

**Regulation 16 Consultation Responses Storrington, Sullington and Washington Neighbourhood Plan –
Regulation 16 Consultation – Summary of Representations**

Stakeholder Reference	Policy No. Paragraph	Summary
Ref #1	Support	1. "I fully support the document in its current form. It is a robust plan."
Ref #2 Sport England	General comments	1. General comments regarding protecting sport pitches and loss of playing fields, which do not mention specific points from within the plan.
Ref #3	Objection Longbury Hill as a Local Green Space	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Objection to the inclusion of Longbury Hill as a Local Green Space. 2. Mentions the criteria for local green space designation set out in Paragraph 77 of the National Planning Policy Framework, arguing that the land will not meet any of these. The site is commercial softwood plantation, with a lack of public access, absence of any ecological or historical significant value. 3. Quotes the South Downs National Park Authority in the 'Local Green Spaces Addendum-November 2017, which states that the site does not currently meet the criteria, despite previously stating that it did. The 'Local Green Spaces Addendum - Longbury Hill Wood January 2018' produced by Washington Parish Council, then put back the site in Local Green Space allocations, not addressing the issues made by the South Downs National Park Authority. 4. Appendix 1 of the plan fails to mention that the site is used for commercial softwood timber plantation, with the evidence of there being a rich amount of wildlife and flora and fauna, having no professional reports. Some evidence is vague and there seems to be a desire for Local Green Space designation based purely upon objections to the on-going commercial operations, a view made upon the newspaper clippings which are part of the evidence base. 5. Further disagrees with argument made that there historic significance. With no ancient monuments present in the site and no professional evidence on claims of there being "what is believed to be the Saxon boundary bank". 6. <i>"Longbury Hill must be removed from the list of Local Green Spaces within Policy 16 of the Storrington, Sullington and Washington Neighbourhood Plan 2018-2031 and the accompanying policy maps must to altered to reflect this."</i>
Ref #4	Support with modifications	1. Supports the plan but opposes the allocation of Angell sandpit for housing as this would not be in keeping with the mix of two and three bedroom houses character of the area with access from the private road Heather Way being

	Policy 2(v) Angell Sandpit	<p>seen would need widening resulting in the loss of the rural character of the track. The road also goes onto the busy A283.</p> <p>2. Suggestions are made to modify the access, by having it come off from Water Lane instead of A283.</p>
Ref #5	Support	<p>1. Fully supports the plan and thinks it will allow for good, affordable housing. Especially at Angel Sandpit.</p>
Ref #6	Comments	<p>1. Sees the smaller developments working well but not the larger developments, with the villages not having capacity for them.</p> <p>2. New GP surgery may not come soon enough. With concerns also on congestion and pollution which has affected the person's breathing since moving 5 years ago. There's also insufficient car parking at Waitrose. Asks if the Schools will be able to take on more pupils.</p> <p>3. Understands that the housing numbers have been handed down by central government but feels that the thinks 'we need to think of the bigger picture'. Development in Thakeham has yet to make a significant impact on the area, however, this will make a 'substantial difference'.</p>
Ref #7 West Chiltington Parish Council	Support with some objections	<p>1. Fully supports</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy 2: Supports provision of affordable housing and pleased to see brownfield used rather than greenfield • Policy 8: fully supports protection of views from South Downs National Park. • Policy 9: Fully supports Green Gap Policy, to keep individual identity of three settlements. • Policy 15: Biodiversity corridors links up with those of West Chiltington Parish. • Policy 16: Supports designation of green space allocations and supports the policy which resists development on valuable community land. • SSWNP & Community aims: Fully supports expansion of superfast broadband. <p>2. Supports with some comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy 4: Supports but has concerns over possible negative traffic impacts. • SSWNP & Community aims: Supports the development of more recreation facilities such as Sandgate Recreation Country Park, but need to ensure that volume of cars and public events is managed. • Policy 18: Supports increase and improvements to cycle paths, however, the roads in and surrounding SSWNP are not suitable for work commutes, being suitable for leisure cycling. However SSW traffic impact assessment does not consider the wider impacts on neighbouring parishes. <p>3. Objects the following policies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy 11: The building of a secondary school outside of the built up area boundary seems contrary to SSWNP

