

MILLAND NEIGHBOURHOOD
DEVELOPMENT PLAN 2015–2030

CONSULTATION STATEMENT Sep. 2015

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

- 1. AIMS OF CONSULTATION**
- 2. NEIGHBOURHOOD AREA**
 - 2.1 Defining Milland
 - 2.2 Neighbouring parishes
- 3. CONSULTATION PROCESS**
 - 3.1 Milland Parish Plan 2007
 - 3.2 Steering group
 - 3.3 Main stages of consultation process
 - 3.4 Open meeting/Workshop
- 4. METHODS OF ENCOURAGING PARTICIPATION**
 - 4.1 Milland News
 - 4.2 Social networks
 - 4.3 Website
 - 4.4 Email database
 - 4.5 Generations
- 5. CONSULTEES**
 - 5.1 Statutory bodies
 - 5.1.1 Strategic Environmental Assessment screening opinion
 - 5.1.2 Pre-submission draft MNP (April 2015)
 - 5.2 Local groups
 - 5.3 Individuals and households
 - 5.4 Sense of detachment
- 6. RESPONSES**
 - 6.1 Response Tables
 - 6.2 Summary of main issues arising from consultations
 - 6.2.1 Pre-drafting consultation period
 - 6.2.2 Pre-submission consultation responses (April–June 2015)
- 7. SHAPING THE POLICY AREAS**
 - 7.1 Policy categories
 - 7.2 Settlement boundary area
 - 7.2.1 Meeting with SDNPA (25 June 2015)
 - 7.2.2 Parish council decision
 - 7.2.3 Greenfield development
 - 7.2.4 Redrafting
- 8. CONCLUSION**

APPENDICES

Appendix 1. Workshop (July 2013) briefing and prompts

Appendix 2. Workshop (July 2013) ideas

Appendix 3. *Milland News* articles

Appendix 4. The younger generation

Appendix 5. Names of individuals

Appendix 6. Comments from Andy Coe

ABBREVIATIONS

Abbreviations used in this Consultation statement are defined as follows:

- **MNDP** : Milland Neighbourhood Development Plan (August 2015)
- **MNP**: Milland Neighbourhood Plan (first draft, April 2015; the name of the Plan was changed after a decision by the planning authority in June 2015)
- **NP**: Neighbourhood Plan
- **SDNPA**: South Downs National Park Authority

INTRODUCTION

The Consultation Statement supporting the Milland Neighbourhood Development Plan (**MNDP**) has been prepared to fulfil the legal obligations of The Neighbourhood Planning Regulations 2012, Section 15(2). In accordance with Part 5 of the Regulations, a Consultation Statement:

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

This Consultation Statement is submitted by Milland Parish Council, as the lead neighbourhood planning body (qualifying body), for the Regulation 16 consultation by the local planning authority (South Downs National Park Authority, **SDNPA**) in September 2015, along with other supporting documents including the MNDP itself, a map of the Neighbourhood Area, a Basic Conditions Statement and a comprehensive 248-page Evidence Base, referred to in this Consultation Statement as ***MNDP Evidence Base***. The *MNDP Evidence Base* includes two substantial appendices (*MNDP Evidence Base Appendix IV*, along with 100 pages of three supporting Response Tables in *MNDP Evidence Base Appendix VII*) setting out how Milland consulted its community and statutory bodies during the development of the MNDP and how those consultations directed the final Plan. These two appendices are the bedrock of the Consultation Statement. There are also references to other parts of *MNDP Evidence Base* throughout the Consultation Statement. Milland is wholly within the South Downs National Park and therefore the MNDP policies need to be in general conformity with the strategic policies contained in the South Downs Local Plan, which is likely to be adopted in 2017. The latter's emerging policies have been taken into account during the drafting of the MNDP. In particular, to quote SDNPA Chief Executive, Trevor Beattie, when launching the (Regulation 18) Local Plan Preferred Options public consultation on 2 September 2015:

'Our landscapes are the reason the South Downs became a National Park, so they must sit at the heart of every planning decision we make.'

1. AIMS OF CONSULTATION

Throughout Milland's neighbourhood plan project, the intention has been to ensure that *all* members of the community – residents, businesses and those who work in the parish that forms the neighbourhood area – have been aware of the plan at every stage and have been actively encouraged to influence and contribute to its development.

- Milland, in West Sussex, is a small but disparate parish of scattered rural settlements and it was essential that the voices of all who lived and worked here should be heard, not just those who spoke the loudest, held the strongest views or were perceived to carry the greatest influence.

- It was also important that people should be able to express their ideas and views freely and creatively, rather than being restricted to formal questionnaires. One of the aims was to provoke everybody into thinking more deeply about every aspect of their parish (past, present and future) and to understand its wider context. As a result, the content of the responses was often extensive.

A neighbourhood plan is community led but Milland also invited comments from a large number of **statutory consultation bodies** and other organisations. There was particularly valuable and detailed input from SDNPA and from the local housing authority (Chichester District Council).

2. NEIGHBOURHOOD AREA

2.1 Defining Milland

When Milland Parish Council decided (July 2012) that the possibility of developing a neighbourhood plan should be explored, one of the first debates was the extent of the area that might be included in such a plan. 'Milland' is variously taken to be:

- a large historical landed estate;
- an extensive 19th century Poor Law union district;
- a recently created (1972) local government parish;
- an ecclesiastical parish (with different boundaries); or
- a small village of recent development (since 1940s).

It was decided that the most appropriate and readily definable area would be the **civil parish of Milland**: population around 890, with about 415 dwellings, spread over 10.5 square miles in small scattered settlements and farms, with the village of Milland near its geographical centre. This became the designated neighbourhood area registered with and accepted by SDNPA (June 2013).

2.2 Neighbouring parishes

There was some discussion with neighbouring smaller parishes as to whether they wished to be included in the Milland plan. They confirmed that they preferred to maintain their separate identities but all were consulted during the drafting of the Milland plan and their views and needs were taken into consideration, partly because of recent joint responses to major planning applications locally but especially because of the unusual artificiality of Milland's parish boundaries.

- Milland was only created as a civil parish in 1972, when it was allocated the northern 'waste' parts of four ancient 'long parishes' (Chithurst, Iping, Stedham and Trotton).
- From 1972 each of those old parishes retained its separate identity for the southern sections that were not incorporated into Milland, though they are all small enough to have combined rather than individual parish councils: Trotton-with-Chithurst, about 129 households; and Stedham-with-Iping, 364 households.
- The neighbouring parish of Linch, with fewer than 30 households, is too small to have a parish council (it has a parish meeting) but remains resolutely independent of Milland,

despite sharing an ecclesiastical parish (Linch-with-Iping-Marsh) which is also shared with the neighbouring hamlet of Redford in the small civil parish of Woolbeding-with-Redford. The latter civil parish (70 households) was also consulted during the development of the MNDP.

3. CONSULTATION PROCESS

3.1 Milland Parish Plan 2007

The possibility of creating a neighbourhood plan had been discussed at a meeting of Milland Parish Council in July 2012 as a logical progression from the Milland Parish Vision & Plan published in 2007 (with a supplementary Design Statement in 2009). The Parish Plan (*MNDP Evidence Base Appendix II*) was taken as a starting point.

3.2 Steering group

To commence the project, the parish council decided to launch a series of meetings with local employers as a preliminary to creating a neighbourhood plan steering group. At this stage there was a noticeable emphasis on businesses.

In the event the NP steering group, first formally established in February 2013, developed from an informal focus group (formed in November 2012) whose members represented various community groups such as the churches, school, community shop, community health, local business forum, community magazine, sports club and village hall and the chairman of the parish council. Membership of the steering group changed fundamentally over the next few months. The timeline thereafter is given in full detail in *MNDP Evidence Base, section 2.3.1*.

3.3 Main stages of consultation process

The main stepping stones in this process, highlighted in the table below, were:

- Formation of steering group (Feb 2013)
- Public launch of MNP project (April 2013)
- Designation of neighbourhood area (June 2013)
- Open meeting/Workshop (July 2013)
- Creation of scenarios (Sep 2013)
- Appointment of editor (Sep 2014)
- Creation and distribution of questionnaire (Oct 2014)
- Public launch of draft policies and objectives (Dec 2014)
- First full draft MNP and Regulation 14 pre-submission consultation (Apr–Jun 2015)
- SDNPA Planning Committee meeting (June 2015)
- Final MNDP and submission for Regulation 16 consultation (Aug–Sep 2015).

Note that the plan was originally described as a 'Neighbourhood Plan' (NP). However, from June 2015 onwards, at the request of the local authority, it became a 'Neighbourhood Development Plan' (NDP).

When	What
2012: July	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Parish council discussion to consider initiating a neighbourhood plan
2012: Nov	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Creation of informal parish focus group representing various community groups to discuss possibilities and problems within community and give mutual support
2013: Feb	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Parish focus group becomes Neighbourhood Plan (NP) Steering Group
2013: April	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MNP 'launch article' in <i>Milland News</i> (April issue, circulated late March) MNP launch at open Annual Parish Meeting (18 April) Neighbourhood area registered with SDNPA
2013: June	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SDNPA confirms designation of Milland neighbourhood area as whole of Milland Parish (13 June) Second article in <i>Milland News</i>, announcing date of public meeting/workshop and encouraging participation
2013: July	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Open meeting 2 July: workshop with focus groups – about 80 people attend Confirmation of Community Development Foundation grant towards MNP Area group meetings: Wheatsheaf Enclosure; Mill Vale Meadows; Wardley
2013: July–Dec	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local focus group meetings Steering group gathers background information and evidence Direct contact with residents and businesses
2013: Sep–Nov	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Scenarios devised and circulated Business group meetings Area group meetings: Milland Lane; West Meade; Ripsley
2013: Dec	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Change of steering group chairmanship and membership
2014: Jan–Dec	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local meetings and accumulation of background information continue Attendance at SDNPA NP workshops
2014: Sep	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Parish council agrees budget to proceed with NP and appoints editor to compile drafts based on feedback from community consultations Proactive contacts made with households in the parish not already responded directly Questionnaire devised and circulated (five main categories), responses collated
2014: Nov	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Steering group approves draft objectives and policies Presentation to parish council meeting; summary of draft policies accepted unanimously
2014: Dec	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Double-page article in <i>Milland News</i> launching draft policies and objectives and inviting comments from community Meeting with SDNPA, including discussion re sustainability appraisal (not required)
2015: Feb	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> First rough draft MNP circulated to steering group for comments; subsequently revised during ongoing community consultation (Feb–Apr)
2015: Mar	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SEA Screening Opinion request submitted via SDNPA; statutory bodies agree not required
2015: Apr	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Revised first full draft MNP (April 2015) published 21 April for statutory Regulation 14 pre-submission 6-week consultation; formally launched at Annual Parish Assembly 23 April (limited number of printed copies available at the meeting and in public places such as community shop, village halls, pubs, churches and school) and article in <i>Milland News</i> Draft MNP made available electronically, either in its entirety (including maps and photographs), or text only, or a simpler document giving full details of policies, objectives and projects; available to download from parish council website or by request to the editor Draft MNP also submitted to SDNPA and made available to the general public online through the SDNPA website
2015: Apr–Jun	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regulation 14 consultation period; deadline for comments 5 June; responses collated and considered
2015: June	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 4 June: SDNPA Planning Committee agenda accessed, including all officers'

