of policy	None proposed
A difficult problem due to limited space. Cycling could be encouraged with secure bicycle storage at the station.	It is acknowledged that space is limited	None proposed
Would propose less parking alongside the Green as the village is becoming increasingly “clogged up” with traffic. Greater	It is the responsibility of EHDC to enforce parking regulations. In addition to parking for householders on The Green, some parking spaces around The Green are required by customers of	None proposed

enforcement of controls over yellow lines especially outside Londis much needed.	businesses and shops, and by visitors. On some of those spaces., and there are time limits	
Traffic congestion in the Village is made worse by selfish and inappropriate parking of vehicles. If it wasn't for the generosity of The Castle Inn and the parking facility at the rear of the Home Hardware, in permitting short term parking it would be impossible to shop in the village if you live further out of the centre. It is obvious that Parking Attendants need to be engaged to assist with this huge problem as extremely dangerous for elderly residents to negotiate crossing the road.	It is the responsibility of EHDC to enforce parking regulations. The Castle Inn has recently installed CCTV cameras to limit the length of time for which parking by other than customers can use their car park.	None proposed
Also, the number of spaces around the Green has been reduced by Disabled Spaces in front of certain residents' houses. Whilst having sympathy for the disabled this effectively makes such spaces unavailable to other residents even when the disabled person is on holiday or out for the day. The granting of such disabled spaces needs to be carefully monitored to ensure that they are only given when absolutely necessary.	It is EHDC who decide where disabled parking spaces should be. EHDC conducted a public consultation on a Traffic Regulation Order for the village in 2020, and that resulted in additional spaces for disabled parking. Those spaces have now been marked out, and there is no indication that EHDC is considering implementing any further parking restrictions around the village.	None proposed
People who walk at Stansted Park should have somewhere to park their cars.	The Policy would encourage more parking provision to serve the village centre so if any such space became available, it could possibly be used by visitors to the Stansted Estate. The Estate is outside the Rowlands Castle parish and the designated area of the Neighbourhood Plan, so it cannot refer to any use of land in the Estate.	None proposed
Improved link (Buses) (Cycles) more important.	Hampshire County Council arranges bus services and it has recently held a public consultation on this.	None proposed
New housing must be planned to allow for off road parking where at all possible. If land close to the centre and station becomes available it should be considered for purchase as a facility for parking; the car has the potential to dominate our lives, and damage the character of the village. Vigorous defence against the car's encroachment is essential now.	New housing needs to provide off-road parking in accordance with the EHDC and SDNPA Supplementary Planning Documents for Vehicle Parking Standards. The Policy encourages additional parking provision to serve the village centre and the station having regard for the character of the area.	None proposed
Provision of more parking near the centre of RC Village is fully supported as suitable sites become available.	Supportive of the policy	None proposed
Far too congested at the Railway end of the Green (shops traffic). May even be worth sacrificing the southern end of the Green to parking and forbidding parking at the Railway end.	The village green which was legally registered in 1966 as a 'Village Green', and so it is subject to Acts of Parliament which greatly restrict what changes could be made to it. It is also in the Rowlands Castle Conservation area which also affords protection to trees. Policy 3 designates the entire village green as a 'Local Green Space'.	None proposed

How can people be encouraged to walk or cycle into the village. Extra parking could work against this. Illegal parking (on yellow lines) causes problems. There should be a raised pedestrian crossing in the centre of the village, with a 20-mph speed limit throughout.	The Parish Council has recently supported the introduction of a 20mph speed limit in built-up areas which was proposed in a Hampshire County Council consultation. Enforcement of parking regulations is the responsibility of EHDC. Changes to roads (e.g. installation of a raised pedestrian crossing) is the responsibility of Hampshire County Council and, therefore, cannot be addressed by the Neighbourhood Plan.	None proposed
Something must be done. At times the part by the arches is like Piccadilly Circus.	This supports the policy.	None proposed
Parking so difficult often. Why was parking stopped the Stansted side of the Railway Bridge? 2-hour parking there would help (and deter railway users).	Parking restrictions were implemented on that part of Finchdean Road because cars had been parked close to and at the bend thereby restricting visibility by passing vehicles.	None proposed
Any additional parking areas could have solar panels (for EV charging) & or green roofs to offset the Carbon and any loss of natural landscaping with tarmac and so on.	The EHDC 'Vehicle Parking Standards' Supplementary Planning Document would expect parking areas to provide EV charging points.	None proposed
Essential to "police" double yellow lines. Parking at Londis is a joke – even around the corner up Woodberry Lane.	This cannot be addressed by the Neighbourhood Plan. East Hants District Council is responsible for the enforcement of parking regulations.	None proposed
Adequate parking offroad is vital for any new development. Most properties seem to have 4 vehicles: Husbands car/Van, Wife's car, Daughter's car, live in Boyfriend car/van. Often in 2/3 bed terraces with no driveways. Parking on pavements is a visual blight in many parts of the Village. Local Government aspirations for social engineering ("Encouraging" reduced car use/ownership) must be resisted in a rural location like Rowlands Castle.	Any new developments must provide off-road parking as specified in the EHDC and SDNPA 'Vehicle Parking Standards' Supplementary Planning Documents. It is EHDC who is responsible for enforcing parking regulations on adopted roads. The Neighbourhood Plan cannot address Local Government aspirations.	None proposed
Could the car park at the Recreation Ground be extended to provide extra spaces for cars – particularly on occasions when there is a meeting at the Parish Hall. (2)	These comments will be considered by the Parish Council as part of the community feedback.	None proposed.

Policy 9

Agree with the Policy

Disagree with the Policy

Comment	Response	Changes to the Draft Plan
There is no mention of the reservoir. This could have a massive impact on the water table and potential for flooding. (2)	This is an agreed development, referencing it in policy would have no meaningful benefit.	None proposed.
Sensitivity to protect the aquifer may become more necessary, particularly during dry seasons.	Supportive of policy.	None proposed.

<p>Woefully inadequate, as the Havant Thicket will raise the water table and appropriate steps need to be taken to protect the village.</p> <p>Why, there is a significant bed of chalk between reservoir and the sink hole (RC) and it is not clear if there will be enough measures to waterproof the reservoir.</p> <p>Flash flooding is now more prevalent as the rising rivers are rarely seen, so the ducting available to handling flooding is diminished.</p>	<p>Havant Thicket is an agreed development which has been extensively reviewed throughout the planning process. Referencing it in policy would have no meaningful benefit.</p>	<p>None proposed.</p>
<p>With the advent of climate change, flash flooding has become more frequent. We live in a property that can be at risk after exceptional rainfall because of rain coming down the Green from Links Lane, the Fairway and the new housing development opposite. We would like to see installation of more drains along The Green (where there are very few) to ensure that rain gets quickly away in a heavy storm.</p> <p>Any new housing around the village results in greater flooding pressure on the area around The Green.</p>	<p>The thrust of this comment is that more street drainage should be installed around the Green. This is outside of the scope of an NP which is limited to policy relating to land use and development.</p>	<p>None proposed.</p>
<p>Important to be on the early warning system for excesses in weather. I do not believe groundwater management really affects the villagers.</p>	<p>No action required.</p>	<p>None proposed.</p>
<p>Needs more priority and enforcement to stop developers opting out of the proposed plans.</p>	<p>Believed Supportive of policy.</p>	<p>None proposed.</p>
<p>Essential for lavant flooding potential increases with climate change.</p>	<p>Believed Supportive of policy.</p>	<p>None proposed.</p>
<p>More investment in support older homes who are a flood risk on Kings Way, Manor Lodge Road.</p>	<p>A potentially valid comment but outside of the NP scope.</p>	<p>None proposed.</p>
<p>We need more "green" front gardens and fewer concreted over gardens.</p>	<p>Outside of NP scope.</p>	<p>None proposed.</p>
<p>A lot could be done by the highways department to clear all the road drains, many of which are blocked and ensure the ditches in Finchdean Road are also clear. (5)</p>	<p>A potentially valid comment but outside of the NP scope.</p>	<p>None proposed.</p>
<p>Finchdean/Dean Land End/Rowlands Castle should be classified as a priority area.</p>	<p>Not clear as to a priority for what?</p>	<p>None proposed.</p>
<p>Drainage should be publicly provided/maintained, rather than private/developer.</p>	<p>This is a matter for the planning consent given for a specific development rather than a point of overall planning policy.</p>	<p>None proposed.</p>
<p>This is very positive and greatly improved over the last 10 years or so with measures introduced at Finchdean and Woodberry Lane. However, parts of Treadwheel Road are still prone to</p>	<p>Supportive of policy?</p>	<p>None proposed.</p>

flooding in heavy rain when enormous puddles of water especially at bends in the road are very dangerous for unsuspecting motorists.		
More gardens are being turned into parking areas – Planning should ensure pervious materials are used.	This is surely desirable but is unlikely to be enforceable under current planning guidance.	None proposed.
Plot 5b Comley Hill has significantly raised the level of the land by having hundreds of lorry loads of spoil / soil spread over the surface.	Planning Enforcement is a matter for East Hampshire District Council and cannot be addressed by the Neighbourhood Plan. Enforcement Order EC/55880/002 has been served and is currently being appealed.	None proposed.