Ref #8 Environment Agency	Support with suggestions	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Policy 2: supports the site allocation, despite being Flood Zone 2, as there were no reasonable alternatives in Flood Zone 1 and deems the Sequential Test has been passed. Recommends HDC are satisfied with this. 2. Sequential Test should be updated to reflect the site falls within both Flood Zone 2 and 3. 3. Pleased with policy criteria but suggests <i>“the policy includes criteria to ensure the sequential approach is taken on site and that any built development is located within areas/land designated as Flood Zone 1 as recommended in the Sequential Test document. The flood risk assessment would also need to assess how safe access and egress can be achieved”</i>.
Ref #9	Objection	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Supports the principle of residential development in Policy 2 (iii) Land off North Street (Old Ryecroft allotments) but objects to criterion b, seeing all houses developed without habitable rooms on ground floor. 2. This is not in line with the council’s detailed site assessment which states 50% of the site is in Flood Zone 2 and suggest design be in line with Flood Risk Assessment (FRA). Having no habitable rooms at ground level would undermine the role of the FRA. 3. This would see the plan not meet the basic conditions during examination as it would not contribute to sustainable development.
Ref #10	Support Policy 2: Angell Sandpit	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Support the inclusion of Angell Sandpit in the Neighbourhood Plan as, once developed, it would make efficient use out of an unused, private site in Storrington to provide 6 additional family homes.
Ref #11	Support Policy 2: Angell Sandpit	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Support the inclusion of Angell Sandpit in the Neighbourhood Plan as, once developed, it would make efficient use out of an unused, private site in Storrington to provide 6 additional family homes.
Ref #12	Support Policy 2: Angell Sandpit	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Support the inclusion of Angell Sandpit in the Neighbourhood Plan as, once developed, it would make efficient use out of an unused, private site in Storrington to provide 6 additional family homes.
Ref #13	Support Policy 16: Local Green Space	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Longbury Hill Wood should remain a Local Green Space in the SSWNP.
Ref #14	Support Policy 2: Angell Sandpit	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Support the inclusion of Angell Sandpit in the Neighbourhood Plan as, once developed, it would make efficient use out of an unused, private site in Storrington to provide 6 additional family homes.

Ref #15	Support Exclusion of Site 36	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Generally supports the policies outlined in the plan and whole heartedly supports the allocation of development sites chosen and the rejection of those not included. 2. The exclusion of site 36 is strongly supported mentioning the Plan's Appendix 2, 3 and 5 assessments of and exclusion of, the site. Notes that the site does not fall into the Horsham District Planning Framework's definition of 'windfall site' nor 'infill'. 3. Further detail is provided of Site 36's planning history and adjacent planning applications and policies from 1989 to 2018 this includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Various applications to build from 1-8 houses, with Inspectors being quoted when some applications went to Appeal. • South Downs National Park boundary being 200 metres away from Site 36's southern boundary when officially designated in 2010. • Storrington Conservation Area was extended in 2018 to adjacent the Monastery and fields south of the site. • Nearby green field sites have been approved for development recently and it would have a detrimental effect on the highly sensitive landscape on Storrington's southern edge if the site was developed. • Site is outside of the Built Up Area Boundary and rejected in HDC's SHELAA. • Site 36 and the connected field down to the South Downs National Park Boundary to be designated an additional Local Green Space. • HDC Landscape Character Assessment 2003 notes Storrington Area 1, which resides in, is 'important' and 'high' sensitivity and is '<i>important to the Attractive Character of it's Historic Core.</i>' And has 'High' sensitivity in the Horsham District Council Landscape Capacity Assessment 2014. • There is also mature hedgerow along the sites boundary and any changes would see the loss of protection under The Hedgerows Regulation 1997. • Development of Site 36 would be to the detriment to the setting of Storrington
Ref #16	Support LGS Site 17: Longbury Hill Wood	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Supports the inclusion of Longbury Hill Wood as a Local Green Space designation. 2. The inclusion will "<i>enhance wildlife and also benefit the environment as a whole, And hopefully protect this area from future development</i>".
Ref #17	Support LGS Site 17: Longbury Hill Wood	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Lanes of Heath Common have already been highly developed. 2. Wholeheartedly supports the LGS designation at Longbury Hill Wood.
Ref #18	Support	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Has concerns over the site being developed in future and lead to total destruction of a natural site

