

Copthorne Neighbourhood Plan Decision Statement – 26th July 2021

1. Introduction

- 1.1. Under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended), Mid Sussex District Council has a statutory duty to assist communities in the preparation of neighbourhood development plans and orders and to take plans through a process of examination and referendum. The Localism Act 2011 (Part 6 chapter 3) sets out the Local Planning Authority's responsibilities under Neighbourhood Planning.
- 1.2. This statement confirms that the modifications proposed by the Examiner's report have been accepted, the draft Copthorne Neighbourhood Development Plan will be altered as a result of it; and that this plan can proceed to referendum.

2. Background

- 2.1. The Copthorne Neighbourhood Development Plan relates to the area that was designated by Mid Sussex District Council as a neighbourhood area in July 2012. This area corresponds with the Copthorne and Worth ward boundary that lies within Mid Sussex District.
- 2.2. Following the submission of the Copthorne Neighbourhood Development Plan to the District Council, the plan was publicised and representations were invited. The formal publicity period ended on Wednesday 24th March 2021.
- 2.3. Mr Andrew Ashcroft BA (Hons) MA, DMS, MRTPI was appointed by Mid Sussex District Council with the support of Worth Parish Council, to undertake the examination of the Copthorne Neighbourhood Development Plan and to prepare a report of the independent examination.
- 2.4. The Examiner's report concludes that subject to making the recommended modifications recommended, the Plan meets the basic conditions set out in the legislation and should proceed to a Neighbourhood Planning referendum.

3. Decision

- 3.1. The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 requires the local planning authority to outline what action to take in response to the recommendations of an examiner made in a report under paragraph 10 of Schedule 4A to the 1990 Act (as applied by Section 38A of the 2004 Act) in relation to a neighbourhood development plan.
- 3.2. Having considered each of the recommendations made by the Examiner's report, and the reasons for them, Mid Sussex District Council in consultation with Worth Parish Council have decided to accept the modifications to the draft plan. Table 1 below outlines the alterations made to the draft plan under paragraph 12(6) of Schedule 4B to the 1990 Act (as applied by Section 38A of 2004 Act) in response to each of the Examiner's recommendations. The reasons set out have in some cases been paraphrased from the Examiners report for conciseness. This statement should be read alongside the [Examiner's Report](#).
- 3.3. If a Local Planning Authority is satisfied that, subject to the modifications being made, the Neighbourhood Plan meets the legal requirements and basic conditions then it can proceed to Referendum.

The paragraph numbering refers to the submission version of the Copthorne Neighbourhood Plan.

Table 1 Examiner's recommended modifications for the Copthorne Neighbourhood Plan and the Council's decision

Examiner's Recommended Modifications	Justification	Decision
1. Introduction		
<p>Include a map to show the boundaries of the neighbourhood area</p> <p>At the end of paragraph 1.3 add: 'The neighbourhood area is shown on Map [insert number]'</p>	To clearly identify the boundaries of the neighbourhood area.	Accepted
Monitoring and Review of the Plan		
<p>Add a new paragraph (1.15) to the Plan to read:</p> <p>'The Parish Council will put measures in place to monitor the effectiveness of the policies in this Plan up to 2031. This process will underpin any decisions on the need or otherwise for the Plan to be reviewed and/or updated. The adoption of the emerging Site Allocations DPD will be an important milestone in the formulation of the wider development plan. In this context the Parish Council will assess the need for any review or update of a made neighbourhood plan within twelve months of the adoption of the DPD'</p>	For clarity purposes.	Accepted
Policy CNP1 General Development Requirements		
<p>In Policy CNP1.2 replace 'unreasonable' with 'unacceptable'</p> <p>In Policy CNP1.3 replace 'possible' with 'practicable'</p> <p>Replace Policy CNP1.5 with: 'Development proposals should be designed and arranged to maintain the separation between Copthorne Village and other surrounding settlements'</p> <p>In Policy CNP1.6 replace 'permitted' with 'supported'</p> <p>The amended part of the policy will read as follows:</p> <p>CNP1.2 Proposals for new development should not cause unreasonable unacceptable harm to the amenity (including general activity, access,</p>	For clarity purposes.	Accepted

Examiner's Recommended Modifications	Justification	Decision
<p>noise, privacy, daylight, and sunlight) of existing and future occupants, both on site and nearby.</p> <p>CNP1.3 Proposals should retain features such as shaws, hedgerows, ponds and brooks, and enhance them, where possible <u>practicable</u>.</p> <p>CNP1.5 Development proposals should be laid out to maintain the perception of separation between Copthorne Village and other surrounding settlements. <u>Development proposals should be designed and arranged to maintain the separation between Copthorne Village and other surrounding settlements.</u></p> <p>CNP 1.6 Extensions to existing buildings will be permitted <u>supported</u> provided they adhere to other policies in the development plan and:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Are no higher than the existing building. (b) Do not conflict with traditional boundary treatment of an area. (c) Use materials which are compatible with materials of existing/surrounding buildings. 		
CNP2 redevelopment and Infill Development within the Defined Built-up area		
<p>Replace the opening part of the policy with: 'Proposals for redevelopment and infill development within the defined built-up area will be supported subject to the following criteria:'</p> <p>In b replace 'detriment' with 'causing unacceptable harm'</p> <p>In c replace 'Does not cause unreasonable harm' with 'The new development will not cause unacceptable harm'</p> <p>The policy as amended will read as follows:</p> <p>CNP2.1 Redevelopment and infill development is supported within the defined built up area subject to meeting the following criteria: <u>Proposals for redevelopment and infill development within the built-up area will be supported subject to the following criteria:</u></p>	<p>For clarity purposes.</p>	<p>Accepted</p>