Policy 10

119 Agree with the Policy

2 Disagree with the Policy

Comment	Response	Changes to the Draft Plan
Agree important community and sports facilities should be retained BUT to say they will be supported without qualification ignores any decisions that have previously been made by the Parish Council or any impact these might have on the residents near to those facilities. Rewording suggested of “The important community and sports facilities shown in Table 4 should be retained and any improvements would be supported with the exception of any increase in infrastructure or any improvements that would have an urbanizing appearance that would be incongruous with the prevailing rural ambiance of Rowlands Castle”. The wording being consistent with Settlement Character Assessment.	Agree with recommendations.	Policy changed by adding a reference to the Rowlands Castle Settlement Character Assessment and Rowlands Castle Village Design Statement. Policy changed to will be supported subject to amenity considerations being satisfied’.
Suggest consider if the wording for provision of further facilities is consistent with that in Policy 3 with respect to the Recreation Area.	This is believed to refer to the revised wording “if appropriate” in policy 3 and will be supported subject to amenity considerations being satisfied in policy 10. These two wordings are considered to be consistent with each other.	Amendments have been made to provide consistent wordings for policies 3 and 10.
I note the reference to “community and sports provision” in the overall vision and objectives and elsewhere. Is there a reason for this specific wording or might it be worth broadening it to “recreation” provision. For instance, some may not associate themselves with sport but instead do other forms of exercise.	We agree reference to ‘recreation’ should be added to the Policy Objective and the Policy.	Objective and Policy changed to include “recreation”.

Aim to update the children’s play area (3)	This cannot be addressed by the Neighbourhood Plan, but suggestions such as these will be passed to the ‘Recreation Ground Playpark Project’ the Terms of Reference for which were agreed at the Rowlands Castle Parish Council meeting on 7th November 2022.	None proposed.
The provision of sports and outdoors facilities has changed little for many years. The existing provision needs to be modernised. And work is required to ensure that the facilities meet the needs of all residents.	This cannot be addressed by the Neighbourhood Plan, but suggestions such as these will be passed to the ‘Recreation Ground Playpark Project’ the Terms of Reference for which were agreed at the Rowlands Castle Parish Council meeting on 7th November 2022.	None proposed.
It is a bold statement in part 1 to say that any improvements would be supported. For example, flood lighting on the children’s play area, soccer pitches or tennis courts would adversely affect neighbours and may only be a marginal benefit a few. The same is true of a number of aspirations which have the potential for a nuisance. Suggest amending to read “will be given proper consideration”.	Agree with suggestion.	Policy changed to refer to ‘will be supported subject to amenity considerations being satisfied’.
Bridleways and footpaths tend to cross roads, some of them with national speed limits. Warning signs are ignored, there should be greatly reduced speed limits where it is dangerous to drive fast.	This cannot be addressed by the Neighbourhood Plan. Speed limits are set by Hampshire County Council in accordance with national regulations. The Parish Council has contacted HCC about measures to reduce speeding on several occasions and most recently at a meeting with the HCC Highways officer for this are on 23rd August 2022.	None proposed.
More provision required for older children at the Recreation Ground.	This cannot be addressed by the Neighbourhood Plan, but suggestions such as these will be passed to the ‘Recreation Ground Playpark Project’ the Terms of Reference for which were agreed at the Rowlands Castle Parish Council meeting on 7th November 2022.	None proposed.
Please note (and Ideally “recommend”) attention is directed to include a village museum (if not heritage centre) as requested by RCHC.	A village museum (if not a heritage centre) will be recorded in the Community Aspirations Report.	None proposed.
It should be noted that Finchdean Chapel (United Reformed) has now sadly shut its doors, for as I understand, the last time.	Agreed.	Finchdean Chapel removed from the policy.
Please may the children’s play area on the main recreation ground by updated? We find ourselves driving to other towns and villages to sue their play facilities currently. The play system was installed in 2004 and has a recommended life of 20 years. The play equipment fails the annual maintenance and safety requirements checklist located on the supplier’s website. This is my only criticism on the Village, we LOVE living here and think	This cannot be addressed by the Neighbourhood Plan, but suggestions such as these will be passed to the ‘Recreation Ground Playpark Project’ the Terms of Reference for which were agreed at the Rowlands Castle Parish Council meeting on 7th November 2022.	None proposed.

you do a marvellous job maintaining not only the beautiful atheistic but also the sense of community amongst the residents. I dip my hat to you fine madams and sirs.		
Would be good to provide a tap for drinking water.	There is a tap for drinking water on the external wall of the pavilion adjacent to the children's play area	None proposed.
Consider installing an area in the Recreation Ground for Boules / Petanque. Consider an artificial Boule area on the Recreation Ground.	This cannot be addressed by the Neighbourhood Plan, but suggestions such as these will be sent to Rowlands Castle Parish Council the trustee of the Recreation Ground.	None proposed.
Greater provision is required.	No details of the greater provision required is given.	None proposed.
Due to the frequent and now regular anti-social behaviour, vandalism and arson we believe there is an urgent need for 24-hour CCTV surveillance around the recreation ground car park, the pavilion and the playground/equipment. Infrequent police visits to the Rec are clearly insufficient.	This cannot be addressed by the Neighbourhood Plan, but CCTV cameras were installed in the Recreation Ground car park and on the pavilion CCTV in October 2002. This was arranged by the Parish Council. The parish council has reported anti-social behaviour to the police via '101', and any others seeing such behaviour are encouraged to do so.	None proposed.
I agree with this in principle. However, it must be recognised that several of these facilities are only available because of the endeavours and funding of a small group of residents. For example, the Church Hall at St Johns can only be viable if it has sufficient users, and they are prepared to pay reasonable hire charges. It is significantly subsidised by members of the congregation. They may not always continue to be able to do this. Any interventions to prevent closure or change of use would have to be accompanied by appropriate financial or other help to ensure viability. I give this only as an example. The same must apply to the Church on the Green and Scouts facilities.	This concern is recognised.	Policy changed to refer to 'is no longer viable'.
Would like to see the rec ground used for more large sporting tournaments/events.	This cannot be addressed by the Neighbourhood Plan, but suggestions such as these will be passed to the 'Recreation Ground Playpark Project' the Terms of Reference for which were agreed at the Rowlands Castle Parish Council meeting on 7th November 2022.	None proposed.
No development of the Rec for Residential. Cameras for increasing security out of hours.	This policy and policy 3 (Local Green Spaces and Protected Open Spaces) would prevent residential development on the Recreation Ground. There are also covenants on Recreation ground. CCTV cameras were installed in the Recreation Ground car park and on the pavilion CCTV in October 2002. This was arranged by the Parish Council.	None proposed.

Many footpaths – but only two Bridleways – so horses/riders have to use busy roads.	Policy 11 (Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding Access) supports this for new developments. Hampshire County Council would be responsible for providing additional bridleways	None proposed.
Absolutely vital for all age groups. From the RC UC3A to sporting activities, all essential.	Supportive of policy.	None proposed.
Essential to support. (2)	Supportive of policy.	None proposed.
I am put off cycling by the HGV's and tractors which use our narrow roads.	Highways matters cannot be addressed by the Neighbourhood Plan which can consider only land use and development. Hampshire County Council is responsible for highways matters.	None proposed.
Perfectly adequate for current size of the village.	Supportive of policy.	None proposed.
I think we need to be very careful about increasing the sports facilities in the Recreation Ground which is at its maximum regarding facilities. Any facility especially if it generates noise should be situated well away from Residential Housing and the impact on the Residents around the Rec needs to be considered carefully.	This cannot be addressed by the Neighbourhood Plan, but this comment will be passed to the Parish Council who are the trustees of the Recreation ground.	None proposed.
More Leisure facilities could be provided.	No details of such facilities are suggested. The Neighbourhood Plan can only consider land use and development matters.	None proposed.
We are very fortunate to have facilities such as the Rec providing a range of sports and exercise activities as well as the wonderful Golf Club.	Supportive of policy.	None proposed.
Except for the portion of the Recreation Ground that might be used for further parking.	This policy would not necessarily preclude extending the parking area, but Rowlands Castle Parish Council would have to consider that.	None proposed.
Keep well maintained and safe. Away from dogs.	This cannot be addressed by the Neighbourhood Plan which can consider only land use and development. The Parish Council is responsible for maintenance of the Recreation Ground.	None proposed.
Table 4, Finchdean Chapel has closed and is no longer used as a Chapel. I believe it should not be listed as a community facility.	Agreed.	Finchdean Chapel removed from the policy.
Do not allow any development of Mays Coppice Farm.	This cannot be addressed by the Neighbourhood Plan. The EHDC Land Availability Assessment (2021) 'accepted' Mays Coppice Farm (as being developable), and the Neighbourhood Plan is not permitted to prevent development on land designated in this way. This does not imply that the emerging EHDC Local Plan would allocate this site for development.	None proposed.
Sports (teams etc) will only survive if there is a demand, for the village cricket team there is not. Football almost disappeared but has recovered a bit.	This cannot be addressed by the Neighbourhood Plan which can consider only land use and development.	None proposed.