	LGS Site 17: Longbury Hill Wood	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Will disrupt character of this ancient Anglo-Saxon boundary area 3. disrupt flora and fauna in the area and asks “are there endangered species, such as bats?” 4. Will create pollution from cars and wood burners affecting nearby woods. 5. <i>“one of the area’s vital lungs”.</i>
Ref #19	Support LGS Site 17: Longbury Hill Wood	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Supports the Local Green Space designation at Longbury Hill Wood and is concerned by ‘the development’ on this site. 2. The village is ‘busting at the seams’ with traffic with ‘huge developments approved’ on Water Lane, with the Brick Works on Rock Road earmarked for development. 3. The village does not have the space nor infrastructure to cope with future development.
Ref #20	Support LGS Site 17: Longbury Hill Wood	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Supports the inclusion of Longbury Hill Wood as a Local Green space. 2. <i>“This is a special unique area around Heath common and many people are passionate about retaining it as a green space for its beauty and habitat for wildlife”</i>
Ref #21	Support Policy 2: Angell Sandpit	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Supports allocation of 6 family homes on Angell Sandpit, as it is much needed in Storrington, whilst the site is ‘<i>not used and is rather inaccessible to the public</i>’.
Ref #22	Support LGS Site 17: Longbury Hill Wood	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Supports Longbury Hill Wood as a LGS. 2. Fully supports the report made by Washington Parish Council ‘Addendum – Longbury Hill Wood January 2018. This report demonstrates the local importance <i>“with regard to its beauty history, recreation, tranquillity and wildlife and therefore it remains as a proposed Local Green Space in the SSWNP”.</i>
Ref #23	Supports LGS Site 17: Longbury Hill Wood	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Supports Longbury Hill Wood as a LGS. 2. Concerned by potential level of traffic and air pollution on Rock Road from future development. 3. GP is ‘overloaded’ and would be ‘further strained’ should anymore development happen. 4. Understands that the site <i>“is classified as Country and NOT within the town planning area”.</i>
Ref #24	Supports LGS Site 17: Longbury Hill Wood	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Supports Longbury Hill Wood as a LGS. 2. Feels that the Heath Common area has had a ‘great deal of development’, green spaces are needed to keep the semi-rural environment and space for wildlife.

Ref #25	Supports LGS Site 17: Longbury Hill Wood	1. <i>"We wish for LHW to be allocated as GREEN SPACE".</i>
Ref #26	Supports LGS Site 17: Longbury Hill Wood	1. <i>"I strongly support the above Wood as local green space in section 4.82 of the Storrington, Sullington and Washington neighbourhood plan 2018-2031".</i>
Ref #27	Supports LGS Site 17: Longbury Hill Wood	1. <i>"We need to preserve this area in order to support woodland and the preserve of future generations and wildlife."</i> 2. Fears for the future of the woodland. Argues that the development of houses has outstripped the woodland and feels that this site needs to be protected from future development.
Ref #28	Supports LGS Site 17: Longbury Hill Wood	1. Should be included as a LGS. 2. Argues that areas like this should be protected because once they are lost, they are lost for good. 3. <i>"feel very strongly that we must protect these areas for environmental, conservation, anti-pollution, civic amenity, wildlife and purely aesthetic reasons"</i>
Ref #29	Supports LGS Site 17: Longbury Hill Wood	1. <i>"This area must be kept in the neighbourhood plan as a green space. It is need for the environment and wildlife as well as an amenity for the residents and public."</i>
Ref #30	Supports LGS Site 17: Longbury Hill Wood	1. Initially had concerns about the site and was under the impression that the tree clearance was going to be less than what has been done so far. 2. Objects to development on this site. 3. There has been 'too much development' recently which is 'spoiling' the countryside. 4. Also concerned by the effects that this has had on the wildlife.
Ref #31	Supports LGS Site 17: Longbury Hill Wood	1. Feels that <i>"it is important that this area is preserved as green space for future generations and for wildlife."</i> 2. Hopes that the Examiner will appreciate the feelings of locals wanting this site to be protected from future development.