	<p>comments on Regulation 14 draft MNP</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 11 June: SDNPA Planning Committee meeting to consider officers' comments on Milland draft. Committee decision that Milland must now have settlement boundary area for core village and must rename MNP as Milland Neighbourhood Development Plan (MNDP) • 11 June: Regulation 14 responses (including SDNPA Planning Committee decision) discussed at steering group meeting • 25 June: Meeting with SDNPA to receive explanation of decisions and ramifications
2015: July	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parish council confirms MNDP to continue. Revision of first draft commences, taking all responses into account
2015: Aug	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revision continues plus compilation of supplementary Evidence Base, Consultation Statement and Basic Conditions Statement for Regulation 16 consultation
2015: Sep	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 17 Sep: Parish council accepts final (August 2015) MNDP • Final (August 2015) MNDP submitted formally to SDNPA for Regulation 16 Consultation along with supporting documents

These events were interspersed with regular meetings of the parish council and of the Neighbourhood Plan steering group, including many consultations (face-to-face or by email) with officers of the local planning authority, South Downs National Park Authority (SDNPA).

3.4 Open Meeting/Workshop

The Open Meeting & Workshop held on 2 July 2013 was the major impetus for propelling the project into action within the community. The participants – about 80 members of the public – were invited to join various focus groups set up around the village hall and were free to move between the different groups to listen to discussions and contribute their own ideas, vocally and as a series of post-it notes. Focus group leaders kept a record of the names and contact details for all participants.

The objectives of this Open Meeting were:

- To give an insight to neighbourhood planning and benefits for Milland
- To stimulate the right level of thinking
- To give the opportunity to share initial thoughts
- To share the proposed process, timeline and what happens next.

The agenda included:

- Intro / Welcome
- History of Milland
- Our Children's Vision
- Background / Process
- SDNP – Planning Policy (Tim Richings)
- Kirdford Neighbourhood Plan Insights (Josef Ransley)
- Brainstorm Milland Neighbourhood Plan Visions (Focus Groups)
- What Next?
- Q & A.

Details of suggested prompts for each focus group facilitator are given in **Appendix 1**. The ideas produced within each focus group are described in **Appendix 2**.

4. METHODS OF ENCOURAGING PARTICIPATION

The main methods used by Milland to reach the **widest possible range of participants** for consultation included:

- public meetings and workshop;
- focus group and area meetings, with scenarios as discussion points;
- follow-up questionnaire;
- direct personal contact by email and in face-to-face discussions;
- availability of electronic copies of first draft MNP by email and online;
- availability of printed copies of first draft MNP in public venues (community shop, village halls, pubs, school, churches) and by limited personal delivery; and
- regular communication with the whole community through *Milland News* and the parish council website.

4.1 Milland News

Milland News has played an important role in reaching all parts of the community. It is an independent and long-standing (established 1994) bimonthly community publication with local articles of general interest, produced by volunteers and delivered free to every household, business and community centre in the parish (and by subscription to those in other parishes) and financed mainly by the biennial Milland Rural Fair, a major community event run by volunteers. It is also distributed to local newspapers in Liphook, Midhurst, Petersfield and Haslemere and to bodies such as West Sussex County Council and Chichester District Council (chief executives), SDNPA, West Sussex Record Office, Action in rural Sussex (AirS), Sussex Association of Local Councils (SALC) and the parish's county and district councillors. It provides article writers with blanket coverage of the whole parish on a regular basis.

Throughout the NP project there were bimonthly *Milland News* articles, some at considerable length. These included thought-provoking discussions on subjects that were directly or indirectly relevant to a neighbourhood plan (housing, traffic, power failures, sewerage problems, broadband speeds, mobile phone failures, snow disruption, accidents and many other matters), as well as reports on the project itself. The latter are reproduced in full in *MNDP Evidence Base Appendix IV (sections 2.4 and 3.2)*, along with all relevant minutes of parish council meetings in the same Appendix (*sections 2.3 and 3.2*). A major article in the December 2014 issue of *Milland News* is repeated in this Consultation Statement for quick reference (**Appendix 3**).

4.2 Social network

In this small parish, which has a strong and active sense of community, most residents are known to each other either within their own small settlements or more widely through their involvement in community groups and events. Advantage was taken of this social network during consultations about the MNDP and much use was made of direct contacts. Businesses were readily accessible through the community's Milland Business Forum.

4.3 Website

In the early stages of the project, the original steering group decided to set up a website devoted to the NP; they were particularly inspired by the interactive website created for the Petersfield NP consultations. A website address was registered but the site never became active: neither the funds nor the will and expertise to maintain it were available and it was uncertain whether many would visit the site. Occasional use was made of the parish council website to keep the community informed but the main source of general information was through printed issues of *Milland News*.

4.4 Email database

As well as ensuring that all households and businesses were aware of the issues that arose during the consultation process because of articles in *Milland News*, use was made of an extensive database of email addresses (accumulated and held by *Milland News*) to alert households and businesses to the project and encourage their involvement. This email system remained very effective until the *Milland News* service provider began to refuse to distribute outgoing circular emails in June 2015. With circular emails, special efforts were made to ensure that the minority of inhabitants not accessible by email were consulted by their neighbours.

4.5 Generations

Most of the older generation were known personally to the editor, the parish clerk and other members of the steering group and their views were sought in one-to-one conversations if they were not comfortable with electronic communication.

The younger generation was approached mainly through the parish's Hollycombe Primary School. Over the past 25 years, local children of various ages have contributed their views about Milland at intervals for publication in *Milland News* and in Milland books. At the open meeting and workshop held to launch the neighbourhood plan on 2 July 2013, pupils from Hollycombe School presented a video outlining what they liked about Milland and their hopes for its future, supported by a poster display in the village hall. Their views and ideas (**Appendix 4**) were taken into account during the drafting of the MNP, albeit some of their visions were less achievable than others. With no youth club or similar group in the parish, it proved more difficult to involve secondary school pupils and college or university students, though a few of them did put forward their own suggestions directly or through their parents.

5. CONSULTEES

Those who have been consulted throughout the MNDP process include:

- statutory consultation bodies;
- local groups; and
- a large number of individual residents and businesses.

5.1 Statutory bodies

5.1.1 Statutory bodies for Strategic Environmental Assessment screening opinion

The first statutory consultation was the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) screening opinion. On 17 March 2015, Milland submitted an SEA screening opinion request form to SDNPA, accompanied by an outline of the Objectives, Policies and Projects put forward in the first rough draft (February 2015) of the MNP. The full February draft was already in the possession of SDNPA. The same material was sent by SDNPA to three statutory bodies:

- English Heritage (later Historic England)
- Natural England
- Environment Agency.

Statutory body	Response
<p>SDNPA (31 March 2015) from the SDNPA Sustainability Policy Officer</p>	<p>Thank you for your email enclosing your screening request form and the accompanying objectives, policies and projects document.</p> <p>The information provided is very comprehensive.</p> <p>Based upon a review of this material it is SDNPA’s view that the plan, as currently drafted, is not likely to have a significant effect on the environment under the terms of the SEA Directive and would not, therefore require an SEA.</p> <p>This view has been based upon:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The very modest scale of development outlined in the draft plan; “...anticipate a maximum of 10 housing units on any site and in view of major infrastructure problems we would not anticipate more than one housing development site...” • The landscape focus of the plan that underpins National Park purposes; • The absence of any forecast impact from development upon sensitive environmental receptors based upon the draft policies of the plan. <p>SDNPA is required to consult the statutory advisors in forming a screening opinion and I am, therefore, copying this email to my colleagues at NE, the EA and EH with a request that they notify you and SDNPA if they take a different view, i.e. deem an SEA necessary.</p> <p>In the absence of a contrary view being expressed by Friday 17 April, I will assume the concurrence of the statutory advisors and conclude that no SEA is required.</p>
<p>Environment Agency (Hannah Hyland, 2 April 2015)</p>	<p>Thank you for consultation on the SEA screening request for the Milland Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>We consider that the scale of development proposed through the Neighbourhood Plan would not have a significant environmental effect and as such would not require an SEA in relation to the issues in our remit.</p>
<p>Historic England, formerly English Heritage (Robert Lloyd-Sweet, Historic Places Adviser, South East England, 16 April 2015)</p>	<p>Thankyou for consulting Historic England on the potential for requirement of a Strategic Environmental Assessment for the emerging Milland Neighbourhood Plan. Having regard to the Objectives, Policies and Projects document submitted alongside the screening opinion request form we find that, at present, the plan is unlikely to result in significant environmental effects.</p> <p>This is based upon the following features of the objectives, policies and projects document:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The very modest scale of development proposed; The general approach of the plan in seeking to sustain and enhance

	<p>the historic environment of the parish, including its designated and non-designated heritage assets, architectural character and landscape, including the noted features of narrow lanes and landscape views;</p> <p>The positive approach to exploring and identifying the area's historic and prehistoric features, involving the community in conserving and enjoying its heritage.</p> <p>We reserve the right to revise this opinion should the Parish Council decide to allocate sites for development that have not previously been appropriately considered through Strategic Environmental Assessment of the Local Plan or National Park Plan.</p> <p>We welcome the consideration of the historic environment, heritage assets and landscape character of the Neighbourhood Plan Area set out in the Objectives, Policies and Projects document and look forward to seeing the draft document for the pre-publication consultation.</p> <p>Please do not hesitate to contact me if there is any information that Historic England can provide in order to assist in the development of the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>
--	---

There was no direct response from **Natural England** and it was therefore assumed by SDNPA that NE concurred with the views of SDNPA, the Environment Agency and Historic England.