Examiner's Recommended Modifications	Justification	Decision
<p>(a) The new development will not appear incongruous with the existing character and/or street scene, ensuring the proposed materials, plot size, boundary treatment, built form, building line and gaps between buildings is like those around it.</p> <p>(b) Suitable access and on-site parking are provided without detriment <u>causing unacceptable harm</u> to neighbouring properties, pavements, pathways, footpaths, cycle paths, bridleways, established tracks, twittens, and other Rights of Way.</p> <p>(c) Does not cause unreasonable harm <u>The new development will not cause unacceptable harm</u> to the amenity of existing and future occupants, both on site and nearby by way of general activity, access, noise, privacy, dominance, daylight, and sunlight.</p>		
Policy CNP3 Homes for Older People		
<p>In Policy CNP 3.1 replace 'be refused' with 'not be supported'</p> <p>Replace Policy CNP 3.2 with: 'Residential developments which incorporate smaller and accessible homes that meet the needs of older people will be particularly supported'</p> <p>Replace Policy CNP 3.3 with: 'Residential developments which achieve a minimum of M4(2) of the optional requirements in the Building Regulations will be particularly supported'</p> <p>The policy as amended will read as follows:</p> <p>Development proposals that would result in the net loss of single storey residential floorspace will be refused <u>not be supported</u>.</p> <p>Major development incorporating residential dwellings must include smaller and accessible homes that meet the needs of older people. <u>Residential developments which incorporate smaller and accessible homes that meet the needs of older people will be particularly supported.</u></p> <p>In addition to the requirements of Policy DP28 in the Mid Sussex Local Plan, all</p>	<p>To offer support to development types coming forward rather than placing requirement without the appropriate assessment of the implications of the requirement on commercial viability.</p>	<p>Accepted</p>

Examiner's Recommended Modifications	Justification	Decision
<p>new dwellings (regardless of size, type or tenure) should achieve a minimum of M4(2) of the optional requirements in the Building Regulations, unless it can be demonstrated that to do so would make the proposal unviable. <u>Residential developments which achieve a minimum of M4(2) of the optional requirements in the Building Regulations will be particularly supported</u></p>		
<p>Policy CNP4 Important Community Facilities</p>		
<p>In Policy CNP4.1 delete the Prince Albert P.H. (j)</p> <p>In Policy CNP 4.2 replace 'should be refused' with 'will not be supported'</p> <p>Replace Policy CNP4.3 with: 'Proposals that would involve the relocation of an Important Community Facility elsewhere within the neighbourhood area will be supported where the new location is easily and safely accessible to the local community by foot or cycle'</p> <p>The policy as amended will read as follows:</p> <p>CNP4.1 The following facilities, as identified on the Policies Map, are designated as Important Community Facilities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Copthorne Surgery (b) Copthorne C of E Junior School (c) Fairway Infant School (d) Copthorne Village Hall (e) Delmar Morgan Centre (f) Copthorne Parish Hub (g) St John the Evangelist C of E Church (h) Copthorne Post Office (i) Copthorne Social Club (j) The Prince Albert Public House (k) Copthorne Scout & Guide Centre <p>CNP4.2 Development proposals that would result in the loss of an Important Community Facility (whether that be the actual facility/building or the use of the facility/building), should be refused <u>will not be supported</u></p>	<p>To avoid the public house being affected by two similar but not identical policies.</p> <p>For clarity purposes.</p>	<p>Accepted</p>

Examiner's Recommended Modifications	Justification	Decision
<p>unless it can be demonstrated that the use and building is no longer required.</p> <p>CNP4.3 Proposals that would involve the Important Community Facility being relocated to elsewhere within the Plan Area may be considered acceptable where the new location is easily and safely accessible by foot or cycle. <u>Proposals that would involve the relocation of an Important Community Facility elsewhere within the neighbourhood area will be supported where the new location is easily and safely accessible to the local community by foot or cycle</u></p>		
Policy CNP5 Conversion of Public Houses		
<p>In Policy CNP 5.1 replace 'permitted with supported' and add 'commercially' before 'viable'</p> <p>Replace Policy CNP 5.2 with: 'If it can be demonstrated that the existing use is not commercially viable development proposals should demonstrate that the site has been fully considered for another community use and that such uses are also not commercially viable'</p> <p>The policy as amended will read as follows:</p> <p>CNP5.1 Proposals which would result in the loss of a public house will not be permitted <u>supported</u> unless it can be demonstrated that the existing use is no longer <u>commercially</u> viable.</p> <p>CNP5.2 If it can be demonstrated that the existing use is not viable the applicant must demonstrate that the applicant has sought to use the site for another community use before considering other uses (such as residential). Other community uses could include combining the public house function with that of a shop, post office, bed and breakfast or self-catering facility. <u>If it can be demonstrated that the existing use is not commercially viable development proposals should demonstrate that the site has been fully considered for another community use and that such uses are also not commercially viable</u></p>	<p>For clarity purposes.</p>	<p>Accepted</p>

Examiner's Recommended Modifications	Justification	Decision
Policy CNP5 Conversion of Public Houses – Supporting text		
At the end of paragraph 5.6 add: 'Policy CNP5.2 addresses this important matter. It requires that other community facilities are fully assessed before considering the acceptability of non-community uses (such as residential). Other community uses could include combining the public house function with that of a shop, post office, bed and breakfast or self-catering facility'	For clarity purposes.	Accepted
Policy CNP6 Assets of Community Value		
Delete the policy Delete paragraphs 5.7 to 5.11	The policy is appropriate in general terms. However, its approach is confusing for two reasons. The first is that its approach towards the existing ACV (the PH) is dissimilar to that in the policy which specifically comments about the P.H (CNP5). The second is that there are no other ACVs to which the policy would also apply.	Accepted
Policy CNP7 Local Green Space		
Replace Policy CNP7.2 with: 'Proposals for development on a Local Green Space will not be supported except in very special circumstances.' The amended part of the policy will read as follows: CNP7.2 There will be a presumption against all development on Local Green Space except in very special circumstances. Such circumstances could include: (a) The proposal is of a limited nature and it can be clearly demonstrated that it is required to enhance the role and function of an identified Local Green Space; or (b) The proposal would result in the development of local community infrastructure and be of an appropriate and limited nature, so as not to prevent the use, role and function of the local green space. <u>Proposals for development on a Local Green Space will not be supported except in very special circumstances.</u>	For consistency with the NPPF.	Accepted