If must be made clear that any changes to the green area within the Recreation Ground will not be allowed where those said changes impact detrimentally on the existing light and noise environment, also affect the rural character of the Ground; local residents must be supportive of any changes	The recreation ground is already protected by Policy 3. Any changes to the facilities would be considered by the 'Recreation Ground Playpark Project' the Terms of Reference for which were agreed at the Rowlands Castle Parish Council meeting on 7th November 2022.	None proposed.
Para 5 - The words concerning the development of facilities in the Rec are NOT supported. Para 17 – these additional aspirations have not been researched or test for general support/ and SHOULD NOT be listed; the impact on the environment of these activities is considerable, and the suggestions take no account of impact on the local residents.	These comments refer to the Community Aspirations Report that will be provided to the Parish Council. The items listed are a record of comments and suggestions made by residents during the consultations preceding this one. They will be considered by the Parish Council and there would be consultation if any of them were to be implemented.	None proposed.
We do need a croquet lawn.	This cannot be addressed by the Neighbourhood Plan, but suggestions such as these will be passed to the 'Recreation Ground Playpark Project' the Terms of Reference for which were agreed at the Rowlands Castle Parish Council meeting on 7th November 2022.	None proposed.
Clubs and facilities links with GP Surgery.	This cannot be addressed by the Neighbourhood Plan which can consider only land use and development.	None proposed.
It would be helpful if tennis court buildings were modernised and could be booked through an online system or app? A paved path around the recreation field would enable children to learn to ride their bikes/roller skate in a safe area, not currently available to families on the busy Castle Road.	This cannot be addressed by the Neighbourhood Plan, but suggestions such as these will be passed to the 'Recreation Ground Playpark Project' the Terms of Reference for which were agreed at the Rowlands Castle Parish Council meeting on 7th November 2022. The Rowlands Castle Tennis Club is responsible for maintenance of and improvements to, the tennis courts.	None proposed.

Policy 11

120

Agree with the Policy

1

Disagree with the Policy

Comment	Response	Changes to the Draft Plan
Excellent footpaths and cycling routes (3)	Policy supported.	None proposed.
Long distance walks within the village are frequently overgrown, brambles etc have to be avoided. Paths across fields are very uneven, making for uncomfortable walking especially for the elderly.	Policy supported to support improved links.	None proposed.
Must be balanced with the needs and safety of walkers. Sad to say many cyclists are ignorant of walkers, particularly when crossing roads. Large pelotons of cyclists tend to feel they ALWAYS have right of way at speed which given the age dynamic	This cannot be addressed by the Neighbourhood Plan which can consider only land use and development.	None proposed.

of Rowlands Castle residents will one day cause a serious accident. When passing through the village cyclists need to bear in mind they are not at the Tour de France!		
Need to extend the network wherever possible.	Policy supported to support improved links.	None proposed.
Typo in Map 19 – “Surrey” in key should be “Sussex”.	Noted.	Correction made to Map 19.
Unfortunately, several public rights of way will be lost due to the reservoir. This didn’t seem to be something the council was overly keen to protect when that planning application was put forward. This need to be rectified when future planning applications are put forward. (2)	Supportive of policy.	None proposed.
It would be good to have a safe cycle path along the B2149 between Rowlands Castle and Horndean, particularly as it mentions safe access to retail facilities. The current road is too narrow for two-way traffic and cyclists to use safely. (2)	Policy supported to support improved links.	None proposed.
Road condition is dangerous for cycling (potholes) which is in direct conflict of the promotion to healthy living, traffic too fast on country lanes including those limited to 40 or 30.	Highways matters cannot be addressed by the Neighbourhood Plan which can consider only land use and development. Hampshire County Council is responsible for highways matters.	None proposed.
Woefully inadequate, effective routes are required with good surfaces & direct to enable horses, riders and cyclists to travel from RC to Horndean, Havant, Emsworth without having to use the roads including access from Whichers Gate roundabout. If we want a better environment, car/SUV use must be limited and all residents as far as possible cycle, ride, walk or use public transport. There are no other options.	Policy supported to support improved links.	None proposed.
Consider all weather leaflet dispensers to be installed in the village (e.g. Bus Shelter) to promote walks, cycle routes etc.	This cannot be addressed in the Neighbourhood Plan, but the suggestions will be passed to Rowlands Castle Parish Council.	None proposed.
Link between Oaklands Avenue and Bridleway was agreed in development plans 6 years ago After complex was completed there still is no link.	Enforcement of planning decisions is not a matter for Neighbourhood Plan and should be addressed East Hampshire District Council Planning Enforcement Department.	None proposed
Stop power scooters on pavements, separate cycles from walkers.	Highways matters cannot be addressed by the Neighbourhood Plan which can consider only land use and development. Hampshire County Council is responsible for highways matters.	None proposed
The excellent walk, cycling routes and bridle paths could be and should be improved. (4)	Policy supported to support improved links.	None proposed.
Pavements can be an issue when peoples’ hedges curtail width so people have to walk single file and often move into road if you want to pass. Walking along Finchdean road to The George is ok in winter but because it is not cut back far enough, in spring and summer	This cannot be addressed in the Neighbourhood Plan, but the comment will be passed to Rowlands Castle Parish Council.	None proposed.

again you walk in single file to avoid it as the overgrown vegetation covers it, safety issues I think. The cut back when it is done must expose the true width of the pavement so people can walk side by side.		
The potholes are a disgrace and danger to cyclists. Endless patching does nothing to solve the problem.	Highways matters cannot be addressed by the Neighbourhood Plan which can consider only land use and development. Hampshire County Council is responsible for highways matters.	None proposed
To be at one with nature and not just locked in a travelling metal box is vital. Whatever RCNP Policy 11 can achieve is to be applauded.	Policy supported.	None proposed.
Cycleways please! Preferably as off-road/on pavements or trails please.	Policy supported.	None proposed.
Essential to retain for locals and visitors.	Policy supported.	None proposed.
I'm not sure if there are any footpaths at risk of falling out of use before the Government deadline of 2026 - could the plan ensure that this has been checked within the neighbourhood boundary and that local landowners are proactively encouraged to provide more permissive rights of way (e.g. the Holt where this is only one vs Stansted Forest, which offers extremely valuable access to nature for many).	Policy supported.	None proposed.
Should investigate having a cycle route from Rowlands Castle to Stanstead House area plus to Westbourne/Emsworth avoiding the busy and narrow and potholed roads.	Policy supported.	None proposed.
Equine users to pick up their horses' faeces. We expect dog owners to do it.	Highways matters cannot be addressed by the Neighbourhood Plan which can consider only land use and development.	None proposed
Motorised wheelchair access alongside the above.	Policy supported.	None proposed
It could be further emphasised that increased use of cycles will (inter alia) reduce the needs of the motor car for parking.	Policy supported.	None proposed.
I'm concerned as to how Deerleap Lane development was built with no pavement to the development. It appears to go against the Neighbourhood Plan.	The plans for the Deerleap Lane development which were approved on appeal in August 2014, required a pavement to be built from what is now the junction with Bailey Road to the development. Because this has not been built this issue could be raised with the East Hampshire District Council Enforcement Department. It cannot be addressed by the Neighbourhood Plan.	None proposed.