5.1.2 Statutory bodies for pre-submission draft MNP (April 2015)

The statutory consultation bodies for the Regulation 14 pre-submission consultation are listed in the table below. It should be noted that, although all of these bodies were invited to look at the draft MNP (April 2015 pre-submission version), not all them chose to make comments. The comments of those bodies that did respond are included in full within the Response Tables in *MNDP Evidence Base Appendix VII: Table C.3*.

Group	Organisations invited
Local authorities	Chichester District Council
	West Sussex County Council: Lucy Seymour-Bowdery
	SDNPA
Neighbouring parishes	Linch
	Woolbeding-with-Redford
	Rogate
	Trotton-with-Chithurst
	Stedham-with-Iping
	Fernhurst
	Midhurst
	Bramshott & Liphook
	East Hants District Council
	Hampshire County Council
Statutory consultees	Minerals & Waste planning authority
	Coast to Capital LEP
	Environment Agency
	English Heritage / Historic England
	Highways Agency / Highways England
	Network Rail
	Homes and Communities Agency
	Coal Authority (<i>not relevant to this area</i>)
	Marine Management Organisation
	Water supplier: Southern Water
National Grid: Plant Protection	

	Gas suppliers (Southern Gas Networks) (<i>no mains gas in the parish</i>)
	Electricity supplier (Scottish Southern Electric)
	Clinical Commissioning Group (Coastal W Sussex)
	Disability awareness groups
	Telecommunications suppliers: BT Vodafone Orange/EE
	Wildlife bodies: Amphibian and Reptile Conservation (ARC) Sussex Butterflies Hampshire & Isle of Wight Butterflies Sussex Wildlife Trust Hampshire Wildlife Trust Sussex Ornithological Society Hampshire Ornithological Society
	Religious groups: Milland Evangelical Church; St Luke's C of E churches Milland and Linch

5.2 Local groups

Local groups that have been consulted at various stages include:

- Milland Business Forum (covering: Liphook Golf Club; Liphook Equine Hospital; Champneys Forest Mere; equine enterprises; and a wide range of up to 60 smaller businesses, services and self-employed of all kinds in the parish)
- Milland Valley Memorial Hall
- Borden Village Hall
- Hollycombe Primary School
- Churches (St Luke's Milland and St Luke's Linch; also Milland Evangelical Church)
- Milland Sports Club
- Milland Lane Action Group
- Wheatsheaf Enclosure Residents Association
- Mill Vale Meadows Road Association
- Ripsley/Black Fox residents group

Where received, the responses of these various groups are included in the Response Tables in *MNDP Evidence Base Appendix VII: Tables C.1 and C.3*.

5.3 Individuals and households

Recorded responses from individuals and households throughout the consultations are given in the Response Tables in *MNDP Evidence Base Appendix VII: Tables C.1, C.2 and C.3*. Many other individuals in the parish did not give formal responses, or their views were represented in group discussions. There is a list of names of those known to have responded direct to the steering group in **Appendix 5**.

5.4 Sense of detachment

One factor that had not been anticipated at the start of the project was an emerging sense among Milland's inhabitants of being 'over-surveyed'. The parish council had initiated

several surveys in recent years (e.g. parish plan, housing, traffic, community needs) and some inhabitants reacted to consultations about the NP as being ‘just another survey’ in which they felt their views would probably make very little difference. Some stated firmly:

- that they were not interested;
- that where they had taken the trouble to express views in previous surveys they had been disappointed at the lack of evidence that their views had resulted in appropriate action; and/or
- that they saw the parish council as a group of individuals they did not know and who did not seem to be genuinely interested in them but were a ‘talking shop’ discussing arcane matters once every two months; and so on.

Although in theory each parish councillor had an ‘area of responsibility’, i.e. a specific geographical part of the parish in which they would take steps to meet and get to know those who lived and worked in that patch and to whom those people could refer if they had a problem, in practice very few councillors had the time to take this role seriously (average 90 inhabitants per councillor). However, the long-serving parish clerk (25 years) had good knowledge of the community.

This feeling of detachment was one of the first hurdles that needed to be overcome by the steering group. In the early stages, that feeling persisted as the group failed to take up the challenge of making direct personal contact with people who were not already involved in community life. There was also an early emphasis on business, with apparently less interest in residents. The situation improved in the later stages, with deliberate approaches being made to a large number of individuals, including especially residents who were not already actively involved in community life in general.

6. RESPONSES

6.1 Response Tables

Full details of responses from all sources during various consultation stages are given in the lengthy Response Tables in *MNDP Evidence Base Appendix VII*. These include:

- **Pre-drafting consultations** (from 2013 up to April 2015): *Table C.1*
- **Pre-drafting questionnaire** (October 2014): *Table C.2*
- **Pre-submission consultations** (April–June 2015): *Table C.3*.

As far as they can be numbered, respondents to each of these stages were as follows:

- Pre-drafting consultations: 152 individuals, plus 4 who represented a total of a further 67 households
- Pre-drafting questionnaire: 35 households
- Pre-submission consultations: 11 statutory bodies, 5 village groups and 20 households

The 2011 Census shows that there are 415 dwellings in the parish, accommodating 362 full-time households, and that there is a population of 891 ‘usual residents’.

6.2 Summary of main issues arising from consultations

This section gives summaries of the main issues arising from the groups of responses (see also *MNDP Evidence Base: Appendices IV and VII*).

6.2.1 Pre-drafting consultation period

The main issues arising from the pre-drafting consultations included the following:

- However desirable and theoretically sustainable future development might or might not be, a major restraint on development of any kind was **poor infrastructure** and this needed to be addressed before further development could be considered.
- The majority response concerning the **local lanes** (which in themselves argued against any increase in HGVs and other vehicles that would be involved in construction work and in the success of some potential businesses) was that their narrowness, especially the north/south routes, should actually be celebrated and retained to protect the area from further traffic. It was noted by many, for example, that construction vehicles largely served the private interest of a property or business owner, rather than the wider interests and convenience of the community.
- There was a strong desire to conserve and enhance the existing **tranquillity and beauty** of the natural and managed environment and resistance to any form of development that might jeopardise it.
- It was felt that the community was more or less **'the right size'** and with a good social and generational balance. There was very little enthusiasm for increasing the number (and certainly the size) of dwellings, unless there was a proven need for smaller affordable homes for those with local connections and on a very limited scale.
- The majority of respondents **valued Milland for what it is** – a rural parish with an unusual history and elusive character – and had no desire to see its atmosphere devalued by becoming similar to other built-up areas. Part of that special character lay in the diversity and individuality of the parish's small settlements and their scattered nature in a rural and beautiful setting, along with the unusual fact that the village at the centre of the parish did not exist a century ago. The village itself had no ambition to become anything like a town; it liked being a small well-knit community and was comfortable in its own skin.

All of the responses in the pre-drafting period were brought together to define some initial draft **objectives and policies**, which were published in detail in the December 2014 issue of *Milland News*, inviting further comment (**Appendix 3**). The first rough draft MNP (February 2015) was inspired by and developed from the pre-drafting responses, including those arising after the *Milland News* article, and was revised further in the light of responses received in the period Feb–April 2015. The first full draft MNP was published in April 2015 as the pre-submission consultation draft and was made widely available to the community and to statutory consultation bodies.

6.2.1.1 Scenario meetings

The focus group sessions from the Open Meeting & Workshop on 2 July 2013 formed the basis for the scenarios that were developed by group leaders from ideas generated during the workshop to stimulate discussion and from further input from the various group meetings that took place after the workshop. The scenarios (compiled in September 2013) and the questionnaire (October 2014) produced a wealth of suggestions and points of view

within the community. The scenarios had been in some cases deliberately controversial, to generate serious thought about the future of the parish; they are reproduced in full in *MNDP Evidence Base Appendix IV, section 2.1*.

The wide range of subjects that emerged during the scenario-inspired pre-drafting open meetings, settlement area meetings, business group meetings and focus group meetings in 2013 and 2014 included:

- the need to relate to neighbouring parishes;
- effects of development on water courses, water supplies and drainage;
- encouraging a broad demography;
- conservation of the environment;
- maintaining the existing strong sense of community;
- traffic and parking;
- impact of tourism;
- potential encroachment from growth of Liphook;
- development within the core village;
- threats to open-access areas;
- loss of smaller dwellings;
- brownfield sites;
- lack of public transport, medical facilities, broadband speeds;
- increase in home working, live/work possibilities;
- increase in equine enterprises;
- renewable energy sources.

6.2.1.2 Questionnaire responses

The questionnaire (Oct 2014) issued to those who had not responded to other methods of participation is reproduced in full in *MNDP Evidence Base Appendix IV, section 2.2* and the detailed responses are given in *MNDP Evidence Base Appendix VII: Table C.2*. The questions were deliberately designed to elicit descriptive answers rather than simple yes/no decisions. Responses to the questionnaire highlighted the following points (opinions were divided for several of the questions):

- Many emphasised the highly valued strong community spirit
- Many admitted that they did not want change, they came to Milland because of how it was and they wanted to keep it that way, didn't want to see it becoming like other places
- Almost all wished to retain the scattered nature of the settlements
- Conservation of the environment was important
- Attempts should be made to differentiate between 'need', 'demand' and 'desire' for new housing
- Starter homes, affordable homes and downsize homes: mixed opinions, possibly a need for a few new small housing units (mixed views on where these should be) but need would have to be proved; concerns about lack of infrastructure to support new development (including public transport); query viability of development
- Any new development should be in sympathy with existing surroundings, complementary rather than conflicting, respecting local style
- Mixed views about substantial enlargements of existing dwellings
- Development of small businesses should be encouraged if viable but no HGVs; encourage working from home, live/work units
- Existing community facilities were sufficient for present community (except medical)

- Traffic problems mainly HGVs; great majority wanted to retain narrowness of lanes
- Parking problems at school and increasingly at Rising Sun pub
- Public transport poor, in theory needed but in practice rarely used and possibly not viable
- Tourism: attraction of the area for leisure pursuits was 'that it is as it is'; concerns that increased leisure use by visitors might destroy the very qualities they (and locals) appreciate; majority against provision of public toilets etc
- Woodland, heaths, commons and water bodies should be protected from development, whether for leisure or for other purposes
- Energy sources: majority against oil exploration (HGVs in lanes, noise etc); majority against wind farms; would consider solar if no adverse impact on landscape.