Examiner's Recommended Modifications	Justification	Decision
Policy CNP7 Local Green Space – Supporting text		
<p>At the end of paragraph 9.3.9 add: 'Policy CNP7 applies the restrictive policy approach towards development proposals on designated local green spaces. Very special circumstances can be considered by the District Council on a case-by-case basis. Such circumstances could include two specific matters. The first is where the proposal is of a limited nature and it can be clearly demonstrated that it is required to enhance the role and function of an identified Local Green Space. The second is where the proposal would result in the development of local community infrastructure and be of an appropriate and limited nature, so as not to prevent the use, role and function of the local green space concerned'</p>	<p>For information.</p>	<p>Accepted</p>
Policy CNP8 Parish Heritage Assets		
<p>In Policy CNP8.1 replace 'possible' with 'practicable'</p> <p>Replace CNP8.2 with: 'The effect of a development proposal on the significance of a Parish Heritage Asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect a Parish Heritage Asset, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the Asset concerned'</p> <p>The policy as amended will read as follows:</p> <p>CNP8.1 Development proposals will be supported where they protect and, where possible <u>practicable</u>, enhance Parish Heritage Assets as identified on the Neighbourhood Plan Policies Map. The Parish Heritage Assets are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Rowfant Station (b) Rose Cottage (formerly Rowfant Station House) (c) The Prince Albert Public House (d) Church of St John the Evangelist (e) Lych Gate (f) Copthorne CE Junior School (g) Claremont (former butcher's shop) (h) The Old Bakery 	<p>To ensure that the policy has regard to national policy.</p>	<p>Accepted</p>

Examiner's Recommended Modifications	Justification	Decision
<p>CNP8.2 All proposals that directly impact Parish Heritage Assets, or the setting thereof, must describe the impact of the development on the significance of the heritage asset, demonstrating that the significance of that asset will not be adversely impacted. <u>The effect of a development proposal on the significance of a Parish Heritage Asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect a Parish Heritage Asset, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the Asset concerned</u></p>		
7. Character Areas		
<p>At the end of paragraph 7.4 add: 'Certain types of development may alter one or more positive aspects that make up the Character Area. This will be acceptable if its overall character and role is not compromised and measures are taken to limit any impacts through mitigation, and where possible, enhancement. For example, this may involve the strengthening of other positive aspects of the area's character or general enhancement to the area through increased biodiversity, green links and other mitigation measures. Clearly this approach will reflect the scale and nature of development proposals and the Character Area in which they are located'</p>	For clarity purposes.	Accepted
Policy CNP9 CA1: The High Weald AONB		
<p>Replace Policy CNP9.1 with: 'As appropriate to their scale and nature development proposals within the defined Character Area 1 - The High Weald AONB (as shown on the Policies Map) should deliver high quality development which takes account of their immediate locality. In particular development proposals should sustain and where practicable reinforce the positive aspects of the character area and respond positively to the identified sensitivity to change matters included in sections 4.1 and 4.2 of the Copthorne Heritage and Character Assessment (May 2019)'</p> <p>Replace Policy CNP9.2 with: 'Proposals for additional buildings at Worth Hall should incorporate appropriate vegetation/screening to respect its wider rural setting and character'</p> <p>In Policy CNP9.3 replace 'should be avoided as these can degrade the overall</p>	For clarity purposes.	Accepted

Examiner's Recommended Modifications	Justification	Decision
<p>rural character' with 'which would detract unacceptably from the rural character of their immediate location will not be supported'</p> <p>Replace Policy CNP9.4 with: 'Development proposals should have regard to the objectives of the High Weald AONB Management Plan 2019-24 and demonstrate that they meet the relevant elements of these objectives for this nationally important landscape'</p> <p>The policy as amended will read as follows:</p> <p>CNP9.1 Development proposals must sustain or reinforce the positive aspects that make up the individual character and distinctiveness of CA1 (as shown on the Policies Map. The positive aspects are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) That buildings are dispersed and generally rural in character. (b) A good network of PReWs including bridleways; (c) Predominantly rural land uses absent of urbanised areas; (d) A variety of habitats including scrub, woodland, ponds and streams, with mature specimen trees in agricultural fields; (e) Dense woodland lining the M23 that acts as a buffer, protecting the wider CA from visual and noise effects or the motorway and Crawley to the west. <p>Certain types of development may alter one or more positive aspects that make up the Character Area. This is acceptable if its overall character and role is not compromised and measures are taken to limit any impacts through mitigation, and where possible, enhancement. For example, this may be the strengthening of other positive aspects of the area's character or general enhancement to the area through increased biodiversity, green links and other mitigation measures.</p> <p><u>As appropriate to their scale and nature development proposals within the defined Character Area 1 - The High Weald AONB (as shown on the Policies Map) should deliver high quality development which takes account of their immediate locality. In particular development proposals should sustain and where practicable reinforce the positive aspects of the character area and respond positively to the identified sensitivity to</u></p>		

Examiner's Recommended Modifications	Justification	Decision
<p><u>change matters included in sections 4.1 and 4.2 of the Copthorne Heritage and Character Assessment (May 2019)</u></p> <p>CNP9.2 The cluster of commercial operations at Worth Hall is incongruous with the overarching rural character of the area. Proposals for additional built form should incorporate appropriate vegetation/screening to enhance the wider rural character. <u>Proposals for additional buildings at Worth Hall should incorporate appropriate vegetation/screening to respect its wider rural setting and character.</u></p> <p>CNP9.3 Proposals that would result in the loss of or change of use of rural buildings or farmsteads to commercial or light industrial ventures should be avoided as these can degrade the overall rural character which would detract unacceptably from the rural character of their immediate location will not be supported.</p> <p>CNP9.4 Proposals must have regard to the objectives of the High Weald AONB Management Plan 2019-24. Development must demonstrate that it meets relevant elements of these objectives for this nationally important landscape. <u>Development proposals should have regard to the objectives of the High Weald AONB Management Plan 2019-24 and demonstrate that they meet the relevant elements of these objectives for this nationally important landscape.</u></p>		
Policy CNP9 CA1: The High Weald AONB – Supporting text		
<p>At the end of paragraph 7.5 add: 'The cluster of commercial operations at Worth Hall is incongruous with the overarching rural character of the area. Policy CNP9.2 seeks to mitigate the effects of any new development at this location'</p> <p>At the end of paragraph 7.7 add:</p> <p>'Policy CNP9 sets out a policy approach for the High Weald AONB Character Area. It draws on the findings of the Heritage and Character Appraisal. It requires that development proposals should sustain and where practicable</p>	For clarity purposes.	Accepted