<p>I am a mountain biker. Improved links are vital for safety and to avoid conflict between locals and the aggressive/obstructive packs of cycling club riders who choke our narrow local lanes. East-West links are non-existent – Good to see that EHDC Policy recognises this Policy 11.3 to separate cyclists from vehicles is crucial.</p>	<p>Policy supported.</p>	<p>None proposed.</p>
<p>Reduction in speed through the village would encourage more cycling. Speeds down Castle Road deter parent from cycling with children. Pot-holes in Woodberry Lane are extremely dangerous for cyclists and need to be fixed (these seem to be at the West Sussex end though)</p>	<p>Highways matters cannot be addressed by the Neighbourhood Plan which can consider only land use and development.</p>	<p>None proposed.</p>
<p>More protected zones for cyclists and pedestrians needed. Footpaths should be of the highest quality.</p>	<p>Policy supported.</p>	<p>None proposed.</p>
<p>Pavements should be incorporated to all walking routes around the village.</p>	<p>Highways matters cannot be addressed by the Neighbourhood Plan which can consider only land use and development.</p>	<p>None proposed.</p>

Part 5 – Individuals Living outside the Parish

Policy 1

Agree with the Policy

Disagree with the Policy

Comment	Response	Changes to the Draft Plan

Policy 2

Agree with the Policy

Disagree with the Policy

Comment	Response	Changes to the Draft Plan

Policy 3

Agree with the Policy

Disagree with the Policy

Comment	Response	Changes to the Draft Plan
<p>While I support this piece in general, I am concerned regarding the definition of “Essential utility infrastructure” and consider the effective blanket banning of improvements to this area for the purposes of people walking or cycling (including both walking and cycling as a mode of transport for those with disabilities, such as wheelchairs, adapted cycles, or other personal mobility aids) as a mode of transport, rather than recreation, to be overbearing.</p> <p>This particularly applies to places such as the Rowlands Castle recreation ground, where people walking, and cycling should be able to easily and safely access the sports pavilion and football pitches in all weathers; this clause could be argued as a reason not to provide a tarmac’d path for this purpose as it’s not necessarily “recreation” in and of itself.</p> <p>Equally, this would prevent the use of some spaces, such as the Green at Finchdean from being modified to provide a tarmac’d walking or cycling route as part of a wider end to end route, which may also be blocked due to the “requirement not to lose parking” (Policy 8) because of the 5 car parking spaces there.</p> <p>I would therefore encourage this policy to be modified to “Essential utility infrastructure will be permitted if no alternative site is available but no other type of development (including infrastructure supporting motor vehicle use in anyway) will be permitted.”</p>	<p>The wording of the policy allows these areas to be enhanced for their existing biodiversity or recreational use. The use of the words “recreational” is believed to cover improvements for cycling, walking etc.</p>	<p>None proposed.</p>

Policy 4
 Agree with the Policy

 Disagree with the Policy

Comment	Response	Changes to the Draft Plan

Policy 5
 Agree with the Policy

 Disagree with the Policy

Comment	Response	Changes to the Draft Plan
<p>Designing to “maintain a strong sense of place” is quite open to interpretation, and would like to see further additional guidance on what is meant here.</p> <p>This may be through addition to the “Manual for Streets 2) or other appropriate national guidance.</p> <p>Of particular importance in this area is design for people, not the storage of motor vehicles.</p>	<p>Agree that this is open to interpretation but this also allows flexibility when making planning decisions. More specific criteria would be likely to be counterproductive.</p> <p>The policy allows for the use of any appropriate national guidance in planning decisions.</p>	None proposed.

Policy 6
 Agree with the Policy

 Disagree with the Policy

Comment	Response	Changes to the Draft Plan
<p>While I support Policy 6 in general, I am concerned that the policy is overly restrictive, as it only considers “within walking distance”.</p> <p>Walking distance is not enough of a criteria to determine this suitability – a 10m walk along a heavily traffic’d route with no footpath where most traffic exceeds 60 mph, is much less walkable than a 100m walk on a suitable, direct, well-lit traffic free route. However Walking routes to a village centre that take a 100m long diversion to avoid a 10m busy traffic’d route would not be acceptable either, and would incorrectly put the convenience of those driving (in a nice, warm, dry vehicles) over people vulnerable, potentially in the cold and wet.</p> <p>Many people can (and want to) cycle for transport further than they can walk, especially in the older age through the use of “non-standard” cycles, such as trikes, especially when electrified, however often don’t due to fears regarding safety on the roads. Therefore, such development proposals should be subject to being safe and suitable, all-weather access, cyclable routes</p>	<p>The Policy states that accommodation for the over 55’s within a reasonable walking distance to the main village facilities around the Green would be encouraged.</p> <p>The use of the phrase “within a reasonable walking distance” allows consideration of any aspect of the route that might be considered “unreasonable” and therefore inappropriate.</p> <p>The policy is encouraging the supply of over 55’s accommodation that can be accessed without any transport issues.</p>	None proposed.

<p>(including slow and slow traffic'd routes), as well as suitable, secure, accessible cycle parking for all types of cycle. e.g. https://wheelsforwellbeing.org.uk/campaigning/my-cycle-my-mobility-aid/ This applies not just to the benefit of those living in over 55 accommodations, but those that also visit for work or recreation, providing an alternative to driving to work, and therefore opening the employment opportunities to more people. My modifying this policy to “where Coherent; Safe; Comfortable and Attractive, walking and cycleable routes (e.g. in accordance with LTN 01/20) to the village centre and other local amenities are available as part of the development” would address this concern. In general please see comments on Policy 11.</p>		
--	--	--

Policy 7

2 Agree with the Policy

1 Disagree with the Policy

Comment	Response	Changes to the Draft Plan
<p>Car parking in the centre is increasingly difficult and often at capacity; more off-road (vehicular) parking would be helpful” Disagree with the last statement; see comments on Policy 8. Also disagree: Development that will lead to the loss of existing business premises will not be supported, unless it can be shown to be no longer suitable for that purpose or that there is no alternative occupier. The above statement enables a specifically tailored business for which there is no demand, to be lost, because an alternative business occupier is not met, i.e. put accommodation over the business. This should be re-prioritised as follows: <i>Development that will lead to the loss of existing business premises will not be supported, unless it can be shown that there is no alternative occupier, and only then deemed no longer suitable for that purpose.</i></p>	<p>Comments on parking are dealt with below under Policy 8. Loss of existing business premises is not supported unless it can be shown to be no longer suitable for that purpose or that there is no alternative occupier.</p>	<p>None proposed.</p>

Policy 8

2 Agree with the Policy

1 Disagree with the Policy

Comment	Response	Changes to the Draft Plan
<p>I fundamentally disagree with this proposed policy as it fails to consider the wider impact of the decision to not only maintain existing, but expand on the current vehicle parking spaces (also known as vehicular storage) within the parish.</p> <p>I also note that “parking policy” in this section only covers vehicular parking and has zero reference to cycle parking; “parking” covers the storage of both forms of carriage.</p> <p>Designing and building for Vehicular Parking will result in induced Demand for Vehicular Parking, a well-recognised and scientifically proven process where, in essence, “providing for something will result in people expecting it to be there until too many people use it and its full”; which will then result in the demand for more vehicular parking; a vicious cycle that for years has been seen to take hold and ruin the once pleasant nature of the Rowlands Castle Village.</p> <p>The policy also puts ahead (alongside the abysmally weak policy 11) the storage of private motor vehicles, where they sit unused for 95% of their time, over the safety and independence of residents in the area (who may not be able to drive, e.g., for age (i.e. under 17) , medical reasons (operation or medication forcing withdrawal of a driving license, re Policy 6), or cost reasons) to travel independently by alternative means, and in doing so further isolate those within these typically car-dependent communities.</p> <p>The on-street storage of these private motor vehicles significantly impacts the ability for people to move around the area in (or with the perception of) safety; only a look around the space taken up by stored vehicles near the Rowlands Castle Green and the atrocious, aggressive nature of some of the drivers towards other in this area when trying to bully (even against children cycling to school or the shops) should be an indicator that this is not a sustainable approach that should be retained, let alone encouraged.</p> <p>Rowlands Castle needs to have a process whereby it actively looks to reduce the car parking spaces available in the area, and convert them to using the space for moving people and goods; be this by public transport, cycling or walking. These processes</p>	<p>The Consultations produced a very strong response on the need for more parking in the centre of Rowlands Castle Village. The policy however is mainly drafted to protect existing provision rather than allocate new sites for parking.</p> <p>Lack of cycle parking was not raised as an issue by the residents of Rowlands Castle Parish but any requirements for cycle parking would need to be accommodated in the same way as new car parking.</p>	<p>None proposed.</p>