6.2.1.3 Pre-drafting meetings

Meetings held during the pre-drafting period included the following:

- 1st meeting of informal parish focus group (Nov. 2012)
- Parish focus group becomes MNP Steering Group (MNP SG) (Feb 2013)
- MNP SG meetings (Apr, Jun, July, Aug, Sep 2013; Jul, Nov 2014)
- Open meeting: Workshop with focus groups (July 2013)
- Focus group meetings (July 2013 onwards)
- Business group meetings (Sep. 2013)
- Ripsley group meetings (Sep/Oct 2013)
- Milland Lane Action Group meetings (Oct/Nov 2013)
- Mill Vale Meadows RA meeting (July 2013)
- West Meade discussion group (Oct/Nov 2013)
- Other local group meetings (Jan–Dec 2014)
- Parish council meetings (2012–2014)
- SDNPA meetings (Dec 2014, March 2015)

There was a noticeable fallow period for the whole project for part of 2014, during which the membership of the SG changed (five members no longer live in the parish) and for a while the incentive diminished, disenchantment set in and the project lost its way. Fresh impetus was given when the new SG membership was settled. To avoid further delays, much of the discussion by the new group was by frequent emails and phone conversations rather than formal meetings. There was also considerable email correspondence with SDNPA between face-to-face meetings.

Discussions at the 2013 open meeting and at focus group meetings, business group meetings and various settlement area meetings are described in the Response Tables in *MNDP Evidence Base Appendix VII: Table C.1*.

Points discussed at meetings of the **Steering Group** (SG) in 2013/14 included the following:

- Preparation for Open Workshop; outcomes of Workshop
- Possibility of interactive online map for public comments
- Residents to have priority over businesses, but latter also to be encouraged
- Need for regular visual communication, including websites and *Milland News*
- Questionnaires and scenarios to generate community discussion
- Establishment of area responsibilities for each SG member
- Changes in SG membership
- Regular updates on community group meetings
- Attendance at SDNPA Neighbourhood Plan meetings and seminars

- Examples of NDPs in other communities countrywide
- Grants
- Parish council's existing policies
- Maps assistance from SDNPA
- Community feedback
- Printing considerations
- Timetables
- Consultations with statutory bodies
- Liaison with neighbouring parishes
- Drafting of objectives, policies, projects.

Notes from **Parish Council meetings** in the pre-drafting period are given in *MNDP Evidence Base Appendix IV, section 2.3*. During the early stages of the subsequent pre-submission consultation period, an item at an interim meeting of the Parish Council on 14 May 2015 was reported as follows:

346. Neighbourhood Plan (NP): Ms Porter provided a detailed update.

- The **first draft** of the NP was 'launched' at the Annual Parish Assembly in April and has now been released for the 'Regulation 14 Pre-submission' consultation period of 6 weeks, during which everyone who lives or works in the parish is being encouraged to make their comments. The deadline for comments is 5 June. These will be taken into account for the final draft of the Plan after a meeting of the Steering Group immediately after the deadline. The whole parish has also been kept informed through *Milland News* (including full details of draft policies) and by direct consultation with individuals, groups and businesses throughout the past year or two.
- The draft has also been circulated to about 25–30 statutory consultees. They include most of the neighbouring parishes as well as regional and national bodies ranging from those with an interest in nature conservation or listed buildings to service suppliers.
- Printed copies have been deposited at the Shop, the two pubs, the school and the Hall for perusal (but not removal) by the public. Publicity was also given in the *Liphook Herald* and *Mid & Pet Observer* and there will be a final publicity article in the next issue of *Milland News*.
- The next step will be to **revise the draft** according to the Steering Group's decisions concerning comments received and then submit it to South Downs National Park Authority for the formal **Regulation 16 Consultation** within the SDNPA, who will also consult more widely. We have been taking the proposed SDNPA policies for its own Local Plan into account.
- Once the SDNPA is satisfied, it will submit the Plan to an **Independent Examiner**, who will mainly check for legal aspects (e.g. compliance with EU regulations).
- When the Examiner is satisfied, Chichester District Council will be instructed by SDNPA to organise a **referendum** in which all those on the electoral roll for the parish of Milland will be invited to say either Yes or No to the final draft of the Plan. The referendum is decided on a majority basis: a majority of just one vote in either direction will seal the fate of the Plan. Every effort will be made by the Steering Group (and the PC) to ensure that as many of the electorate as possible do actually vote at the referendum. If only 3 people vote, their majority decision will still hold sway and the entire parish will be judged to have voted either for or against the Plan. If the majority is Yes, the Plan is then formally accepted and consideration of all future planning applications by SDNPA and Chichester DC must heed its policies.

6.2.2 Pre-submission consultation responses (April–June 2015)

The main issues arising from the pre-submission consultations included the following, with conflicting opinions in some instances:

- Role of churches
- Poor infrastructure (especially utilities) must be addressed before any further development
- Lack of positive suggestions for low-cost housing

- Concerns that low-cost and self-build housing could be sold off for profit of first owner and loss of affordability to future owners
- Lack of evidence base, more surveys needed (respondent unaware of existing MNDP Evidence Base)
- Alternative/renewable energy sources should be encouraged, especially if for community
- Encourage housing in north to serve larger employers
- No need to encourage housing in north as so close to Liphook (which is much better suited for more housing, outside NP etc)
- Future of school buildings
- Encourage outdoor activities, especially mountain biking (not motorised)
- Floodlights: discourage
- Undesignated heritage assets to be considered and protected
- Stress poor sewerage infrastructure
- Consider needs of older generation: improve infrastructure (+ access to medical facilities) and housing opportunities (downsizing, granny annexes, sheltered)
- Allow service providers to provide necessary installations where practically appropriate, sometimes offsite and sometimes on sites where development would not normally be permitted
- Affordable house shortage for locals and protection in future
- Not possible to control HGVs for businesses even though desirable
- Not all shoots are 'exclusive'.

Full details of all responses in the pre-submission consultations are given in *MNDP Evidence Base Appendix VII, Table C.3*.

The main points raised by various **SDNPA** officers during the pre-submission period, and made known to the steering group at the very end of that period, included the following:

- Unnecessary repetition of existing or proposed other policies (e.g. SDNPA Local Plan, NPPF); beware of conflicting with higher-level policy; add local details to support SDNPA strategic policies; refer to emerging SDNPA policies; reflect NPPF policies
- Far too much detail of parish description and history; remove unnecessary detail; make more use of maps and appendices; remove what's not relevant to development policies
- Settlement boundary area should be defined
- Good emphasis on landscape quality (NP purposes)
- Consider annually whether review necessary, rather than reviewing every 5 years
- Identify vulnerable dark night skies areas
- Clarify wording of some policies for easier use in determining planning applications
- Celebrate and enhance narrow lanes rather than describe as a problem
- SDNPA purpose 2 is to promote opportunities for enjoyment and understanding, i.e. need to encourage rather than discourage tourism
- Welcome support for smaller homes but how define and how justify need for them
- Give thought to rural exception sites as well as brownfield sites; need to progress investigation of sites for affordable housing
- Equestrian not considered to be traditional agricultural occupation, keep separate
- How to implement need to improve infrastructure
- Review policy wording on farm diversification
- Convert non-development policies into projects
- Review approach to Local Green Space designation.

All of the pre-submission comments were considered carefully and were incorporated into the revised final draft MDNP (August 2015) where deemed appropriate by the steering group. Most of the advice given by SDNPA was accepted, along with most of the suggestions by other statutory bodies and many of the suggestions from individuals. It should be noted that extensive and very detailed comments from one individual house-owner living and working overseas (**Appendix 6**) and general comments from a very small group interested in their own self-build housing project were often at variance with comments made by the majority and were therefore for the most part not accepted (*MNDP Evidence Base Appendix VII: Table C.3*).

7. SHAPING THE POLICY AREAS

7.1 Policy categories

The original open meeting and workshop on 2 July 2013 had been divided into several focus groups:

- Landscape, natural environment and heritage
- Transport and infrastructure
- Tourism and visitor facilities
- Housing and built environment
- Community life
- Local economy.

As a result of responses from various meetings and all the wide-ranging pre-draft discussions in other circumstances, a broad outline for the Neighbourhood Plan took shape and it eventually fell naturally into the following sections, within which the policies suggested by the community began to be developed:

- Natural environment and countryside
- Cultural heritage, design and settlement strategy
- Accessibility and infrastructure
- Housing
- Local economy and the community.

The level of importance of each sector altered gradually during the consultations and increasingly there was stress on the natural environment and countryside, including landscape. This was enhanced by the emerging policies for the SDNPA's own Local Plan, which were evolving at the same time as the policies for the Milland NDP. The many comments received from SDNPA officers on 4 June 2015 in response to the pre-submission draft (*MNDP Evidence Base Appendix VII : Table C.3*) were of particular importance; for the most part they reflected and reinforced the majority view of the community and clarified what had sometimes been rather vague thinking.

7.2 Settlement boundary area

The most important of the SDNPA comments arose from the wholly unexpected decision at the meeting of its own planning committee on 11 June 2015 that Milland should now define a **settlement boundary area**. Until that point (a long way into the process of finalising the MNDP) Milland had never been considered as a settlement area for development of any kind. This had been the case since at least the 1999 Chichester Local Plan and it had accepted that there was an overall policy of presumption against development throughout the parish. With the new requirement, there was suddenly a presumption in favour of development within a defined settlement boundary around the core village's built-up area. This required in-depth consideration of exactly where such a boundary should be drawn and a review of some of the draft MNDP policies.