Examiner's Recommended Modifications	Justification	Decision
<p>reinforce the positive aspects of the character area and respond positively to the identified sensitivity to change matters.</p> <p>The positive aspects are as follows: [List the bullet points from paragraph 4.2.1 of the Assessment]</p> <p>The identified sensitivity to change matters are as follows: [List the bullet points from paragraph 4.2.3 of the Assessment]</p> <p>The policy has been designed to be complementary to the High Weald AONB Management Plan. This matter is addressed in Policy CNP 9.4'</p>		
Policy CNP10 CA2: Agricultural Belt		
<p>Replace Policy CNP10.1 with: 'As appropriate to their scale and nature development proposals within the defined Character Area 2 - The Agricultural Belt (as shown on the Policies Map) should deliver high quality development which takes account of their immediate locality. In particular development proposals should sustain and where practicable reinforce the positive aspects of the character area and respond positively to the identified sensitivity to change matters included in sections 4.3, 4.4 and 4.5 of the Cophorne Heritage and Character Assessment (May 2019)'</p> <p>Replace the second sentence of Policy CNP10.2 with: 'Development proposals for new clusters of commercial development will not be supported'</p> <p>Replace Policy CNP10.3 with: 'Insofar as planning permission is required proposals for new woodland or the reinforcement of existing woodland along the M23 will be supported'</p> <p>The policy as amended will read as follows:</p> <p>CNP10.1 Development proposals must sustain or reinforce the positive aspects that make up the individual character and distinctiveness of CA2 (as shown on the Policies Map). The positive aspects are:</p> <p>(a) The remnants of the former estate associated with Rowfant</p>	<p>For clarity purposes.</p>	<p>Accepted</p>

Examiner's Recommended Modifications	Justification	Decision
<p>House.</p> <p>(b) Network of PPOWs across the CA which includes the Worth Way /Sussex Border Path;</p> <p>(c) Few public roads, agricultural land uses and blocks of woodland creating a tranquil and rural character.</p> <p>(d) The series of millponds located along watercourses, and the suite recreational activities these provide (such as fisheries).</p> <p>(e) Consistent low density, high boundary treatments and large front gardens of built form.</p> <p>(f) Historic sunken lanes, such as Old Hollow.</p> <p>(g) Characteristically rural views from PPOWs from within the CA including typical features such as mill ponds, woodland and agricultural land.</p> <p>Certain types of development may alter one or more positive aspects that make up the Character Area. This is acceptable if its overall character and role is not compromised and measures are taken to limit any impacts through mitigation, and where possible, enhancement. For example, this may be the strengthening of other positive aspects of the area's character or general enhancement to the area through increased biodiversity, green links and other mitigation measures.</p> <p><u>As appropriate to their scale and nature development proposals within the defined Character Area 2 - The Agricultural Belt (as shown on the Policies Map) should deliver high quality development which takes account of their immediate locality. In particular development proposals should sustain and where practicable reinforce the positive aspects of the character area and respond positively to the identified sensitivity to change matters included in sections 4.3, 4.4 and 4.5 of the Cophorne Heritage and Character Assessment (May 2019).</u></p> <p>CNP10.2 Development proposals associated with existing clusters of commercial development should incorporate appropriate vegetation/screening to enhance the wider agricultural character. Proposals that would create new clusters of commercial development</p>		

Examiner's Recommended Modifications	Justification	Decision
<p>should be refused <u>Development proposals for new clusters of commercial development will not be supported.</u></p> <p>CNP10.3 Proposals which create or reinforce woodland along the M23 will be supported as they will improve the tranquillity and rural character of the area <u>Insofar as planning permission is required proposals for new woodland or the reinforcement of existing woodland along the M23 will be supported.</u></p>		
Policy CNP10 CA2: Agricultural Belt – Supporting text		
<p>At the end of paragraph 7.9 add:</p> <p>'Policy CNP10 sets out a policy approach for the Agricultural Belt Character Area. It draws on the findings of the Heritage and Character Appraisal. It requires that development proposals should sustain and where practicable reinforce the positive aspects of the character area and respond positively to the identified sensitivity to change matters.</p> <p>The positive aspects are as follows: [List the bullet points from paragraph 4.5 of the Assessment]</p> <p>The identified sensitivity to change matters are as follows: [List the bullet points from paragraph 4.5.2 of the Assessment]</p> <p>Policy CNP 10.3 offers support for new or consolidated woodland areas adjacent to the M23. Development of this type will improve the tranquillity and rural character of the area'</p>	For clarity purposes.	Accepted
Policy CNP11 CA3: Copthorne Common and Woodland		
<p>Replace Policy CNP11.1 with: 'As appropriate to their scale and nature development proposals within the defined Character Area 3 - The Copthorne Common and Woodland Character Area (as shown on the Policies Map) should deliver high quality development which takes account of their immediate locality. In particular development proposals should sustain and where practicable reinforce the positive aspects of the character area and respond positively to the identified sensitivity to change matters included in sections 4.6 and 4.7 of the</p>	For clarity purposes.	Accepted