Ref #32	Supports LGS Site 17: Longbury Hill Wood	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There has been large developments in the area recently. 2. The area cannot sustain another large development as <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • schools and Doctors are full • drainage is a concern • “wildlife which has been dessimated by the huge tree felling operation needs to be left to recover” • Traffic is already high with concerns that nearby roads are dangerous, speeds limits being ignored. 3. Needs to be protected for future generations.
Ref #33	Supports LGS Site 17: Longbury Hill Wood	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Support is given to Longbury Hill Wood to be retained as LGS. <i>“have spent 37 happy years living in this area and both of us we fully support that LHW should retain its current status as Green Space.”</i>
Ref #34	Supports LGS Site 17: Longbury Hill Wood	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Support is given to Longbury Hill Wood to be retained as LGS. <i>“the loss of habitat and the shear scare on the landscape is awful. So please help and at least keep as a Green Space”</i>
Ref #35	Supports LGS Site 17: Longbury Hill Wood	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Support is given to Longbury Hill Wood to be retained as LGS. <i>“It is bad enough to see the destruction of so many trees but we were told this area was for forestry vehicles. I feel that if this is now being considered for housing development, then the public has been duped and I know that I and my neighbours would all be most upset.”</i>
Ref #36	Supports LGS Site 17: Longbury Hill Wood	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Support is given to Longbury Hill Wood to be retained as LGS.
Ref #37	Supports LGS Site 17: Longbury Hill Wood	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Supports Longbury Hill Wood as a LGS. 2. Is concerned by the ‘threats to Longerbury hill’. 3. <i>“even if there is to be felling of now mature trees I hope proper care will be taken to retain Longbury Hill as a local green space and not to let there be significant building development on it”.</i> 4. This will allow it to continue being a habitat for local wildlife.
Ref #38	Supports LGS Site 17:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Supports Longbury Hill Wood as a LGS.

	Longbury Hill Wood	2. <i>Licence and planning has already been granted to fell a great many of the trees on the land and it is imperative the land is retained as green space....the land forms a natural boundary, is home to protected species of animals and bats and is a natural woodland habitat."</i>
Ref #39	Supports LGS Site 17: Longbury Hill Wood	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The site is gradually being destroyed and that much wildlife has been lost to tree felling. 2. <i>"Dormice and Badgers are most definitely present here"</i> 3. <i>"Provides an excellent backdrop to the area and is important to all the local people"</i>
Ref #40	Supports LGS Site 17: Longbury Hill Wood	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Supports the allocation for Longbury Hill Wood 2. This needs to be 'preserved and enjoyed by future generations'. 3. Presevation woulf benefit the wild areas and 'all-round well being'. 4. <i>"nature is vulnerable and should be protected"</i>
Ref #41	Supports LGS Site 17: Longbury Hill Wood	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>"I am writing to confirm my strong support for the inclusion of Longbury Hill Wood as a local " green space" in the Storrington,Sullington and Washington neighbour hood plan."</i> 2. <i>"I concur with all the arguments that area advanced in the plan to support this designation."</i>
Ref #42	Supports LGS Site 17: Longbury Hill Wood	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Supports the designation of Longbury Hill as a LGS. 2. Residents are 'shocked and appalled' by the felling of trees on the site. 3. Knows the owners of this site have a legal right to fell the trees and are replanting, however, this will not be done within their life time. 4. The site is outside the built up area boundary
Ref #43	Have comments LGS Site 17: Longbury Hill Wood	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>"I should like to preserve the Preservation of Longbury Hill as a Local Green Space."</i> 2. <i>"This the largest remaining area of unspoilt natural woodland in Washington Parish."</i> 3. Seen as an important haven for wildlife, flora and fauna.
Ref #44	Supports LGS Site 17:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Supports this becoming a LGS. 2. Feels that this has been 'unsympathetically stripped and so many trees felled'.