7.2.1 Meeting with SDNPA (25 June 2015)

An urgent meeting with SDNPA was requested, to discuss the ramifications of the Planning Committee's decisions, and this took place in Milland on 25 June 2015 (Steering Group: Nigel Cartwright, Lorraine Grocott, Val Porter. SDNPA: Sarah Nelson, Strategic Planning Lead; Amy Tyler-Jones, Planning Policy Officer – Neighbourhood Planning). The main points discussed at the meeting were as follows:

- **Settlement boundary area:** Milland queried the SDNPA Planning Committee's sudden decision on 11 June and the ramifications for MNDP, especially the change in emphasis to presumption in favour of development. SDNPA explained it is trying to rationalise by eventually asking all parishes with more concentrated built-up areas to have SBA for consistency. This did not mean that SDNPA would allocate a number of housing units to the parish. It is entirely up to Milland what to include within the boundary (guidelines provided).
- **Housing policies:** Milland wanted to reduce and simplify its draft housing policies. Also requested guidance on who should identify brownfield sites (the parish or, say, SDNPA) and confirm NPPF definitions of brownfield and rural exception sites. SDNPA confirmed it was up to Milland to say whether the parish wanted, for example, only affordable homes, or smaller homes, or self-build or other options, and could include sites for such development in MNDP (identified brownfield sites, potential rural exception sites) if it chose to do so, but would need in advance of the MNDP to secure consent of relevant landowner that they would be willing to offer the site for specific development. Milland Parish Council must lead the initial discussion and approaches but would first have to ensure that there is a demand for such development, and that the landowner is committed and that there will be commitment from a housing association or similar. SDNPA confirmed that the MNDP could be used to allocate a site for self-build (if available). Self-build is not defined as affordable; it may be 'low-cost' but does not necessarily have the protection of being in perpetuity for local people. Self-build projects can be carried out by a social housing group (i.e. as affordable housing on rural exception sites) or by a charity (e.g. Community Land Trust) or other formal management structure. It would be advisable to have binding conditions on re-sale. To be included in the MNDP, a self-build group must first identify a site that the parish council would find acceptable and the group must show that it is available from the landowner. If this was the case, the MNDP could then allocate that piece of land for self-build but would have to prove it was deliverable. If the parish council and the group did not manage to identify any land, the MNDP could not allocate a self-build site.
- **Changes to MNDP in future:** Milland asked about the legality of a future parish council changing any of the MNDP policies that had already been accepted by referendum and whether another referendum would be required. SDNPA said that there appeared to be no regulations yet about reviewing NDPs.

- **Utilities:** Milland explained views expressed by Southern Water that exceptions should be made in some of the MNDP policies to allow the company to install new works where appropriate and asked if there was any precedence for a parish putting together its own 'infrastructure business plan' (in consultation with utility providers) to sort out situations in rural areas that were falling behind as being unprofitable for the service suppliers. SDNPA advised that Southern Water's concerns should be taken into account.
- **Caravan parks, car parks, roads, cycle routes:** Milland had expressed doubts about caravan parks, especially because of narrow lanes and setting precedent for more permanent or larger caravan parks. SDNPA encouraged accommodating touring caravans (as opposed to permanent mobile homes etc) as part of the Park's 'visitors' brief and advised Milland to check SDNPA's emerging policy on tourism and caravans. Milland described car parking problems due to growing numbers of visitors, including to Rising Sun pub and to Chapel Common, and groups parking cars on Cartersland Green before going off cycling. SDNPA advised that the parish council should look further at this problem. Milland noted that SDNPA had been investigating a potential cycle route to Liphook and suggested that it should also investigate a route to Midhurst.
- **Emerging SDNPA policies:** Milland raised the problem that SDNPA emerging policies are still fluid and it was therefore difficult to cite them in the MNDP. SDNPA confirmed that its policies are unlikely to change in substance (just tweaking).
- **Local Green Spaces:** SDNPA said that officially designated sites are already protected but MNDP would need to list other valued green spaces (including water) as LGS for protection from development.
- **Native species:** Milland queried the suggested policy phrasing by SDNPA that 'all new planting must be native species'. SDNPA confirmed that this only applied to developments.
- **Dark night skies:** Milland asked how/who to identify 'vulnerable' areas in Milland as requested by SDNPA. SDNPA suggested that their Dark Night Skies officer should liaise with a local representative; and also suggested that a policy trying to control existing intrusive private exterior lighting would be difficult and the matter was best handled by friendly persuasion and 'education'.

Other matters that there was no time to discuss at this lengthy meeting included:

- Generic historic environment policy (suggested by Chichester District Council)
- Local listing to protect undesignated heritage sites (also suggested by CDC)
- New public rights of way
- Archaeology surveys
- Rewilding
- Evidence about loss of smaller homes
- Potential for housing in the north of the parish.

7.2.2 Parish council decision

In the light of these discussions, the parish council confirmed at its July 2015 meeting that the project should continue, though several members of the MNP steering group and of the parish council had expressed doubts about persisting. However, it was generally agreed that the amount of effort and enthusiasm already put into the project by the whole community over the past 2 or 3 years should not be wasted and redrafting therefore commenced.

7.2.3 Greenfield development

SDNPA provided detailed guidelines on drawing settlement boundaries and these were followed by the steering group. During subsequent discussions on this subject, a particular concern was raised with SDNPA about greenfield development:

“There is strong feeling among the steering group and much of the village that there should be no development on fields and they have asked for confirmation that SDNPA/CDC would be unlikely to approve such development for housing, whether or not within the SBA. Looking at SDNPA LP papers it appears that, regardless of the MNDP: (a) SDNPA in general would only encourage affordable homes for locals in perpetuity in a parish like Milland; (b) such homes should be built on brownfield sites or on rural exception sites (the latter to be agreed between the parish council, the housing authority i.e. CDC, and the planning authority i.e. SDNPA); (c) rural exception sites can only be used for affordable homes for locals in perpetuity, i.e. in effect housing association homes (whether or not via a Community Land Trust); and (d) SDNPA does not encourage development on green infrastructure sites such as agricultural land and woodland unless there is a compelling need. The Milland NDP is strongly against such development but we’d like back-up in principle.”

SDNPA responded as follows (14.8.15) and this advice was taken into account in the final MNDP:

(a) *“SDNPA in general would only encourage affordable homes for locals in perpetuity in a parish like Milland”*: Milland has no requirement for new housing (Policy SD23) so any new homes will either be within the Settlement Policy Boundary or if they are outside of this they would have to be Rural Exception Sites (Policy SD25) i.e. 100% affordable or agricultural workers dwelling (Policy SD48).

(b) *“... such homes should be built on brownfield sites or on rural exception sites (the latter to be agreed between the parish council, the housing authority i.e. CDC, and the planning authority i.e. SDNPA)”*: Within the settlement policy boundary or as a rural exception site

(c) *“... rural exception sites can only be used for affordable homes for locals in perpetuity, i.e. in effect housing association homes (whether or not via a Community Land Trust)”*: See criteria 3 of Policy SD25 ...

Strategic Policy SD25: Rural Exception Sites

1. Proposals for new residential development of 100 per cent affordable housing outside of settlement boundaries as shown on the Policies Map will be permitted, provided they comply with other relevant policies and the following tests are all met:

- a) affordable housing is provided in perpetuity;
- b) the site has been selected through a site-specific sustainability appraisal process;
- c) the scale and location relates well to the existing settlement; and
- d) effective community engagement has been undertaken.

2. The size (number of bedrooms), type (flat, house, extra care etc.) and tenure (social and affordable rented, intermediate, shared ownership or other) of affordable homes for each proposal will be based on up-to-date evidence of local needs. A suitable mix will be determined through liaison between the applicant, SDNPA, parish council, relevant housing authority and rural housing enablers, where applicable.

3. Occupancy conditions and local connection criteria will be applied to affordable housing to ensure local needs are met. Selection will be managed through a partnership approach with the Housing Authority and established community-led and legally constituted organisations or CLTs where applicable.

(d) SDNPA does not encourage development on green infrastructure sites such as agricultural land and woodland unless there is a compelling need. Policy SD22 Development Strategy criteria 3 says it in nut shell ... well a planning jargon nut shell:

3. Development proposals will not normally be permitted outside of settlement boundaries and the countryside will be protected in accordance with relevant policies in the Local Plan

and national policy. In exceptional circumstances, development in the open countryside will be permitted, where it is demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Authority that it is in accordance with the policy for the relevant Broad Area (policies SD4/CP Coastal Plain, SD4/DS Dip Slope, SD4/WD Western Downs, SD4/SS Scarp Slope and SD4/WW Western Weald), and:

- a) It is in accordance with Policy SD25 on rural exception sites, or
- b) It is in accordance with Policy SD27 on Sustaining the rural economy, or
- c) There is an essential need for a countryside location, or
- d) It is an appropriate reuse or redevelopment of an existing building(s).

7.2.4 Redrafting

After further detailed discussion between the parish council, the steering group and SDNPA, as well as taking the community's existing comments into consideration, the appropriate changes were reflected in the final (August 2015) MNDP submitted to SDNPA for Section 16 Consultation in September 2015, which includes a mapped settlement boundary area as requested. The map was based on an existing map in the pre-submission draft MNP that showed how the core village's built-up area had developed over the past six decades from little more than a pub and a few scattered cottages to a community of about 100 dwellings in several housing estates concentrated in three of the four quadrants around a crossroads.

CONCLUSION

Milland, a small parish with limited assets, has gone to considerable lengths to ensure that *all* sectors of its community – whether residents, businesses or those who work in the parish – have been informed and consulted at all stages in the development of the policies in the final MNDP. Where appropriate, suggestions made during these consultations that cannot be described as development 'policies' have instead been put forward as 'projects' to be initiated in most cases by the parish council; these are also described in the MNDP (*MNDP Appendix II*). In addition Milland has consulted widely with statutory bodies and taken steps to ensure that the MNDP takes the National Planning Policy Framework into account and does not conflict with the emerging policies of the SDNPA Local Plan (where known). The emphasis of the 2007 Parish Plan that preceded the MNDP (*MNDP Evidence Base Appendix II*) was on growth and development, especially in the residential, business and tourism sectors. The 2005 survey that was the foundation of the Parish Plan had been distributed to every household (there were 716 people on the electoral roll at the time) but had attracted responses from only 32 households (about 4.5% of the whole community); thus the survey could not claim to represent the views of the community as a whole. During the course of the more extensive consultations for the MNDP it was found that concerns had changed, partly because Milland became part of the South Downs National Park from 2010. There is now much more stress on recognising that the landscape must 'sit at the heart of every planning decision we make' (Trevor Beattie, SDNPA, September 2015). The MNDP consultations have shown that the scale of development that would be acceptable in Milland – a rural West Weald parish of scattered small settlements in a National Park – is very small and potential sites for sustainable development are very limited. As one of the many 'Projects' set out in the final MNDP (August 2015), the parish council is invited to review at regular intervals the future housing needs of the parish and to continue to investigate the very few potential brownfield sites and rural exception sites that might become available in the future.

APPENDICES

The Appendices to this Consultation Statement are set out below. Note that these are not the same as references within the main text to appendices in the separate *MNDP Evidence Base*, which are identified by roman numerals.