Examiner's Recommended Modifications	Justification	Decision
<p>Copthorne Heritage and Character Assessment (May 2019)'</p> <p>Replace Policy CNP11.2 with: 'Proposals for commercial uses on the A2220 and A264 Copthorne Common Road will not be supported'</p> <p>Replace Policy CNP11.3 with 'Where it is practicable to do so development proposals should reduce the severance caused by the primary roads (including the M23, A2220 and A264) by providing improved pedestrian accessibility'</p> <p>Delete Policy CNP11.4</p> <p>Replace CNP 11.5 with: 'Development proposals should be designed to minimise the extent and significance of manmade features in views of agricultural landscapes, such as pylons, agricultural vehicles or caravans'</p> <p>The policy as amended will read as follows:</p> <p>CNP11.1 Development proposals must sustain or reinforce the positive aspects that make up the individual character and distinctiveness of CA3 (as shown on the Policies Map). The positive aspects are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) The large number of mainly 19th century cottages attests to the area's recent past and adds character to the area. The majority are kept in good condition and while amendments have been made the worst excesses of late 20th century home improvement have been avoided. The larger properties have also been well kept which adds to the area's character. (b) The extensive network of paths including the long distance Sussex Border Path; (c) The roundabout on Copthorne Common Road (A2220) acts as a node and a gateway to the settlement of Copthorne; (d) Large areas of woodland which have a high degree of connectivity stretching across the CA west to east and have a rural character and provide a sense of enclosure and tranquillity; (e) Large areas of common land within the CA well connected to the 		

Examiner's Recommended Modifications	Justification	Decision
<p>PRoWs and easily accessed from the surrounding settlements and feature areas important for biodiversity;</p> <p>(f) Views typically are of rural landscapes; either of woodland or agricultural landscapes;</p> <p>(g) Copthorne Common and rural areas surrounding Copthorne provide a verdant backdrop for the settlement; and</p> <p>(h) The area of Copthorne Common within the settlement envelope of Copthorne north of Copthorne Common Road bringing green infrastructure into the settlement</p> <p>Certain types of development may alter one or more positive aspects that make up the Character Area. This is acceptable if its overall character and role is not compromised and measures are taken to limit any impacts through mitigation, and where possible, enhancement. For example, this may be the strengthening of other positive aspects of the area's character or general enhancement to the area through increased biodiversity, green links and other mitigation measures.</p> <p><u>As appropriate to their scale and nature development proposals within the defined Character Area 3 - The Copthorne Common and Woodland Character Area (as shown on the Policies Map) should deliver high quality development which takes account of their immediate locality. In particular development proposals should sustain and where practicable reinforce the positive aspects of the character area and respond positively to the identified sensitivity to change matters included in sections 4.6 and 4.7 of the Copthorne Heritage and Character Assessment (May 2019)</u></p> <p>CNP11.2 Proposals for commercial uses on the A2220 and A264 Copthorne Common Road or uses that serve the nearby urban areas are incongruous with the otherwise rural setting and should be refused. Proposals for commercial uses on the A2220 and A264 Copthorne Common Road will not be supported.</p> <p>CNP11.3 Development proposals should actively seek to reduce the severance</p>		

Examiner's Recommended Modifications	Justification	Decision
<p>caused by the primary roads (including the M23, A2220 and A264) by providing improved pedestrian accessibility. <u>Where it is practicable to do so development proposals should reduce the severance caused by the primary roads (including the M23, A2220 and A264) by providing improved pedestrian accessibility.</u></p> <p>CNP11.4 The suburban development on Newlands Park is not characteristic of this area and should not be considered a suitable design/style/layout cue for further development within this character area.</p> <p>CNP11.5 Development that would increase the presence of manmade features in views of agricultural landscapes, such as pylons, agricultural vehicles or caravans should be avoided. <u>Development proposals should be designed to minimise the extent and significance of manmade features in views of agricultural landscapes, such as pylons, agricultural vehicles or caravans.</u></p>		
Policy CNP11 CA3: Copthorne Common and Woodland – Supporting text		
<p>At the end of paragraph 7.12 add: 'Policy CNP11 sets out a policy approach for the Copthorne Common and Woodland Character Area. It draws on the findings of the Heritage and Character Appraisal. It requires that development proposals should sustain and where practicable reinforce the positive aspects of the character area and respond positively to the identified sensitivity to change matters.</p> <p>The positive aspects are as follows: [List the bullet points from paragraph 4.7.1 of the Assessment]</p> <p>The identified sensitivity to change matters are as follows: [List the bullet points from paragraph 4.7.3 of the Assessment]</p> <p>The suburban development on Newlands Park is not characteristic of this area and should not be considered a suitable design/style/layout cue for further development within this character area.</p>	<p>For clarity purposes.</p>	<p>Accepted</p>

Examiner's Recommended Modifications	Justification	Decision
<p>The Character Area includes the recent development of land to the west of Copthorne. It has outline planning permission, multiple detailed reserved matters approvals and is currently in the process of being developed. The residential part of the site is now known as Heathy Wood, and the commercial part as St Modwen Park, Gatwick. The development provides a site for a new primary school, contributes to secondary school and sixth form provision, a site for a GP surgery and contributions to bus services and improved sports provision for the village. It will also provide highway improvements, new allotments, a community park and accessible open spaces. As the site continues to be built out it may become a Character Area in its own right. The Parish Council will assess the need or otherwise for a redrawing of the Character Area boundaries when its reviews the neighbourhood plan in due course'</p>		
Policy CNP12 CA4: Historic Core		
<p>Replace Policy CNP12.1 with: 'As appropriate to their scale and nature development proposals within the defined Character Area 4 - The Historic Core (as shown on the Policies Map) should deliver high quality development which takes account of their immediate locality. In particular development proposals should sustain and where practicable reinforce the positive aspects of the character area and respond positively to the identified sensitivity to change matters included in sections 4.8 and 4.9 of the Copthorne Heritage and Character Assessment (May 2019)'</p> <p>Replace Policy CNP12.2 with 'Proposals for replacement shopfronts on retail properties in Copthorne Bank and Church Road should be designed in a traditional fashion taking account of the wider form, proportions and massing of the overall building'</p> <p>Replace Policy CNP 12.3 with 'Development proposals which utilise traditional tile-hanging will be supported'</p> <p>Delete Policy CNP12.4.</p> <p>The policy as amended will read as follows:</p>	<p>For clarity purposes.</p>	<p>Accepted</p>