<p>may also include the transition of car parking spaces into Cycle storage spaces, including the installation and provision of Cycle Hangers; 1 car space – 8 cycle spaces, therefore up to 5 visitors/customers replaced with 8 visitor/customers), where appropriate.</p> <p>The requirement under this policy for new developments to provide vehicular storage (but nothing for cycle parking), is one that will cause significant issues in keeping affordable housing in the village, (especially for those who have grown up in the village), as it will drive additional costs into buying a house (through the required purchase of land upon which to store a car for 95% of that time). The policy MUST have guidance on the provision of suitable Long Term and Short-Term Cycle Parking supporting the need of residents and their children, employees, and visitors to the area.</p> <p>There has been shown a marked movement away in the younger parts of society (18 through 25) from obtaining driving licences due to numerous factors, including the escalating costs of owning and operating a vehicle; requiring people to buy (or rent) a plot of land for a car that they don't own when what they need is affordable housing with good quality cycling and walking routes to the local public transport hubs (such as Rowlands Castle Train Station) is key. Equally, the migration for Electric Vehicles will actually make this worse, as people will consider that a trip from electric vehicles will be "better for the environment" than an internal combustion engine vehicle; and have been shown to drive, including shorter distances, more. The move to electric vehicles will further negatively impact the street space as charging points may further impact (This applies to both storage of, and transport)</p>		
--	--	--

Policy 9 Agree with the Policy Disagree with the Policy

Comment	Response	Changes to the Draft Plan

Policy 10 Agree with the Policy Disagree with the Policy

Comment	Response	Changes to the Draft Plan
Disagree with the last sentence: "and accessible to the users of the existing facility" Replace with	The current wording is believed to be sufficient for the purpose of the policy.	None proposed.

“and at least as accessible (Policy 11) to the current and expected future users of the existing facility”		
--	--	--

Policy 11

Agree with the Policy

Disagree with the Policy

Comment	Response	Changes to the Draft Plan
<p>This Policy is, frankly, awful. Policy 8 states that “car parking is mandated” but this policy in effect states that “walking and cycling provision is optional”. It is policies such as these that have resulted in car centric design across the area for far too long, to the detriment of everyone, but especially to those too young, or medically unable to drive. As such, it is counter to Hampshire County Council Local Transport Plan 4: Moving forward with this policy, as currently written, will result in excluding a significant number of people who cannot drive from being part of this community, as they will be forced to live elsewhere, or to buy and maintain a car, just to grow up in a village where the rest of the family live. It has also been shown that women are often more impacted by the lack of provision of cycling and walking infrastructure than men due to the roles and types of journeys undertaken. https://wheelsforwellbeing.org.uk/campaigning/infrastructure-for-all The lead in for this policy, potentially unconsciously, prioritises Cycling and Walking for recreation (by mentioning it first) over Cycling and Walking Transport; and as such de-prioritises the significantly more important component of enabling people to walk or cycle as part of their daily routine. The policy should be re-written as follows: “All development proposals shall be considered for their potential to deliver key walking and cycling routes both internally and as part of the wider network as per Government Guidance and draft or approved applicable Local Cycling and Walking Plans. Development Proposals that do not meet this guidance will not be approved.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> All development proposals of more than 10 houses will, in accordance with the latest (at the time of planning application submission) government guidance on 	<p>The policy encourages footpath and cycle routes, separated from roads where possible, for development proposals of 10 or more dwellings. It also encourages new and improved links to existing rights of way and for protection and, where possible, enhancement of those rights of way.</p>	<p>None proposed.</p>

<p>Walking and Cycling Provision, incorporate and deliver, and improve where necessary the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Coherent; Direct; Safe: Comfortable and Attractive footpath links to public right of way network or local footpath networks, including through development routes. b. New and improved links to promote and enable routes such as the Shipwrights Way, Monarchs Way, Staunton Way, Sussex Border Path and E9 (European Long-Distance Path) will be encouraged. <p>2 New and improved links to promote and enable routes such as the Shipwrights Way, Monarchs Way, Staunton Way, Sussex Border Path and E9 (European Long-Distance Path) will be encouraged.</p> <p>3 All developments will be expected to protect and if required to meet the latest government guidance, enhance the existing network of rights of way across the plan area, including footpaths, cycle paths, and bridleways".</p> <p>The section should also refer to: At the time of publication, Local Transport Note 01/20 (LTN 01/20), applies as the latest Cycling Infrastructure Guidance https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/cycle-infrastructure-design-ltn-120</p> <p>There Government, through Active Travel England, are currently developing a Walking equivalent to LTN01/20.</p> <p>The East Hampshire (and draft SDNP) Local Cycling and Walking Plans, should also be referenced: https://www.easthants.gov.uk/cycling-walking-strategy</p> <p>The Hampshire County Council LTP4 should also be referenced: https://www.hants.gov.uk/transport/localtransportplan</p>		
<p>We would like to see additional public transport services explicitly mentioned in this policy. "to encourage, and support the delivery of public transport schemes, such as buses, to the local schools, shops, and areas of employment.</p>	<p>These are not matters that can be covered in a Neighbourhood Plan but are included in the Community Aspirations Report which will be considered by the Parish Council.</p>	<p>None proposed.</p>
<p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Draft Plan.</p>	<p>Thank you.</p>	<p>None proposed.</p>

Part 6 – Organisations

BJC Planning

Comment	Response	Changes to the Draft Plan
<p>Policy 2: Map 3 shows 2 shades of green on the plan of Rowlands Castle but only one shade of green on the legend. It is difficult to reconcile View B2 with the position shown on Map 5. It appears that the view may be further to the north.</p>	<p>Appears to be an artefact of the blue overshading showing areas with SDNP. Map location correct but description in Table 1 may be confusing.</p>	<p>None proposed. Table 1 description amended to be more specific as to location.</p>
<p>Policy 3: The protection of Local Green Space shown at Rowlands Copse on Map 10. Green infrastructure and ecology corridors are strongly supported to facilitate biodiversity and wildlife.</p>	<p>Supportive of policy.</p>	<p>None proposed.</p>
<p>Policy 5: Agree policy 5. However, the policy offers little guidance on housing design and character. It should address different forms of housing including the option of self-build/custom housing which offers the opportunity for good control over design. This includes the overall design of the development and the individual buildings. It can facilitate a quality housing development. It is noted that there are 25 people on the Register of Self Build and Custom build seeking plots in Rowlands Castle. The Government requires that self-build or custom build plots are provided within 3 years of registration.</p>	<p>It was not the intent of the policy to develop detailed design guidance, rather to establish general principles. This is a matter for housing allocation which is not included within the scope of the RC Neighbourhood Plan.</p>	<p>None proposed. None proposed.</p>
<p>Policy 6: Housing provision for the over 55s is supported as the ageing population has specific needs. Housing which is capable of adaption for people's needs as they age is required and will be a valuable contribution.</p>	<p>Your support is noted.</p>	<p>None proposed.</p>
<p>Policy 7: The vitality and viability of the Rowlands Castle Village Centre is strongly supported. Additional housing in the village will help to support the retail and service providers based in the village.</p>	<p>Your support is noted.</p>	<p>None required.</p>
<p>Policy 8: The provision of adequate parking will help to support the village centre and avoid the conflicts arising around parking on occasions.</p>	<p>Supportive of policy.</p>	<p>None required.</p>
<p>Policy 11: The provision of enhanced facilities for walking, cycling and horse riding is strongly supported. Good signage and quality surfacing for footpaths is very important.</p>	<p>Supportive of policy.</p>	<p>None required.</p>

Other Policies: The Neighbourhood Plan should address “the acute shortage of properties for rent in the village”.	No land is being allocated for housing in the plan so it is not possible to address this. Strategic Land Assessment is being done by EHDC as part of their new Local Plan where the issue can be addressed.	None required.
Further Comments: Strong support is given to the “aspiration” that requires new development to provide a mix of affordable, small family houses, retirement housing and flats.	Noted.	None required.

Fowler Architecture & Planning Ltd on behalf of Shorewood Homes Ltd

Comment	Response	Changes to the Draft Plan
Policy 5: Shorewood Homes Ltd support the inclusion of this policy within the Neighbourhood Plan.	Supportive of policy.	None proposed.
<p>Policy 6</p> <p>Shorewood Homes Ltd have no objection to the principle of including a policy of this nature. However, the current wording is ambiguous.</p> <p>In particular, the term “reasonable walking distance”, which is open to interpretation.</p> <p>We would suggest that the policy is reworded to include a maximum walking distance to the main village facilities in the Green.</p>	<p>There is flexibility in the phrase (reasonable walking distance) so we agree, it is open to interpretation and also means it is not overly restrictive.</p> <p>The Policy is designed to encourage the provision of over 55’s accommodation and the open interpretation has been adopted to ensure there are as few barriers as possible to the provision of this accommodation which is much needed in the village.</p>	None proposed.
Other Policies: Shorewood Homes support the proposed Settlement Policy Boundary for Rowlands Castle. However, they feel that there should be policy that sits along Map 19 within the Neighbourhood Plan, which outlines support for the principle of development on sites within the Settlement Policy Boundary of Rowlands Castle.	Given the result of the Rowlands Castle Housing Needs Survey and the overwhelming requirement of over 55’s Housing it is this type of development that is being encouraged within the Settlement Policy Boundary.	None proposed.