APPENDIX 1: July 2013 Workshop briefing

Group Process Briefing, including suggested prompts

1. Each individual in the group to spend 5 mins quietly thinking and writing down on post-its 3 to 5 tabloid headlines they would like to read about the group topic in 15–20 years time (write one headline per post-it)
2. Place all the post-its on the flip chart and work together to cluster post-its into themes as appropriate and discuss the headlines to share understanding. (15mins)
3. Agree who will summarise and feedback the outcome of the above to the meeting

Some suggested prompts:

Housing & Built Environment

- Your vision for the parish as a place to live 10-20 years from now
- Should we encourage renewable energy projects
- How we can best look after our historic buildings, and keep our parish looking distinctive
- What do we need to consider / how do we manage the impact on the local environment
- What kind of design principles should be followed
- What principles should guide the placement of new facilities / housing
- Do we need more parking / cycling paths??
- Live / work units??
- What type of housing & facilities will help support a balanced, vibrant community for the next generation
- Whether we need more housing and, if so, how much should be added each year
- What types of housing we need - flats, single story, semi-detached, detached, terraced
- How much affordable housing we need- and what 'affordable' means here
- The building types and styles that would best suit our local environment
- Are there features in our current built environment which need renovating / enhancing

Tourism & Visitors (Some prompts)

- How we can improve our tourist and visitor information
- Could we do more for walkers, cyclists, riders
- Do we need more visitor accommodation - B&Bs etc
- What facilities, attractions and activities might encourage visitors to spend more time – and money – in Milland and surrounding area.
- How we can help visitors and residents alike make the most of our location at the heart of the SDNP

Our Transport & Infrastructure

- Traffic management volumes, restrictions and speeds
- Developing a 20mph speed limit area,
- Encouraging cycling and walking
- Parking - availability,
- Our public transport provision / car sharing
- Water / Sewage
- Electricity / broadband / telecommunication

- Renewable energy supplies
- Halls / shops / sports facilities / Medical

Our Local Economy

- Employment opportunities in the parish for all (young & older)
- How we can create jobs to help reduce commuting and attract more people into the parish
- What types of new business / employment opportunities would we like /do we need? – for example, trades, apprenticeships, agricultural, rural, retail, hospitality, light industrial,
- artisan, commercial, professional services, IT, tourism
- Where new employment should be located – village centre, out-of-village, brownfield sites
- The impact on business of local rents, rates, parking, demand for services and competition

Landscape/Natural environment & heritage

- How should we manage / develop our verges, greens woodlands, farmland, wildlife , sports grounds and other common areas
- Should we be better protecting / managing our trees
- Wider Community involvement in maintaining our open spaces and village aesthetics
- Opening the countryside for walkers, riders and cyclists
- Developing our footpaths and bridleways
- The relationship with the National Park
- Biodiversity of our gardens, verges, footpaths and open spaces
- Our waterways and other features
- Community gardens / allotments

Our Community Life

- What additional community facilities would you like to see
- What additional facilities for young people will be required
- How easily older people can use existing community facilities, what others are needed
- What support services will we needed
- How do we want to develop our community spirit
- How else should we be supporting one another

APPENDIX 2: Workshop ideas

The following ideas, comments, questions and forecasts (future *headlines*, in italics) were produced on post-it notes within each focus group at the Workshop in July 2013. Not all comments were given seriously, especially the more ironic ‘headlines’.

Landscape/Natural Environment and Heritage
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plan to encourage nature • Community re-engage with land and work it – horses and turnips! • Milland social enterprise • Farmers doing contracting work • Army/Landmarc involvement • Trees and hedgerows • Forestry • Verge trimming by locals, not WSCC contractors • Pushchairs over stiles – need gateways • Parking for walkers and cyclists • <i>Sheep seen in Milland</i> • Horses – go back to farming! • Swiftboxes etc part of planning aspect • Photovoltaic; Windfarms; Fracking • Allotments • Outsiders!

Local Economy

- Milland breathes life into local economy
- Leisure visitors to Milland
- Local businesses draw visitors to Milland
- Sympathetic businesses drawn to Milland
- Broadband unleashes economic opportunity
- Milland becomes a home working haven
- Equestrian business thrives
- Transport and access for HGVs and horse riders

Transport & Infrastructure

- *Hydroelectric plant opens (underground!)*
- More renewable energy
- Biomass/waste plant
- *Gas supplies switched on*
- Community groundsource heat pump – combined heat and power
- Cycle route to Liphook completed
- New heavy vehicle access created
- *Car sharing scheme celebrates 10th year*
- Bus on loop between Milland/Liphook/Petersfield
- Liphook community bus services
- *Ski lift to Liphook opened*
- *Boris bike scheme opens*
- Input of surrounding settlements
- *Whole parish receives 5Mb data*
- Parking – mesh on rec field for big events?
- Home delivery co-ordination scheme
- Improve road surface at busy junctions while maintaining character

Community Life

- A storage facility where people could take left over paint, wood off cuts, brick etc that could be re-used by other people
- Register of equipment that could be borrowed by members of the community
- Older people outreach and support – can attract funding if written into neighbourhood plan
- *Milland's Village Hall extension officially open*
- *Milland Youth club enjoys record number of members*
- *New bus service serves Milland*
- *Milland School rated No. 1 in Sussex*
- *Milland News publishes its biggest ever issue*
- *Village Party at the Green – All the Village was there!*
- *Millfest 2020 was bigger than Glastonbury*
- Fun events
- Facebook and parish email addresses
- 18–25-year-olds
- Free beer for all OAPs in the Rising Sun

Housing and Built Environment

- *Where has the beautiful Valley gone?*
- Only develop along the East/West road
- Housing for work/life opportunities
- Communication broadband etc
- Milland, a place where people can live and work
- Quality of architecture
- Quality of materials used
- Who says growth is necessary?

APPENDIX 3: Milland News articles

Throughout the pre-drafting and pre-submission periods, articles were published in *Milland News* at regular intervals. The most important of these articles appeared in the April 2013 issue, launching the MNP project, and in the December 2014 issue, outlining the main concepts that would form the basis of proposed policies. Other articles about the MNP appeared in the issues for June 2013, August 2013, October 2013, December 2013, February 2014, October 2014, February 2015, April 2015, June 2015 and August 2015. All of these articles can be seen in full in *MNDP Evidence Base Appendix IV, section 2.4*. The major **December 2014** article, originally published as a colour feature and written by the editor of *Milland News* (also the editor of the MNDP), is repeated below for easy reference (note that the editor's timetable for taking the MNDP to referendum was somewhat optimistic).

MILLAND NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

A Neighbourhood Plan gives voice to the needs and opinions of all those who live and work in a community about how their neighbourhood should develop over the next 15 years or so. In our case it covers the whole of the civil parish of Milland, an area of about 10½ square miles with a population (all ages) of around 890 people living in about 400 dwellings. A Neighbourhood Plan has much more weight than the well designed Milland Vision & Parish Plan of 2007 and, once approved by the community, it will form the basis on which all future planning applications will be decided. It also allows the community to express its aspirations for the future of the neighbourhood.

The Parish Council launched the idea of a Milland Neighbourhood Plan back in 2012. A steering group was formed and there was a well attended launch at an open meeting in the hall in July 2013, where the children were among those who expressed their thoughts about the future of Milland and where the meeting divided into groups to examine various aspects of a possible Neighbourhood Plan: the built environment; tourism; transport and infrastructure; local economy; community life; housing; landscape, natural environment and heritage.

It has to be admitted that, at the time, we were perhaps a little misled and over-ambitious. **The nitty gritty is that a Neighbourhood Plan is all about planned development** – sustainable development is the buzzword (which means that people need to think about the needs of future generations as well as their own). It arose from the **Localism Act of 2011** in which the stated aim was to **give people more control over what happened in their own community, rather than being told what to do by higher levels of local government or by the government itself**. Or that was the theory!

I have now been asked by the Parish Council to pull together a draft **Milland Neighbourhood Plan (MNP)** and to see it through to its conclusion.

Milland, as you know, is an oddity: it was only created as a civil parish in 1972 (by chopping off the northern extremes of four other parishes), its **core 'village'** has only developed around the Rising Sun crossroads since the mid 20th century and the rest of the parish comprises scattered farms, cottages and very **individual 'settlements'** ranging from Wheatsheaf Enclosure and Ripsley to Wardley, Borden Village and others, all with very different characters and needs. The MNP will respect those characters and needs.

To prepare the first draft, I have collated all the responses we received during 2013 from various groups and meetings and I then looked for the gaps. At the beginning of October I sent out about 130 emails to households in different parts of the parish not previously covered and most of you responded to my questionnaire, some at considerable length and all with invaluable comments. All of these recent responses have now been collated and the combined collations (about 60 pages so far in very small font) form the **evidence base** for my first draft of the Plan. I estimate that so far I have collated direct responses from about 280 of the 370 households (excluding second homes) and businesses in the parish.

From these and from a great deal of other background information (my table of source material likewise runs to many pages!) I drew up **detailed possible policies, supported by the evidence base**. I am now working on weaving these elements together to form the first draft of the Plan. The format is guided by NPs for other parishes as diverse as Edith Weston in Rutland and, nearer to home, Rogate, Kirdford, Loxwood and Fernhurst. I have looked at many other NPs all over the country as well. I want to liaise with neighbouring parishes, including Rogate and Fernhurst, but also Linch and Woolbeding-with-Redford, neither of which will be drawing

up their own NPs but both share challenges similar to those in Milland. I shall also work in very close co-operation with appropriate people at SDNPA.

What's in the Plan?

The **components of the Milland NP** will be:

1. Legislative background, purpose of Plan, background to its preparation
2. Description of the parish, its setting and history
3. The Plan:

Part 1: **Natural Environment and Countryside**

Part 2: **Cultural Heritage, Design and Settlement Strategy**

Part 3: **Accessibility and Infrastructure**

Part 4: **Housing**

Part 5: **Local Economy and Community**

I intend to stress the Part 1 section in particular, in keeping with the first priority of a National Park. I shall also stress that Milland's main challenges for any future development include its poor infrastructure (especially things like sewerage and communications networks), our narrow lanes and our scattered hamlets. I shall include quite a few **maps**, as they show at a glance what the text is referring to, especially for those who don't know Milland.

The main factors affecting the future development of the parish of Milland are:

- ***the importance of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty, landscape and cultural heritage of the parish within the National Park;***
- ***infrastructure;***
- ***narrow lanes;***
- ***the scattered nature and individuality of the parish's various 'settlements';***
- ***the desire to concentrate development within the core village.***

The broad summary below is drawn from a much larger number of more detailed policies that need to be seen within the context of the comprehensive evidence base that informs the draft Neighbourhood Plan and which you will be able to see and comment on when the first draft is completed.