	Longbury Hill Wood	3. Will allow future generations to enjoy it
Ref #45	Support with comments LGS Site 17: Longbury Hill Wood	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Supports the allocation of Longbury Hill Wood as a LGS. 2. It is a haven for wildlife and is under threat 3. The natural habitats are 'disappearing under new homes' 4. Needs to be protected for future generations and local wildlife with a home. 5. Need to keep village distinctive and stop 'ribbon development' which can be seen on A283. 6. Recommends scrutinising any future felling or development to prevent the 'total destruction of a beautiful piece of woodland'.
Ref #46	Support with comments LGS Site 17: Longbury Hill Wood	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Support is given to Longbury Hill Wood to be retained as LGS. <i>"What was previously an attractive gateway to Storrington and Sullington has been reduced to a bleak eyesore at, one can only assume, some considerable cost to local wildlife. But let's turn this scene of devastation into a rare opportunity for opening up fresh green space for this part of West Sussex."</i> 2. Despite setting against the South Downs National park, there is little green space with development on The Glebe making green space provision fall further. 3. Be used as a LGS for all three villages and a sanctuary for returning wildlife. 4. Fears that if it was not designated, then the site's new 'supposedly temporary' access to Rock Road and the land has just been cleared, making flora fauna preservation redundant.
Ref #47	Support with comments LGS Site 17: Longbury Hill Wood	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Fully supports Longbury Hill Wood as a LGS. 2. Reference is made to planning application DC/17/2117, and that the application was made for proposed felling, under Forestry Commission licence FLA 019/180/17-18. The operation has completely cleared the site of all greenery. 3. Is <i>"concerned that this huge clearing is to make way for more housing of which Storrington can barely cope with the current house let alone approved planning to date."</i>
Ref #48	Support with comments LGS Site 17: Longbury Hill Wood	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Fully supports Longbury Hill Wood as a LGS. 2. <i>"planning permission had been given to remove the dead Scots pine trees and generally tidy up the site before replanting. However, what has happened is that the woods have been totally demolished and the site flattened. This has had a huge, negative impact on the ascetics of this area and the effect on wildlife will be catastrophic."</i>

		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. <i>“Large members of the community are totally opposed to what has happened and now fear that planning applications for building houses will be presented in the future. This is totally unacceptable, our parish is changing beyond recognition and the infrastructure simply cannot support more housing.”</i>
Ref #49	Support with comments LGS Site 17: Longbury Hill Wood	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Fully supports Longbury Hill Wood being designated as a LGS. 2. Already outside the designated built up area. 3. <i>“wildlife and fauna which have already been displaced because of the clearance. These species must be allowed to return to ensure the area remains open and green and the surrounding district remains rural. Enforcement of the conditions granted under the Forestry Licence must be paramount to keeping this as an open green space in the neighbourhood plan.”</i>
Ref #50	Oppose Angell Sandpit	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Strongly objects to Angell Sandpit site. 2. Our objection is to the access from Heather Way which is an unmade private road, with cars unable to pass each other and lead to an increase in traffic. 3. Access would be better off from the Water Lane end which is closer to the site and offers options for where the entrance could be. 4. There is already an entrance from the Water Lane end at the Angel Sands development. 5. Recommend a review of site access with it to be delivered off Water Lane.
Ref #51	Support with comments LGS Site 17: Longbury Hill Wood	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Fully supports Longbury Hill Wood as LGS 2. <i>“Heath Common has historically been a rural area. There has already been considerable development to the south of the area and we feel that it is essential for the benefit of future generations and for the preservation of wild life and the environment in general that it should continue to be classified as GREEN SPACE.”</i>
Ref #52	Support with comments LGS Site 17: Longbury Hill Wood	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Fully supports Longbury Hill Wood as a LGS 2. <i>“It is a unique opportunity to provide access to a historic and beautiful place in the Sussex countryside. Any development here would be disastrous and the site should be preserved for future generations. Bearing in mind the massive development in surrounding villages and towns (Billingshurst, Thakeham, Southwater etc.) it can only improve on the paucity of open space available to the community.”</i>