Church on the Green

Comment	Response	Changes to the Draft Plan
<p>Policy 3: We agree the Policy.</p> <p>The land between the Church on the Green and Redhill Road is used by the Church during community events, but is not currently used by other organizations. As there are now double yellow lines on the road on all sides of the church this area is also essential for occasional parking for deliveries etc. Traffic calming would greatly benefit from the narrowing of the road entrance at</p>	Thank you for your support. Traffic calming and double yellow lines are a matter for the Highways Authority and cannot be dealt with in the Neighbourhood Plan.	None proposed.

the junction, so slowing traffic turning left from Redhill Road to go around the Green towards Links Lane.		
Policy 8: Parking availability within the area is currently inadequate and all new development will make it worse, especially around the Green in the commercial areas. All new developments should include off road parking space for the community as well as for residents/users. Commuters using the station occupy parking spaces that would otherwise be available for residents and visitors and additional parking at/for the station should be developed. Perhaps with a charge to discourage people using RC station to save money on parking a Havant or Petersfield.	Supportive of policy.	None proposed.
Policy 10: In Table 10 please delete Finchdean Chapel from the list of Churches. It is now closed permanently and has probably already been sold by URC Wessex Trust. Further info about the building's status may be obtainable from Gloria Carpenter.	We agree with these comments.	Finchdean Chapel removed from the list of churches.

No Responses from the Following Consultees on any Policies

Rowlands Castle Association	Rowlands Castle Heritage Centre	Rowlands Castle U3A
Castle United Youth Football Team	St Johns Primary School	Rowlands Castle Women's Institute
Department of Architects and Civic Design Cricket Club	Jigsaw Nursery	Rowlands Castle Tennis Club
Rowlands Castle Guides & Scout Group	Rowlands Castle History Society	Rowlands Castle Golf Club
Montessori Nursery		

Part 7 – Local or other Businesses

No Responses from the Following Consultees on any Policies		
Halls Garage	Bumblebee Café	Travel Lodge
HPD Estate Agency	Rowlands Castle Golf Club	The George PH, Finchdean
Rowlands Castle Pharmacy	Rowlands Castle Doctor's Surgery	The Workshop, Finchdean
Rowlands Castle Veterinary Practice	Londis Stores	The Fountain Inn, Rowlands Castle
RJ Winnicott Builders/Home Hardware Stores	The Castle Inn	Wessex Food Brokers

Part 8 – General Comments

Comment	Response	Changes to the Draft Plan
The village is looking increasingly untidy. More volunteers are needed for litter picking and clearing weeds and grasses out of gutters.	This is not within the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan. Details of these responses will be available for the Parish Council to consider what further action may be taken in this respect.	None Proposed
Action is needed to reduce the number of drivers who exceed the 30-mph speed limit by 20 to 40 mph, especially main roads, such as Woodberry Lane, Finchdean Road, Bowes Hill and Links Lane.	This is not within the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan and is a matter for the County Council who are the Authority responsible for Highways. It is clear from the consultations that traffic issues are a major concern for residents and the Parish Council are very much in the forefront of applying what pressure they can to improve matters. These responses will be available for the Parish Council as further evidence of these concerns.	None Proposed.
There has been considerable work and community engagement pulling together the Rowlands Castle Neighbourhood Plan 2022-2033. I feel the proposal is of significant benefit to the village and surrounding area and support its proposals in full. (4)	Supportive of Policy	None Proposed.
Page 46 – spelling of “levants” incorrect.	Agreed.	Second line, 1st para. To be corrected.
There has been much new housing development in RC Village in very recent years, adding to local traffic and pressure on local infrastructure. Fully support use of this plan to inform and guide any further future housing development proposals.	Supportive of Policy	None Proposed.
In terms of land use and development “control” this is an excellent set of policies. However, one issue that keeps recurring in all public consultations, is the lack of policing in the village (e.g. parking abuse, speeding, and occasional public nuisance by loud/speeding (2 wheeled) vehicles. Whilst the police/Las spend resources on e.g. speed traps on relatively safe roads such as A3 and roads through Leigh Park into Havant, public nuisance and severe danger – particularly elderly people and animals – is caused by these various acts of antisocial behaviour. If this document is not the vehicle to put forward such policies, is it that the Parish Council (through the Police Commissioner’s Office, the EHDC and the HCC) could support in some other (more aggressive) way. Particularly relating to the “rat-run” routes, these factors contribute most to reducing the general environment within the village.	Highways and Policing is not within the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan and is a matter for the County Council and the Police Authorities who are responsible for these matters. It is clear from the consultations that traffic issues are a major concern for residents and the Parish Council are very much in the forefront of applying what pressure they can to improve matters. These responses will be available for the Parish Council as further evidence of local concerns.	None Proposed.

<p>Overall, the neighbourhood plan provides a basis for positive planning applications. I will be very interested to see how future planning applications adhere to the plan and believe it is essential to review and consider changes to the neighbourhood plan on a regular basis to ensure there are no loopholes with the plan moving forward.</p>	<p>Supportive of Policies. Neighbourhood Plans are subject to review when further changes to improve their effectiveness can be made.</p>	<p>None Proposed.</p>
<p>The Neighbourhood Plan now appears as very orderly and thoughtful. I recommend that important next steps to formalize the Plan are clearly described with a view to ensuring that all/most residents participate in the eventual vote in favour, and that they know which and where this will take place. It will also be helpful if residents appreciate the intermediate approvals via – the Parish Council. -the planning inspector -residents vote (by a simple majority) -subsequent EHDC and SDNP approvals. (It may also be helpful to cite the Legislation which introduces statutory Neighbourhood Plans. It may also be helpful to mention that three previous (non-statutory) plans may remain as “supplemental planning guidance. This should be linked to a wider traffic management issue.</p>	<p>There is a formal process for approving the Neighbourhood Plan which will be run by EHDC and will ensure that all residents are made aware and have the ability to vote. Traffic management issues are a matter for the Highways Authorities but all comments are being passed to the Parish Council to apply what pressure they can to resolve local concerns.</p>	<p>None Proposed.</p>
<p>No one way traffic system anywhere. No zebra crossing. No limit on deliveries to the village shops.</p>	<p>This is not within the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan, but details of these responses will be available for the Parish Council to consider what further action may be taken in this respect.</p>	<p>None Proposed.</p>
<p>Congratulations for the clear information and the way the plan is set out. It should be understandable to all residents. It is clear the Parish Council have worked hard to present this for residents to join in this democratic process. Congratulations on also making it available at the Village Fair and on one weekend at the Parish Hall.</p>	<p>Thank you, supportive of policies.</p>	<p>None Proposed.</p>
<p>I would like to commend and congratulate everyone who has helped put the draft plan together. It’s an amazing piece of work. Skilfully pulled together and well written throughout.</p>	<p>Thank you, supportive of policies.</p>	<p>None Proposed.</p>
<p>There is no greater threat to the quality of life in Rowlands Castle than the impact of traffic on the village (density, HGV, speed, noise, pollution, parking, rat-runs, etc). Parking has some policy behind it but as these issues cut across the broad intent of the</p>	<p>This is not within the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan and is a matter for the County Council who are the Authority responsible for Highways. It is clear from the consultations that traffic issues are a major concern for residents and the</p>	<p>None Proposed.</p>