Examiner's Recommended Modifications	Justification	Decision
<p>CNP12.1 Development proposals must sustain or reinforce the positive aspects that make up the individual character and distinctiveness of CA4 (as shown on the Policies Map). The positive aspects are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) The large number of non-designated built heritage assets, mainly well maintained, which contribute to the character of the village. (b) Sensitive modern infill with the widespread use of red brick achieving a blend of old and new. (c) The 'village feel' resulting from the main urban area only being slightly suburbanised by modern buildings. This 'village feel' is particularly highlighted by the setting of the church within its churchyard. (d) The boundary walls of historic large houses and their grounds. (e) Copthorne Brook is visible at the bottom of the village green. (f) PReWs which provide easy pedestrian access through the settlement and the residential streets and further public rights of way which link to a wider network outside the CA. (g) A number of heritage assets are clustered along the primary roads of the CA. (h) Community features are focused around the village green creating a social hub to the settlement. (i) Wide residential roads with an established rhythm and spacing of consistently sized dwellings, vegetated front gardens and or front boundary treatments. <p>Certain types of development may alter one or more positive aspects that make up the Character Area. This is acceptable if its overall character and role is not compromised and measures are taken to limit any impacts through mitigation, and where possible, enhancement. For example, this may be the strengthening of other positive aspects of the area's character or general enhancement to the area through increased biodiversity, green links and other mitigation measures.</p> <p><u>As appropriate to their scale and nature development proposals within the defined Character Area 4 - The Historic Core (as shown on the</u></p>		

Examiner's Recommended Modifications	Justification	Decision
<p><u>Policies Map) should deliver high quality development which takes account of their immediate locality. In particular development proposals should sustain and where practicable reinforce the positive aspects of the character area and respond positively to the identified sensitivity to change matters included in sections 4.8 and 4.9 of the Copthorne Heritage and Character Assessment (May 2019).</u></p> <p>CNP12.2 Shopfronts on Copthorne Bank and on Church Road are dominant in the streetscape and detract from the character of the CA and setting of undesignated heritage assets. Shops should therefore adopt traditional shop fronts when they are altered/replaced. Proposals for replacement shopfronts on retail properties in Copthorne Bank and Church Road should be designed in a traditional fashion taking account of the wider form, proportions and massing of the overall building.</p> <p>CNP12.3 To maintain the character of the area, proposals should utilise traditional tile hanging rather than timber (or faux) weatherboarding. Development proposals which utilise traditional tile-hanging will be supported.</p> <p>CNP12.4 All proposals for new development should take great care to avoid increasing street clutter (such as overhead power / phone cables) and the urbanisation of the CA (such as front gardens being converted to driveways).</p>		
Policy CNP12 CA4: Historic Core – Supporting text		
<p>At the end of paragraph 7.14 add:</p> <p>'Policy CNP12 sets out a policy approach for the Historic Core Character Area. It draws on the findings of the Heritage and Character Appraisal. It requires that development proposals should sustain and where practicable reinforce the positive aspects of the character area and respond positively to the identified sensitivity to change matters.</p>	<p>For clarity purposes.</p>	<p>Accepted</p>

Examiner's Recommended Modifications	Justification	Decision
<p>The positive aspects are as follows: [List the bullet points from paragraph 4.9.1 of the Assessment]</p> <p>The identified sensitivity to change matters are as follows: [List the bullet points from paragraph 4.9.3 of the Assessment]'</p> <p>Shopfronts on Copthorne Bank and on Church Road are dominant features in the streetscape and detract from the character of the conservation area and setting of undesignated heritage assets. Policy CNP12.2 comments about the opportunities to remedy this issue by way of replacement shopfronts</p> <p>The character of the historic core relates in part to the use of traditional building materials. The use of non-traditional materials has the ability to detract from this character. In order to maintain the character of the area, proposals should utilise traditional tile hanging rather than timber (or faux) weatherboarding.</p> <p>Insofar as planning permission is required development proposals should be designed to avoid increasing street clutter (such as overhead power / phone cables) and the urbanisation of the character area (such as front gardens being converted to driveways)'</p>		
Policy CNP13 CA5: Post War Copthorne		
<p>Replace Policy CNP13.1 with: 'As appropriate to their scale and nature development proposals within the defined Character Area 5 - The Post War Copthorne Character Area (as shown on the Policies Map) should deliver high quality development which takes account of their immediate locality. In particular development proposals should sustain and where practicable reinforce the positive aspects of the character area and respond positively to the identified sensitivity to change matters included in sections 4.10 and 4.11 of the Copthorne Heritage and Character Assessment (May 2019)'</p> <p>In Policy CNP13.2 replace 'aesthetic' with 'design and approach'</p> <p>The policy as amended will read as follows:</p>	For clarity purposes.	Accepted

Examiner's Recommended Modifications	Justification	Decision
<p>CNP13.1 Development proposals must sustain or reinforce the positive aspects that make up the individual character and distinctiveness of CA5 (as shown on the Policies Map). The positive aspects are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) The larger properties, many of them built on former farmland sold as building plots in the late 19th century indicate the popularity of the area in the decades after the railway was built. Built in differing styles they give a prosperous feel to the village. (b) Roads with pavements and connecting footways providing good pedestrian accessibility and many intersecting PRow's providing great permeability through the area. (c) Green verges lining our roads and streets. (d) Screening vegetation along most of Copthorne Common Road (A264). (e) Open nature of residential streets. (f) Pockets of pre-war developments and (g) Areas of mature vegetation such as the river corridor and the informal path between Calluna Drive and Bridgelands. <p>Certain types of development may alter one or more positive aspects that make up the Character Area. This is acceptable if its overall character and role is not compromised and measures are taken to limit any impacts through mitigation, and where possible, enhancement. For example, this may be the strengthening of other positive aspects of the area's character or general enhancement to the area through increased biodiversity, green links and other mitigation measures.</p> <p><u>As appropriate to their scale and nature development proposals within the defined Character Area 5 - The Post War Copthorne Character Area (as shown on the Policies Map) should deliver high quality development which takes account of their immediate locality. In particular development proposals should sustain and where practicable reinforce the positive aspects of the character area and respond positively to the identified sensitivity to change matters included in sections 4.10 and 4.11 of the Copthorne Heritage and Character Assessment (May 2019).</u></p>		