Ref #53	Support with Modifications	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 'Delighted' with the Vision & Aims. Quotes part of this from p21 2. The plan needs to protect sites Chantry Lane industrial estate, Chantry sandpit and views from the A283. 3. Whether not there is an application on a site, the plan should protect areas of outstanding beauty, namely for their 'integrity, landscape and heritage of the area'. 4. <i>"The plan does not protect the National Park from future development/road access outside of the neighbourhood plan."</i> 5. Finds the lack of protection for these views to be 'disappointing'. Believes that 60 letters were sent in supporting the fields. 6. Stipulates that the Horsham District Planning Framework aim protect the Protected Landscape of the South Downs and rural character beyond define settlement boundary. 7. <i>"Although Policy 8 does address my concerns to some degree it is not sufficiently specific and I worry that the wording is subjective. Lack of protection for our portion of the South Downs National Park and the areas abutting the park can in no way be considered to maximise the location of the parish as "The Heart of the Downs"; it is simply allowing the spread of suburbanisation."</i> 8. Modification suggestions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>"I would like to see a paragraph included in the plan, along the lines of: "The fields adjacent to Sullington Lane and the A283 are part of the SDNP. It is our stated objective of our plan 'to work with the SDNP to protect and enhance the National Park and its setting in the wider landscape' and to maximise our location 'at the heart of the Downs'. Therefore these fields are considered worthy of special mention within our plan to ensure that any future development, including road building, that would affect them does as not impinge on the integrity, landscape, natural beauty, wildlife, and cultural heritage of the South Downs National Park."</i> • <i>"I understand that the Water Lane Country Park is not yet in use but I wish to help ensure the fruition of the Country Park site and therefore ask that this eight hectare area (which is a large area of land but is not considered to be extensive within the context of the built up area of Storrington) be designated as a Local Green Space in the context of its future use, as described by the South Downs National Park Authority in their Local Green Space report."</i>
Ref #54	Support with LGS Site 17: Longbury Hill Wood	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Fully supports Longbury Hill Wood as LGS 2. <i>"The current visual impact (clearance of trees) does not clearly show its status in planning terms: The land has been cleared under a Forestry Commission licence as mature woodland. Restocking of that woodland under the terms of that Forestry Licence is currently awaiting implementation. The current access should be removed within one year under the terms of the HDC permission re access. DC/17/2117 condition 7 refers to the removal of the access when no longer required."</i>

		<p>3. <i>“The land should therefore be viewed as: Replanted woodland under the terms of the FC licence, the current temporary access removed, no current permission for housing, and any possible future application should demonstrate a need (with reference to sustainability to access to Storrington centre) and need under the provision for housing within the Joint NP.”</i></p>
Ref #55 <i>ECE Planning</i>	Support Policy 2v Paragraphs 4.35, 4.36, 4.37 and Page 28	<p>1. Supports the inclusion of Angell Sandpit as a housing allocation in the Submission Draft SSWNP <i>“We welcome the allocation of the site for six new dwellings in principle and agree with the Site Assessment Report that the site is ‘suitable’, ‘achievable’ and ‘available’.”</i></p> <p>2. <i>“We wish to work positively and proactively with the Neighbourhood Plan Forum and Horsham District Council on the progression of the Neighbourhood Plan through to Examination.”</i></p>
Ref #56 <i>Southern Water</i>	Support with modifications Policy 2	<p>1. i Land at Robell Way (Paula Rosa), Sullington, and iv Ravenscroft Allotment Site, Storrington: in line with Paragraph 162 of the NPPF and NPPG, local sewage infrastructure was assessed for the two sites.</p> <p>2. <i>“It has been identified that a connection at the “practical point of connection” in the sewer network as defined in the New Connections Services implemented from 1st April 2018, could lead to an increased risk of flooding unless network reinforcement is undertaken.”</i></p> <p>3. <i>“This is not a constraint to development provided that planning policy and subsequent conditions ensure that occupation of the development is phased to align with the delivery of sewerage infrastructure. Southern Water has limited powers to prevent connections to the sewerage network, even when capacity is limited. Planning policies and planning conditions, therefore, play an important role in ensuring that development is coordinated with the provision of necessary infrastructure.”</i></p> <p>4. No appropriate policy provision would go against paragraph 109 of the NPPF, requiring the planning system to prevent both new and existing development contributing to pollution.</p> <p>5. Suggests the following changes to Policy 2: i Land at Robell Way (Paula Rosa), Sullington</p> <p><i>Land at Robell Way (‘Paula Rosa’), Sullington as shown on the Policies Map for a housing redevelopment scheme, provided:</i> [...] <i>e. Occupation of the development is phased to align with the delivery of sewerage infrastructure, in liaison with the service provider.</i></p>