document, they are fundamental and must be addressed as policy because they undermine many of the worthy areas.	Parish Council are very much in the forefront of applying what pressure they can to improve matters. These responses will be available for the Parish Council as further evidence of these concerns.	
The "reduce the impact of traffic" statement and some aspirational comments at App1 do not focus the document on the huge import of the traffic issues.	This is not within the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan and is a matter for the County Council who are the Authority responsible for Highways. It is clear from the consultations that traffic issues are a major concern for residents and the Parish Council are very much in the forefront of applying what pressure they can to improve matters. These responses will be available for the Parish Council as further evidence of these concerns.	None Proposed.
The village needs a detailed traffic survey and a ruthless signage audit and enforcement as the first step in reducing creeping urbanisation.	This is not within the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan and is a matter for the County Council who are the Authority responsible for Highways. It is clear from the consultations that traffic issues are a major concern for residents and the Parish Council are very much in the forefront of applying what pressure they can to improve matters. These responses will be available for the Parish Council as further evidence of these concerns.	None Proposed.
It is vital to protect our heritage.	Assume response is supportive of Policy 4.	None proposed.
Traffic is a huge problem in the village and whilst the present situation in Redhill Road/Castle Road and around the village green does cause bottlenecks, it does also slow the traffic down. Any plans to develop one way system will paradoxically increase the amount of traffic and more importantly the speed of the traffic.	This is not within the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan and is a matter for the County Council who are the Authority responsible for Highways. It is clear from the consultations that traffic issues are a major concern for residents and the Parish Council are very much in the forefront of applying what pressure they can to improve matters. These responses will be available for the Parish Council as further evidence of these concerns.	None proposed.
Woodlands Avenue is a private unadopted road owned by the residents of the estate. Access from it for any development will be denied by the residents.	This is not believed to have any impact on the draft plan.	None proposed.
More and more housing being required, buyers see the village as is, also present occupiers do not want it spoilt, so planning carefully, as thoughtfully as possible is vital to the area.	Supportive of Policies.	None proposed.
I think the plan considers all relevant aspects. The Appendices raises other points, which are of concern.	Supportive of Policies.	None proposed.
I would please ask not only to protect the village and parish; but also the nature and ecosystems on where the village and parish has developed in equal measure too.	These comments cover topics that would typically be covered in a Biodiversity policy. This was not identified as a policy need during the early development of the Neighbourhood	None proposed.

<p>As human developments are ever more – and yet as the climate emergency and the related biodiversity emergencies intensifies, protecting rare, beautiful habitats, like the parish, where we are lucky to live, and where nature also calls home-and after all they have just as much right to call it home as we do – should be at the forefront of hearts and minds too, and thus protected. Doing our part (as all parishes should too) preserving it for wildlife, planet and future generations alike. Once it and the wildlife and its habitats are gone, it’s gone...</p>	<p>Plan. The SDNP Local Plan contains a strategic Biodiversity and Geodiversity Policy (SD9) which will provide the protection mentioned in this residents’ comments. Policy CP21 of the EHDC Joint Core Strategy Local Plan covers Biodiversity provides similar protection to SD9. Together these policies offer protection for the biodiversity of the parish and, together with the landscape protections include in RCNP Policy 2 should meet all points raised by this comment.</p>	
<p>We need serious parking enforcement and speeding needs to be addressed down Bowes Hill and Finchdean Road.</p>	<p>This is not within the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan and is a matter for the County Council who are the Authority responsible for Highways. It is clear from the consultations that traffic issues are a major concern for residents and the Parish Council are very much in the forefront of applying what pressure they can to improve matters. These responses will be available for the Parish Council as further evidence of these concerns.</p>	<p>None proposed.</p>
<p>Pg 5 The red outline here on Map 1 is the Parish boundary as it was (maybe 1950’s). Pg 6-7-8 1-2 I think a hairdressers should be mentioned. They have been here a lot longer than the vets. 1-11 Developers WILL build on flood plains won’t they? 1-12 Will the SDNPA policy ever be made public. 1-14 The Oil Field is in the SDNP, what is the opinion of this? Pg 23-27 The map of Finchdean Green (Map 8) Pg 26 Bridleway 24 has a historic significance in that it is of Saxon origin. Pg 30 RCHS paper March 2019 to have passed me by. Pg 31 The list amazes me. Pg 49 Finchdean Chapel ?? (Discuss) Pg 57 Also means more traffic.</p>	<p>The Policies support all the existing businesses in the village without exception. There are no proposals in the plan to build on flood plains and there are policies which are designed to specifically discourage building. This however is a matter for Local Planning Authorities, EHDC and SDNP. The SDNP Local Plan has been published and is currently subject to further review and change. The existing Oil Field in the SDNP is permitted development and given there are no proposals for further development a policy on this was not considered necessary. Noted on Bridleway 24. As Finchdean Chapel has been deconsecrated it has been removed from the list.</p>	<p>None proposed.</p>
<p>Re Waste Services - I am not convinced that recycled waste is being managed well. Sometimes both my bins are emptied into the general waste lorry.</p>	<p>This is not within the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan and is a matter for the Local Authorities.</p>	<p>None proposed.</p>
<p>Risk of coalescence from the Horndean direction remains a concern. Traffic volumes/speeds through the village (on all roads) will only worsen: more effective speed reduction measures are needed. Perhaps that’s outside the scope of this, but it is a key issue.</p>	<p>Any risk of coalescence from Horndean is believed to be very low and insufficient, at this stage, to be included in the policy. Traffic issues are a matter for the Highway Authorities, but the Parish Council will be provided with all the comments on these matters for further consideration.</p>	<p>None proposed.</p>

Re the “Aspirations” – I agree traffic calming measures and lorry weight and width restrictions need to be put in place ASAP.	Noted, this is part of the Community Aspirations Report.	None proposed.
The policies in the Plan are generally supported BUT need strengthening to prevent excessive flexibility in their interpretation, -flexibility which will undoubtable be exploited by some planners who may not understand or care how their ideas can destroy the character of this village of Rowlands Castle. At this stage, experience would indicate, it is advisable to be the most cautious and restrictive concerning future developments.	Believed supportive of policy.	None proposed.
There is a lot of fly tipping in Finchdean Road. The amount of rubbish thrown from the cars as they race through Idsworth is unbelievable. Is there some way solar panelled CCTV or signs can be put up to try and deter fly tipping. It’s unbelievable what people with do in what is a National Park.	Thank you for your response to the Public Consultation on the draft Rowlands Castle Neighbourhood Plan which is much appreciated. Unfortunately, the important speeding traffic and possible solutions are outside the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan, but your comments will be provided to the Parish Council who will consider your comments separately.	No changes required to the draft plan.
From my point of view knowing that the bridleway /rough path leading through to the green eventually. Due to me increased arthritis I am unable to walk far, but have a mobility scooter which manages a certain amount of uneven ground. If this pathway was sorted, agreed by the builders before, many people would make use of this.	We agree that bridleways and their maintenance in good order is important for the residents. Supportive of policy.	None proposed.
Congratulations on the outstanding report and the efforts of all concerned. You all should be proud of an excellent document, posters, and leaflet. (3)	Thank you for your support.	Supportive of Policies.

Part 9 – Further Policies

Proposed Policy	Response	Changes to the Draft Plan
Need to remove dwellings around the bridleway from Woodberry Lane to Whichers Gate Road which do not have planning permission.	This is not within the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan and is a matter for the EHDC which is the relevant planning authority that is charged with enforcing planning policy.	None Required.
<p>Give increasing focus to strategic policy to address “Climate Change”. I suggest there are paragraphs which describe a strategic village initiative, building on the current efforts for “greening”.</p> <p>It might include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. “Greening with tree preservation and new planting (including drought resistant species). 2. Retention of green corridors for animals and insects to migrate 3. Including garden management to allow movement under walls and fences, to allow movement of hedgehogs, mice, amphibians etc. 4. Discontinuance of herbicides and pesticides (toxic materials generally) to protect insects in particular. 	These matters, whilst clearly very pertinent cannot be covered in the Neighbourhood Plan, which can only cover Land Use and Development.	None Required.
Tackle speeding, give users more space or protection and maintain all recreation routes in better condition.	These matters, whilst clearly very pertinent cannot be covered in the Neighbourhood Plan, which can only cover Land Use and Development.	None Required.
<p>Policing: Hampshire Constabulary fails to respond effectively even to serious incidents.</p> <p>Doctors Surgery: Fails the community and needs new management.</p> <p>Pharmacist: Fails the community and needs new management.</p> <p>Air quality: Whichers Gate exceeds safe levels for PM 2.5 and Nox.</p>	These matters, whilst clearly very pertinent cannot be covered in the Neighbourhood Plan, which can only cover Land Use and Development.	None Required.
<p>Too long, needs to be more precise, it is a plan not a discussion document, better still it should be an implemental strategy for consultation and agreement.</p> <p>Feedback via this form, very old-fashioned way to do this. There are much better ways to do this. Monkey Surveys, Menti. As to get the plan to the point it can be executed, you need the proof of what needs to be done i.e. a vote on specific points. As this type of response, you get no sense of the weight/depth of</p>	The Policies as set out in the draft Plan are those to be followed by the Planning Authorities in considering planning applications and believed to be sufficiently clear to allow proper implementation. The Regulation 14 Consultation is only part of the considerable amount of consultation that has been done over a period of many years. This has included questionnaires sent to all residents, direct consultations with businesses and community organisations in the Parish and	None Required.