THE MAJOR POLICIES FOR MILLAND CAN BE SUMMARISED AS FOLLOWS:

Part 1: Natural environment and countryside

- As a priority, the **natural environment**, natural resources, landscape, tranquillity and dark skies of the parish as a whole will be conserved, protected and enhanced.
- The exploitation of **renewable energy sources** on a commercial scale must ensure that the site is appropriate in terms of scale and visibility in the National Park landscape, that any pollution (noise, air, light etc) does not impinge on local residents, that no extra heavy-vehicle traffic is generated during installation or subsequent use of the facility and that the installation directly benefits the local community as a whole by supplying an alternative source of energy for use within the parish.
- The exploitation of underground **oil or natural gas reserves** within the parish will only be considered where the narrow lanes are not used by heavy vehicles and plant during the exploration, structural installation and subsequent servicing of the site.

Part 2: Cultural heritage, design and settlement strategy

- The **cultural heritage and general character** of the parish will be retained, especially the rural and largely scattered nature of its various settlements and including respect for vernacular building styles and materials.
- The individuality of each of the **scattered settlements** will be respected and enhanced.
- Development, if any, will be largely restricted to the **core village's existing developed land**.

Part 3: Accessibility and Infrastructure

- There will be no further building development unless and until certain aspects of the **infrastructure** have been successfully addressed (e.g. sewerage system, communications network, mains energy supplies).
- The **narrowness of local lanes** protects the area from an overburden of traffic and these roads will not be widened to accommodate larger vehicles or increased traffic flow.

Part 4: Housing

- Any new development that includes **affordable housing** will be based on proven local need that is not already met by existing affordable housing, with priority for those who have demonstrably strong family or work connections with Milland.

- **New housing** of any kind should be on identified brownfield sites within the core village and with an adequate ratio of built area to green space within the site. In the interests of social cohesion, preference will be given to mixed housing.
- Steps will be taken to ensure the continued availability of **smaller homes**.

Part 5: Local economy and Community

- Building development to support local employment will be on existing **business sites** within the core village or on identified brownfield sites, but only where infrastructure is sufficient and only for businesses that do not detract from the character of the area, do not disturb its tranquillity and are appropriate to a rural area, and only where they do not attract an increased use of local lanes by large vehicles.
- Development that encourages self-employment and **working from home** will be viewed favourably.
- Expansion of existing **community businesses** (e.g. pubs, shops, garages) will be encouraged if there is consent by the majority of the nearby population but only if the business provides adequate customer and trade parking within its own curtilage.
- **Agriculture, forestry and horticulture** will be supported. Diversification on farms will be supported where activities and structures do not detract from the environment or adversely affect tranquillity, wildlife and the landscape or place an unacceptable burden on local infrastructure.
- Sustainable agriculture and horticulture will be given priority over equine enterprises. Expansion of existing **equine enterprises**, or the creation of new ones, will only be permitted where it can be shown there will be no increase in horsebox or other traffic in the narrow lanes.
- Peaceful and appropriate **leisure activities** such as walking, cycling and horse riding will be encouraged, along with improvements to the network of public footpaths and bridleways, but noisy leisure activities will be discouraged.
- Development or extension of existing and new **community buildings** (e.g. halls, club houses, schools, medical centres) will be supported.
- **Open spaces** such as commons, woodland, village greens and community green spaces will be strongly protected from building development and from use for organised exclusive recreation such as golf courses.

The next stage

At the Parish Council meeting on 13 November, this summary of generalised policies was accepted. I can now work on completing the first draft to incorporate these policies and produce it in a presentable form so that it can be **put out to everybody in the community** (and to various statutory bodies) for their comments over a **consultation period** of at least 6 weeks. I hope to do this largely electronically, rather than printing out lots of copies, and will be in touch direct with all of you for whom I have email addresses. I intend to keep printing costs to a minimum throughout and at all stages I shall encourage people to read the draft online via the parish council website but will print out enough copies to be easily accessible to those who are not online; for example, copies will be placed in the shop, hall and other community venues, and on demand for those who want it. There will also be plenty of information regularly in *Milland News*.

Where appropriate, all the comments on the first draft will then be incorporated into a **revised draft** which, ultimately, will be submitted to an **independent examiner** selected by SDNPA. Once the draft meets with the examiner's approval (with changes where appropriate), it will become the **final draft ready for submission to the parish's referendum**. The referendum is open to everybody who is on the electoral roll for the parish of Milland, which at present means about **700 voters**.

At the referendum, the MNP must be taken as a whole: it is not possible at that late stage for people to select what they like and reject what they don't like. It's all or nothing: the 'selective' bit comes in considering the first draft, not the final one, so every effort will be made to ensure that you all have a chance to comment on the first draft. SDNPA will publicise the referendum and of course it will also be publicised by *Milland News*.

It takes a majority of only one vote for the Plan to be accepted, regardless of how low the turnout might be. So if only three people bother to vote and two of them say yes, the Plan is official. I am aiming to hold the referendum on the **same day as the general, district and parish council elections in May**, so that the turnout will be as high as possible and the parish will genuinely have its say.

If the referendum accepts the final draft, the Plan is thereafter the basis of the consideration of all Milland planning applications, whether by the parish council or the local planning authority, and is formally incorporated into the SDNPA Local Plan.

If you have any questions or opinions or thoughts please do not hesitate to contact me on 01428 741403, or by email to milland.news@virgin.net or drop me a note at West Kingsham, Cooks Pond Road, Milland GU30

7JY. My aim is to have listened to as many of you as possible, but I do need you to come forward if you haven't already been directly consulted. It is *your* Neighbourhood Plan.

In a nutshell, the Milland Neighbourhood Plan is designed to ensure that future generations can continue to enjoy what this rural parish's residents and businesses currently enjoy, and at the same time to enhance the parish's good qualities and provide the next generation with a springboard for its needs and aspirations. Each of us is only passing through, however long we live in the parish. Past generations have created our neighbourhood and, as its custodians, we need to ensure that it is something for the next generation to cherish and in which they can thrive.

APPENDIX 4: The Younger Generation

In **1989**, in their own contributions to the Parish Appraisal (*Milland: Yesterday, Today and Tomorrow*; see *MNDP Evidence Base Appendix III, section 1*), children aged 9 and 10 wrote about what they liked, or didn't like, about living in Milland.

In **2003**, *Milland News* ran a writing competition for local children to imagine what Milland would be like in 2050. Although the editorial team noticed that the subject must have been discussed in the classroom (many entries mentioned hover cars, robots, chocolate factories and heritage parks), some of the more thought-provoking ideas influenced the Milland Neighbourhood Development Plan a dozen years later. The children's visions for Milland in 2050 ranged from a quiet place not unlike today, to a suburb of the 'city' of Liphook or even to the village in Milland becoming a 'big town'.

Extracts from the 1989 and 2003 contributions from the younger generation are given in *MNDP Evidence Base Appendix III, section 7*. One of the most thoughtful from the 2003 ideas is repeated here for quick reference. It was submitted by a 14-year-old.

Milland 2050

Milland has changed a lot since 1950: we can expect more changes still by 2050. Milland will be a suburb of the city of Liphook. The fields will slowly disappear, as they are taken up by new housing. The huge demand for housing will be because Milland will be a designated spot for asylum seekers to settle; there won't be any room anywhere else. The long abandoned Rural Fair, no longer relevant in the urban 'community', will be happy nostalgia. If you ever mention Milland as being 'rural', people will take it as a joke. Anyway, there'll be no green space for it. In the centre of the town, there will be shops, such as Woolworths and Argos. The hotel 'The Rising Sun' will be popular among travelling business people. The unemployment rates will be high, as robots will do most of the work – from cleaning to shop keeping. This won't stop people moving here, it'll be preferable to the city of Liphook. There will be a museum dedicated to old pictures of Milland showing endless fields. People can wonder at how remote Milland used to be. At Christmas time, Millvale Meadows will be a national tourist attraction because of the spectacular Christmas lights (better than Blackpool!). The rest of the year, though, it will be a road of dreary flats. People that will live there will marvel at the thought that it used to be bungalows and houses with gardens. A typical child living in Milland will not go outside in case they are knocked down by rogue robot litter collectors; they will resort to playing computer games all day long (a bit like we do already!).

Ten years later, in July **2013** at the open meeting to launch the Milland Neighbourhood Plan project, the children of Hollycombe School were invited to make a presentation in the village hall. They took the trouble to produce their own video as well as an extensive display of imaginative posters. The following article published in the August 2013 issue of *Milland News* sums up the children's efforts.

Youthful visions

The highlight of the very well attended open meeting about the Neighbourhood Plan on 2 July 2013 was a video produced by the pupils of Hollycombe School explaining how they saw the future of Milland. They spoke to camera in ones, twos and threes and presented their ideas clearly and confidently, with a good spark of humour (and the occasional fit of giggles), albeit one or two of their aspirations might be hard to achieve in practical terms.

Nearly all of them mentioned '**nature**' as a priority, and many of them wanted to keep Milland green and tranquil but also wanted a bit of excitement. They concentrated on leisure activities and

sustainable transport, sometimes combining the two with considerable imagination. For example, they wanted a **zip-wire** for fun *and* as a means of transport around the Valley (I'm not sure what happens if you want to go uphill rather than down, but they also suggested **jet-packs** for personal transport). There was the interesting idea of a never-ending **railway** circuit around the whole area, with a walking-pace train so that you could hop on and off at useful points such as the school, the hall, the shop, the sports field, the pub or anywhere else whenever you wanted. They suggested a **tree trail** for adventure (perhaps inspired by last year's Rural Fair) and a **tree house** as the basis of a building and decorating practice area for children to develop new practical skills. They envisaged and illustrated an ambitiously large **underground leisure centre** beneath the Recreation Field (admirable multiple use of the available space!) which would include swimming pool, skating rink and so on, along with what I misheard as a Nerve Centre, which turned out to be a Nerf centre (foam-based toys, mainly weaponry like dart blasters, water guns and swords and video-game equipment but also soft balls for football, basketball and other sports). There would be a Frisbee court, carefully surrounded by netting to prevent injuries to bystanders, and a hedge maze. Other ideas included a **pet shop** and a **library**.

Huge congratulations to Amy Clark, who made the video: she obviously has a very promising career ahead of her! Many thanks to all the children and also to head Tamsin Austoni for inspiring them and working with them to meet our challenge. The future, of course, is for the young to enjoy and it is up to us as the present generation to keep Milland in good shape for their sake.