Examiner's Recommended Modifications	Justification	Decision
<p>CNP13.2 Proposals should seek to minimise negative impacts resulting from additional traffic. In particular, green verges should be protected from vehicles and inappropriate parking. Where measures are put in place to prevent parking on green verges, they should adopt a consistent aesthetic design and approach.</p>		
Policy CNP13 CA5: Post War Copthorne – Supporting text		
<p>At the end of paragraph 7.17 add:</p> <p>'Policy CNP13 sets out a policy approach for the Post War Copthorne Character Area. It draws on the findings of the Heritage and Character Appraisal. It requires that development proposals should sustain and where practicable reinforce the positive aspects of the character area and respond positively to the identified sensitivity to change matters.</p> <p>The positive aspects are as follows: [List the bullet points from paragraph 4.11.1 of the Assessment]</p> <p>The identified sensitivity to change matters are as follows: [List the bullet points from paragraph 4.11.3 of the Assessment]'</p>	<p>For clarity purposes.</p>	<p>Accepted</p>
Policy CNP14 Our Economy		
<p>At the beginning of Policy CNP 14.1 add: 'Insofar as planning permission is required'</p> <p>In Policy CNP 14.1 replace 'are not supported and will only be permitted in exceptional circumstances' with 'will not be supported unless the wider benefits of the proposal outweigh the loss of the retail floorspace concerned'</p> <p>Replace Policy CNP 14.2 with: 'Development proposals that would result in the loss of employment floorspace/land will not be supported unless it can be demonstrated that the on-going use of the premises or land for employment purposes is no longer commercially-viable'</p> <p>Replace Policy CNP14.3 with: 'Development proposals for the provision of</p>	<p>For clarity purposes.</p>	<p>Accepted</p>

Examiner's Recommended Modifications	Justification	Decision
<p>improved telecommunication infrastructure will be supported where they do not have an unacceptable impact on residential amenity'</p> <p>Replace Policy CNP14.4 with: 'Development proposals for new employment and commercial development over 100sqm, residential development of one unit or more, replacement residential development, and buildings undergoing significant refurbishment should install Fibre to the Premises broadband connection unless it can be demonstrated that it would not be commercially-viable to do so'</p> <p>The policy as amended will read as follows:</p> <p>CNP14.1 <u>Insofar as planning permission is required</u>, development proposals that would result in the loss of our shops and retail premises within the built-up area boundary (as defined by Mid Sussex District Council), are not supported and will only be permitted in exceptional circumstances <u>will not be supported unless the wider benefits of the proposal outweigh the loss of the retail floorspace concerned.</u></p> <p>CNP14.2 Development proposals that would result in the loss of employment floorspace/land will not be permitted unless; it can be demonstrated that the on-going use of the premises or land for employment purposes is no longer viable. <u>Development proposals that would result in the loss of employment floorspace/land will not be supported unless it can be demonstrated that the on-going use of the premises or land for employment purposes is no longer commercially-viable.</u></p> <p>CNP14.3 Proposals for the provision of improved telecommunication infrastructure are actively encouraged and will be approved where they do not have an unacceptable impact on residential amenity. <u>Development proposals for the provision of improved telecommunication infrastructure will be supported where they do not have an unacceptable impact on residential amenity.</u></p>		

Examiner's Recommended Modifications	Justification	Decision
<p>CNP14.4 All new employment and commercial development over 100sqm, residential development of one unit or more, replacement residential development, and buildings undergoing significant refurbishment, must install Fibre to the Premises (FTTP) broadband connection unless it can be demonstrated that it is not viable to do so. <u>Development proposals for new employment and commercial development over 100sqm, residential development of one unit or more, replacement residential development, and buildings undergoing significant refurbishment should install Fibre to the Premises broadband connection unless it can be demonstrated that it would not be commercially- viable to do so.</u></p>		
Policy CNP14 Our Economy – Supporting text		
<p>At the end of paragraph 8.6 add: 'In this context Policy CNP14.1 addresses this important issue. It does so within the wider context of the increased flexibility for retail and commercial uses available within Class E of the Use Classes Order. In general terms the policy would not support a change of use from a retail premises unless the wider benefits of the proposal outweigh the loss of the retail space concerned. Plainly this will involve the District Council making a judgement on a case-by-case basis. However, such exceptional circumstances may exist where the proposal includes the development of a replacement or relocated retail facility or where it can be demonstrated that the retail use is no longer commercially viable and where a replacement community or commercial use would have wider benefits to the community'</p>	For clarity purposes.	Accepted
Policy CNP15 Sustainable Transport		
<p>Replace the opening element of Policy CNP15.1 with: 'Development proposals will be supported where they otherwise taken account of other policies in the development plan and promote sustainable transport within the Plan Area by:'</p> <p>Replace CNP 15.1 a) with: 'Demonstrating that adequate sustainable transport links already exist, or new sustainable transport links will be provided as part of the development, to Important Community Facilities (set out in Policy CNP4) and open spaces'</p> <p>Delete Policy CNP15. 1 c).</p>	For clarity purposes.	Accepted