<p>feeling/views, and it is particularly hard to cross reference points made.</p>	<p>Survey Monkey Questionnaires to capture the views of all parties that have an interest in the Parish.</p>	
<p>We would be in favour of the installation of more flashing speed warnings on roads entering the village and specifically along The Green. We regularly observe vehicles speeding in, around and through the village.</p>	<p>This is not within the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan, but it is clear from the consultations that this is a major concern for residents. Details of these responses will be available for the Parish Council to consider what further action may be taken in this respect.</p>	<p>None Required.</p>
<p>There is no mention of traffic management. I appreciate that the Council have made changes in relation to parking and yellow lining in certain sites in the village to try and improve traffic flow and safety. However, this has tended to focus on the village centre. As a resident on Whichers Gate Road, I am increasingly concerned about the volume and, more importantly speed of traffic. Essentially Whichers Gate Road and Prospect Lane is a residential road. Residents need to be able to pull in and out of driveways, to get children out of cars, to unload shopping etc. Yet traffic treats it as a major road with great impatience for those of us trying to carry out everyday activities. I recently travelled through a village call Sherbourne St John on the A340. Despite being on a main A road the village had “chicanes” at each entry point to the village causing traffic to slow down. I would strongly propose a similar approach in Rowlands Castle. Traffic volumes are only likely to increase, and speed with it. If we had a Chicane at the Village Entry Notices on Whichers Gate Road and Durrants Road to the South and Manor Lodge Road to the North it would significantly slow down traffic. This would have the consequence of many less incidents and near misses at the Harvester double mini roundabout. Car then turning into Redhill Road would already have appreciated they were in a Residential area and hopefully drive more thoughtfully. Given the other entry points of the village Bowes Hill, Finchdean Road and Woodberry Lane all tend to come from other villages I think they may not need similar, although others may have a different opinion. If this approach can be adopted on a busy A-road I can’t see why it cannot be applied to two B roads. Along with this I would also urge the introduction of a 20-mile hour speed limit throughout the village. If this can be achieved across massive swaths of Greater London, again I can’t see why we can’t do it here.</p>	<p>This is not within the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan and is a matter for the County Council who are the Authority responsible for Highways. It is clear from the consultations that traffic issues are a major concern for residents and the Parish Council are very much in the forefront of applying what pressure they can to improve matters. These responses will be available for the Parish Council as further evidence of these concerns.</p>	<p>None Required.</p>

<p>Traffic has a significant impact upon the amenity of the village and so I think should be an additional priority within the plan.</p>		
<p>I would like to see a policy or a requirement for all new developments to contribute to addressing climate change. Maybe this could be through achieving CO2 energy savings of 20% above building regs and reducing water usage of no more than 110 litres per day for each occupier for example? And key principles of energy reduction through passive design, layout, orientation, landscaping and materials, and by utilizing technologies that help achieve Zero Carbon Developments such as:</p> <p>Site layout and building design to maximise solar efficiency through shading, reducing solar reflectance, fenestration, insulation and green roofs and walls.</p> <p>Development should include recycled construction material as part of the development, by incorporating recycled or reclaimed materials and renewable and low carbon technologies.</p>	<p>This is not within the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan, it is a matter for the EHDC which is the relevant planning authority and deals with any planning applications for new development.</p>	<p>None Required.</p>
<p>Either a Policy devoted to Climate Change or addition into the existing Policies of aspects of Global warming. It is such an important issue that I am surprised there is no mention of it. Properties newly built should not have gas. Prohibit the use of Solar Panels on aspects which spoil the historic vista of the Village. Only to be used on rear aspects.</p>	<p>This is not within the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan, it is a matter for the EHDC which is the relevant planning authority, and deals with any planning applications for new development.</p>	<p>None Required.</p>
<p>The RCNP statement that “development should be in response to local needs” requires a policy that describes the criteria required to meet the intent. Otherwise, is hollow and unachievable. If such a policy could not be permitted (likely), then aspirational criteria could be added as an appendix.</p>	<p>The draft Plan sets out the policies that aim to control development within the Settlement Policy Boundary to meet the needs of the local community. Where this is outside the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan and there is sufficient local support, it is included in the Community Aspirations Report that will be provided to the Parish Council.</p>	<p>None Required.</p>
<p>Urbanisation – Rowlands Castle is becoming rapidly urban (defined: relating to town or city) and in addition to many traffic issues, visitors, especially from the south, get no feeling for a quiet, pleasant semi-rural village. Far from it. For example, there are 40+ signs on the busy and dangerous double roundabout at the top of Redhill. What should be seen is the War Memorial with the church as a backdrop but both are behind a forest of mostly superfluous signage, garish livery of the Shell garage and untidy advertising and façade of the Harvester. This was highlighted in the VDS 2000 but the situation has deteriorated unchecked.</p>	<p>The Neighbourhood Plan is a land use plan and is not able to deal with Highway matters. These concerns however, where there is sufficient local support, are included in the Community Aspirations Report that will be provided to the Parish Council.</p>	<p>None Required.</p>

<p>A greater control of planning permissions. The policy of granting permission through there isn't access to the land from a public highway is ludicrous.</p>	<p>The Neighbourhood Plan is not allocating new sites for development, any sites coming forward will be considered by EHDC and SDNP Planning Authorities. We would, however, expect that a lack of suitable access would be a major bar to any permission being granted.</p>	<p>None Required.</p>
<p>Maintenance of hedges and kerbs from weeds etc.</p>	<p>The Neighbourhood Plan is a land use plan and is not able to deal with these matters. These concerns however, where there is sufficient local support, are included in the Community Aspirations Report that will be provided to the Parish Council.</p>	<p>None required.</p>
<p>Policy 6 correctly identifies a serious problem in the village in that there are relatively few properties into which older residents can move to downsize if/when family circumstances make a move to a smaller home desirable/preferable. (As chairman of the village Good Neighbours organisation for the last 10 year I am very aware of many older people living in houses far too big from them and who would dearly love to downsize but have found nothing suitable in the village. We know of some who have had to move out of the village to find smaller homes in recent years.) However I would recommend a further policy is considered for the younger generation of homeowners. The majority of development in the village over the last few years seems to have been for 3, 4 or 5 bedroom family houses-possible because that is where builders can optimise their profits on development. Due to all the good things mentioned in the draft plan, property prices in and around the village are higher than others locally and young people and first-time buyers are finding it increasing difficult to buy in the village. If this trend were to continue, then as we all grow older before passing on, we are less likely to get new, younger residents in the village. I would therefore strongly recommend a new policy along the lines of 12 Housing for Younger People. Whenever a new development is considered, a significant number* of "low cost/affordable/shared ownership houses MUST be included, so that new, younger families and individuals can buy into the village and continue to maintain a balanced age range within the community.</p>	<p>Policy 6 encourages the redevelopment of larger 4/5 Bedroom properties to smaller 1- and 2-Bedroom properties designed for over 55's living but equally suitable for young families so the policy is designed to accommodate the need for smaller properties.</p> <p>Strong demand for these types of properties was identified in the Rowlands Castle Housing Needs Survey 2018.</p> <p>The provision of affordable housing is a requirement on the development of all large sites, and this is part of the Strategic Policies formulated by the EHDC and SDNP Authorities. It is not considered necessary or appropriate for the Neighbourhood Plan to also include policies in respect of this provision.</p>	<p>None required.</p>

<p>*Might it be possible to specify a specific proportion? 25% ?? 33% // Although government planning regulations specify a certain number of low cost or social housing, they don't appear to be as profitable and builders seem to find plenty of wiggle room to ignore and reduce numbers built to below the specified minimum.</p> <p>If this policy is adopted, might it be worth considering a maximum age limit for some of the houses specified?</p>		
<p>We could do with a more thoughtful bus service. A direct and regular route to Havant.</p>	<p>The Neighbourhood Plan is a land use plan and is not able to deal with these matters. These concerns however, where there is sufficient local support, are included in the Community Aspirations Report that will be provided to the Parish Council.</p>	<p>None required.</p>
<p>More trees and wild areas throughout the village to counteract the loss of wild areas through development</p>	<p>The Neighbourhood Plan is a land use plan and is not able to deal with these matters. These concerns however, where there is sufficient local support, are included in the Community Aspirations Report that will be provided to the Parish Council.</p>	<p>None required.</p>
<p>A policy to clean up the degenerating light industrial units in Finchdean.</p>	<p>These properties have established existing use rights and there is currently no expectation they will become available for development.</p> <p>Any controls on the existing use come within current planning legislation enforced by the SDNP Planning Authority and its Agents.</p>	<p>None required.</p>