APPENDIX 5: Names of individuals

Most of the responses throughout the consultations came through group meetings but many others came from individuals direct to the steering group and the editor. In alphabetical order, the following individuals are known to have submitted comments at various stages of the process (the list does not include parish councillors and members of the steering group). It should be noted that in many cases, especially when responding to the questionnaire, individuals replied on behalf of other members of the same household, whose names are not necessarily included below. In addition, there appears to be a lack of record of all the names of those who joined various focus groups at the Workshop in July 2013. Therefore the list should be considerably longer.

Ablitt, John	Carter, Angela	Every, Simon
Ablitt, Rosemary	Carter, Robin	Fairhurst, Nicola
Allen, David	Cartwright, Juliet	Fairhurst, Trevor
Allen, Rob	Cartwright, Nigel	Farley, Alastair
Anderdon, James	Carver, Wyndham	Farwell, Robert
Appleton, Josie	Chatterton Newman, Roger	Flint, Alan
Austin, Suzanne	Cheeseman, Robert	Galbraith, Allan
Austoni, Tamsin	Coe, Andy	Gilliard, John
Aylwin, Lesley	Collier, John	Gilliard, Vivien
Barker, Will	Collins, Brendan	Goodbourn, Carrie
Bartlett, John	Collins, Claire	Granger, Miranda
Bartlett, Sue	Cusack, Mandy	Granger, Peter
Bates, Helen	Cusack, Matt	Grayson, Chris
Bates, Michael	Dale, James	Griffith, Jane
Bell, John	Davies, Mark	Griffith, Michael
Biggs, Penny	Dempsey, David	Grocott, Lea
Bird, John	Dew, Michael	Grocott, Lorraine
Bond, Annabelle	Doyle, Nick	Harding, Jane
Bore, Ann	Dryden, David	Hodson, Robert
Bore, John	Dryden, Sue	Holt, Polly
Calvert, Michael	Elliot, Ian	Hooper, Piers
Campbell, Audrey	Elliot, Marlene	Hooper, Sue
Carrington, Michelle	Evans, Robin	Hore, Peter

Hutton, Caroline
Iles, Stuart
Jackson, Francis
Jenner, Edward
Jenner, Kim
Jenner, Rob
Keegan, Gillian
Keith, Allen
Keohane, Mark
Lambotovi, Martina
Langley, Harry
Lickfold, David
Mason, Margaret
McLaren, Carol
Meyrick, Robert
Monk, Robert
Moore, Pam
Moore, Richard

Morton-Smith, Isabella
Ogilvie-Laing, Denise
Parker, Alison
Parker, Jeremy
Parkinson, Simon
Pendleton, Michael
Porter, Sharon
Porter, Sharon
Pownall, John
Price, Janet
Pudge, Connie
Pudge, Simon
Quinnell, Robin
Russell, Martin
Russell, Sue
Scott, David
Sentance, Carol
Stayte, Dennis

Stopher, Colin
Stump, Duncan
Taylor, Jen
Thomas, Gill
Thomas, Peter
Thomson, John
Todd, David
Truss, Maureen
Turton, Mary
Turton, Trevor
Valler, John
Webb, Stuart
Wigram, John
Wild, Ralph
Williams, Hugh
Williams, Lulu
Willson, Katerina

APPENDIX 6: Comments from Andy Coe

During the pre-submission draft consultation period lengthy comments were received from one individual, Mr Andy Coe, who owns a property in Milland but has lived and worked overseas for some time. The comments, which in contrast to other responses were highly critical of the draft MNP, included detailed points set out in an email dated 27 May 2015 to which was attached a heavily annotated copy of the April 2015 draft MNP. The email (below) was addressed to most members of the parish council (rather than the steering group), copied to the editor, and was immediately forwarded by the editor to SDNPA for information. The five parish councillors who were also part of the steering group took the trouble to respond to Mr Coe's original email individually and at some length, in essence expressing concern that many of his views would result in more extensive development than the majority of respondents would find acceptable and that changes in thinking by SDNPA and other bodies in recent months were not reflected in his comments. There was particular disappointment at his implication that consultation by the steering group had not be wide enough, though he had not had access to the MNDP Evidence Base and, being no longer resident, must have been unaware of the major efforts undertaken by the steering group to reach every part of the community by a wide variety of means. In general, the steering group members did not feel that Mr Coe's views represented those of the wider community as shown in the Evidence Base. Mr Coe (9 June) responded direct and at considerable length to the parish councillors who had contacted him with their comments on his circular email.

Mr Coe subsequently requested a personal meeting with SDNPA officers, which took place in July 2015 while he was briefly back in the country, but no notes of that meeting have been made available to the steering group. There was some concern that an individual should take up the SDNPA officers' time in this way rather than, like all others in the community, responding to the steering group during the various consultation periods. The points expressed by Mr Coe have been taken into *MNDP Evidence Base Appendix VII, Table C*, along with comments on how they have or have not been addressed in the final MNDP. The email was as follows.

Please find below my feedback on the draft Neighbourhood Plan as it has been developed so far. Below I make some general observations and suggestions and have attached the .doc version with more specific comments and suggestions.

[Framing my perspective](#)

As those of you who know me will know I have been a part of the Milland community since 2004. I have always been a supporter of improvement and advancement and personally put a lot of time and effort (like a lot of others) into ensuring that Milland was moving forward in an appropriate and forward looking way for the benefit of all. Although at the moment I do not reside in the Parish I will return there and I would to return to a Village that has continued to moved forward in a way which can be a beacon of good practice to similar communities in the National Park and is a community which is successful and sustainable for all. (This includes being socially balanced for all generations, economically successful and environmentally sustainable).

The concept of Neighbourhood Planning

When Peter Harvey and I started the process of the Neighbourhood Plan there were a few key concepts which were strongly emphasised by the SDNP. They were that the plan should:

- Be forward looking and not be used to prevent sustainable development
- Ensure that the community plans and supports its future
- Be evidence based
- Be an inclusive process
- Be adopted by the majority of the community in a referendum
- Be built with and adopted by the SDNP

As far as I am aware these key concepts haven't changed greatly so I am concerned that the current draft in circulation falls short in relation to the first four bullets. It is extremely evident that the document is loaded with one particular view point.

My Observations and comments on the current draft

I have made specific comments in to the attached draft but my overall impression is that the whole tone of the existing document and the detailed Policies it includes have been written based on the pre-assumption that any development is detrimental, will be very limited and / or completely throttled until the sewage pump problem is resolved or and all the power lines are buried. Even the photo's on the front page exclude any of the built environment and although they represent the rural environment very well they have clearly be chosen to reflect one view of the Parish. The document is very short of any evidence to back the heavy doses of "opinion". There are many examples where opinion has been framed as fact. There are several areas where professional assessment and evidence needs to be supplied. Without balanced, objective, data support evidence there is no ability to support the conclusions drawn.

The "Vision Statement" as current worded is basically saying that nothing should change.

A Vision statement, by definition should be "Visionary". It should:

- Define the optimal desired future state - the mental picture - of what needs to be achieved over time
- Provide guidance and inspiration as to what should be focused on achieving in five, ten, or more years
- Function as the "north star" - it is what everyone will work towards
- Be written succinctly in an inspirational manner to it can easily be recalled by all involved

In organisations a Vision is generally built after having done a balanced assessment of the Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats. I believe this kind of exercise needs to be completed so that a true "Vision Statement" can be developed.

My quick assessment would read as follows: (this needs more work: I'd be quite happy to work with others on this when I am back in the village in July or before over the wires if necessary)

Strengths:

Strong sense of community and heritage

A broad mix of skilled and proactive people

Diverse natural and built environment

Clear core village and hamlets with space for infill

A sustainable balance of facilities (thriving school, Pub, Shop, Sports facilities, Community Halls, Churches)

Established thriving Local, Rural, Farming, Equine, Recreational, Tourism and other economic successes and opportunities

Proximity to good communications and arterial road infrastructure

Weaknesses:

Current traditional infrastructure problems(Primarily the foul drainage pumping plant)

Constricted entrance to the village specifically via Milland Lane and Stubbs Hill
Some disruption to services in extreme weather
Lack of smaller lower cost housing for local younger working generation.
Lack of live / work units
Lack of smaller retirement units with suitable support
Lack of local support of public transport

Opportunities:

Further development of existing and new local businesses
Opportunity to develop renewable energy sources
Space to develop within boundaries of existing core village and hamlets
Further enhancement of community facilities and support services
Enhancement of access via Rake Road

Threats;

Blindness to the real needs and opportunities (Nimbyism)
Lack of proactive strategic foresight and will to take control of the future
Danger of missing out on opportunity to other local communities
Loss of current local facilities if not economically sustainable
Missed opportunity to increase local employment

An alternative Vision Statement to the one in the current draft

To protect the heritage and proactively enhance the structural, social, economic and environmental interests of the Milland Parish to enable an environment in which all generations and demographic of people can be successful and be educated, live, work and play in a supportive community.

We will do this by:

- Over coming the existing structural frustrations and making use of innovative technologies
- Improving the quality of access to the village via the Rake Road
- Being innovative in identifying suitable locations within current boundaries for development of economically and environmentally sustainable live / work and accommodation units to meet local needs
- Ensure the infrastructure, facilities and services provided supports a balanced generational and social economic profile
- Continue to support recreational infrastructure for the local population
- Work with the SDNP to develop the Parish as a leading example in of a sustainable rural community.

This kind of statement should then be underpinned by a set of Policies which are positively worded to enable the above. Many of the existing areas suggested in the draft can be re-engineered to this more positive stance. Most of them are currently written to restrict, ban and contain!!

My other key concern is that the current document doesn't contain the evidence required by the Neighbourhood Planning process. There needs to be records of meeting outcomes, names, dates of those consulted, professional assessments etc. As noted in my attached comments there are many instances where pure opinion has been promoted with no evidence or professional support.

I was responsible for driving the development of the Parish Plan back in 2007. This was a highly consultative process with a number of public meeting and numerous meetings with all the key groups in the parish which generated outputs which were captured and presented in a common format. The same kind of process needs to be conducted for this plan. At the beginning of the process for this Neighbourhood Plan I had initial meetings with David Scott of Scott Labels, The Milland Business Forum, The sports club, The Liphook Equine Hospital, The Wheatsheaf Enclosure, The Hollycombe school and others. I recorded the outcomes and handed these over before leaving for South Africa. The views I collected have not been adequately represented in this draft which is concerning as the reflected a very different view from that currently presented.

I hope this feedback is taken constructively. I am willing to help out more to ensure that all views are considered, that the plan is professionally evidenced and that it is based on building a positive, forward looking and thriving rural community.