Examiner's Recommended Modifications	Justification	Decision
<p>The amended part of the policy will read as follows:</p> <p>CNP15.1 Development will be supported providing it promotes sustainable transport within the Plan Area by: <u>Development proposals will be supported where they otherwise taken account of other policies in the development plan and promote sustainable transport within the Plan Area by:</u></p> <p>(a) Demonstrating that adequate sustainable transport links to the principal village facilities including the village centre, the primary school, retail facilities, GPs' Surgery, recreation open space and other transport links already exist or will be provided as part of the development. <u>Demonstrating that adequate sustainable transport links already exist, or new sustainable transport links will be provided as part of the development, to Important Community Facilities (set out in Policy CNP4) and open spaces.</u></p> <p>(b) Identifying and undertaking appropriate measures, such as highway improvements prior to new development being occupied, to address transport infrastructure inadequacies that the development would have caused.</p> <p>(c) Where a Transport Assessment or Transport Statement is not required, major developments must include analysis of its impact on the highway network and include proposals to mitigate any harmful impacts. This could include, but not be limited to, physical works, financial contributions towards local transport schemes, and the introduction of speed management systems.</p> <p>(d) enhancing the existing public footpaths, rights of way, bridle paths, cycle ways and twittens.</p>		
Policy CNP15 Sustainable Transport – Supporting text		
<p>At the end of paragraph 9.6 add: 'Where a Transport Assessment or Transport Statement is not required major developments should include analysis of its impact on the highway network and include proposals to mitigate any harmful impacts. This could include, but not be limited to, physical works, financial contributions towards local transport schemes, and the introduction of speed</p>	<p>For clarity purposes.</p>	<p>Accepted</p>

Examiner's Recommended Modifications	Justification	Decision
management systems'		
Policy CNP16 Car Parking		
<p>In Policy CNP 16.1 replace 'propose to remove' with 'which would involve the loss of' and 'permitted' with 'supported'</p> <p>Replace Policy CNP 16.2 with: 'Insofar as planning permission is required development proposals which would result in the loss of parking spaces within an existing garage should provide replacement parking provision in accordance with Policy CNP16.3'</p> <p>In Policy CNP 16.3 replace 'must' with 'should'</p> <p>At the end of Policy CNP 16.3 (as a separate paragraph) add: 'Where it can be demonstrated that the application of the higher standards would have a detrimental impact on the proposed development in general, and in the Historic Core character area in particular, the application of the WSCC standards and which respect the details of the site would be supported'</p> <p>The policy as amended will read as follows:</p> <p>CNP16.1 Developments within the defined Built up Area Boundary which propose to remove <u>which would involve the loss of</u> off-road parking spaces on a site will only be permitted <u>supported</u> where alternative provision is made in accordance with CNP16.3.</p> <p>CNP16.2 Where an existing parking space within a garage will be lost (for example by its conversion to habitable rooms or demolition) parking provision must be made in accordance with CNP16.3. Insofar as <u>planning permission is required development proposals which would result in the loss of parking spaces within an existing garage should provide replacement parking provision in accordance with Policy CNP16.3.</u></p> <p>CNP16.3 New development must <u>should</u> include car parking spaces in</p>	<p>For clarity purposes.</p> <p>To acknowledge the fact that in some cases, planning permission is not required for the development concerned.</p> <p>For clarity purposes.</p> <p>To recognise the ability of street parking to generate safety and traffic flow issues in some areas of the neighbourhood areas and to avoid higher parking standards to result in the quality and integrity of overall development layout and format being too dominated by this one factor.</p>	<p>Accepted</p>

Examiner's Recommended Modifications	Justification	Decision										
<p>accordance with the greater of: The latest WSCC guidance¹⁵ at the time the application is submitted. OR For residential units, provision of on-plot / offstreet car parking spaces in accordance with the following table:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Number of bedrooms</th> <th>Number of parking spaces</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3</td> <td>3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4+</td> <td>4</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><u>CNP16.4 Where it can be demonstrated that the application of the higher standards would have a detrimental impact on the proposed development in general, and in the Historic Core character area in particular, the application of the WSCC standards and which respect the details of the site would be supported.</u></p>	Number of bedrooms	Number of parking spaces	1	2	2	2	3	3	4+	4		
Number of bedrooms	Number of parking spaces											
1	2											
2	2											
3	3											
4+	4											
Policy CNP16 Car Parking – Supporting text												
<p>At the end of paragraph 9.12 add: 'Policy CNP16.2 comments about circumstances where an existing parking space within a garage will be lost (for example by its conversion to habitable rooms or demolition) as a result of proposed development whether to the house concerned or more generally. In some cases, planning permission will not be required for the development concerned (such as the incorporation of an integral garage into the house). In these circumstances the policy acknowledges this matter'</p> <p>In paragraph 9.15 replace 'bad' with 'important'</p> <p>At the end of paragraph 9.15 add: 'In this context Policy CNP16.3 address the underpinning nature of the policy approach which is to address the on-street parking in the neighbourhood area. There are two important factors at play in the neighbourhood area which will require a nuanced application of the policy approach. The first is that on-street parking in some areas (such as in Copthorne Bank) has a greater ability to generate safety and traffic flow issues than in other areas (such as might exist in residential streets well away from through traffic and commercial/community facilities). In this context applications</p>	For clarity purposes.	Accepted										

Examiner's Recommended Modifications	Justification	Decision
<p>for new development which can demonstrate that their impact on overall off-street car parking levels is minimal may wish to submit information to demonstrate that they can comfortably be accommodated within the West Sussex County Council standards. The second is that development to higher parking standards may result in the quality and integrity of its overall layout and format being too dominated by this one factor. This may have particular impacts in the Historic Core Character Area. This matter is addressed in the final part of Policy CNP16.3'</p>		
Policy CNP17 New Parking Areas		
<p>Replace Policy CNP17.2 with: 'The resulting parking areas should use permeable surfacing or sustainable drainage solutions wherever practicable'</p> <p>The amended part of the policy will read as follows:</p> <p>CNP17.2 Whilst parking areas will often be surfaced with tarmac, the applicant should seek to use permeable surfacing or sustainable drainage solutions wherever possible. <u>The resulting parking areas should use permeable surfacing or sustainable drainage solutions wherever practicable.</u></p>	<p>For consistency purposes.</p>	<p>Accepted</p>