		<p><i>f. Access is maintained to the existing underground sewerage infrastructure for maintenance and up-sizing purposes.</i></p> <p>iv Ravenscroft Allotment Site, Storrington:</p> <p><i>Land west of Ravenscroft, Storrington as shown on the Policies Map, is allocated as a comprehensive scheme for housing and allotments. Proposals will be permitted where:</i></p> <p><i>[...]</i></p> <p><i>g. Occupation of the development is phased to align with the delivery of sewerage infrastructure, in liaison with the service provider.</i></p> <p><i>h. Access is maintained to the existing underground sewerage infrastructure for maintenance and up-sizing purposes.</i></p>
Ref #57	Support Policy 2v (Land at Angell Sandpit	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>"I am in favour of more housebuilding in Storrington and this proposal adds six family homes to our housing stock."</i>
Ref #58	Support with LGS Site 17: Longbury Hill Wood	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Fully supports Longbury Hill Wood as LGS. 2. <i>"Para 4.82 of the SS&WNP 2018 comments on Longbury Hill and Washington Parish Council's proposal to maintain it as a Local Green Space within the Neighbourhood Plan. I fully support Washington Parish Council in this stance and would like to see Longbury Hill retained as a Local Green Space."</i> 3. <i>"I can't really add to the assessment in the addendum, it seems to me to present comprehensive analysis of why it should be retained. Longbury Hill, whilst not accessible to the public, is essential to maintaining the unique nature of Heath Common and the surrounding area and provides a welcome green space for both wildlife and residents. I am appalled at the extent of tree felling that has already taken place in the area, I cannot understand how this was approved."</i>
Ref #59	Have Comments LGS Site 17: Longbury Hill Wood	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>"Whilst Longbury Hill Wood seems to have been included as a Local Green Space in the SSW Neighbourhood Plan I would like the reassurance that this woodland will be preserved for the benefit of the wildlife and our future generations, and I think this area needs special mention and special protection. It is the green corridor between Warren Hill, Sandgate Park and Sullington Warren and whilst the landlord must be able to manage the wood, it must be emphasised that this space is special and must not be built on. Our flora and fauna are finding themselves in diminishing spaces and these sorts of corridors are essential for their continued well being, and of our continued well being too as we all need these spaces for our mental relaxation from stress."</i>

Ref #60	Support Policy 2v Angell Sand Pit	1. "A good use of unused land and a good opportunity to build much needed new homes to meet increasing demand for housing"
Ref #61	Oppose Policy 2v Angell Sand Pit	1. The 2 and 3 bedroom houses proposed are not in keeping with the 4 bedroom houses nearby on site nor the other houses in the area. 2. Disputes the proposed access off Heather Way. 3. Suggests that this should be off of Water Lane.
Ref #62	Support Policy 2v Angell Sand Pit	1. <i>"I support this as it's good use of an otherwise unused site."</i>
Ref #63	Support with LGS Site 17: Longbury Hill Wood	1. Supports the allocation of Longbury Hill Wood as a LGS. 2. Already noticed a 'decline' in wildlife since the clearing of the trees began. 3. Rocky Road will not be able to cope with extra development and any additional traffic. 4. <i>"Any development will totally spoil the natural beauty of the wooded surroundings"</i>
Ref #64	Support Policy 2v Angell Sand Pit	1. <i>"I fully support this application and feel it would be a great unused space".</i>
Ref #65	Support LGS Site 17: Longbury Hill Wood	1. <i>"support the inclusion of Longbury Hill Wood as a green space, to preserve the wildlife corridor and the character of Heath Common."</i> 2. Modification <i>"Enforcement of re-planting where tree felling has taken place."</i>
Ref #66	Support SEA/SA Appendix 5 p14 (site 36)	1. <i>"I strongly support the conclusion that the 1.2 hectare site [site 36] is found unsuitable and unachievable for development with an overall negative affect on sustainability objectives"</i>
Ref #67	Oppose Policy 2v	1. <i>"This land is highly sensitive environmentally. It was recommended to be returned to the National Trust for reinclusion into the Sullington Warren site (SSSI)"</i>

	Angell Sand Pit	2. <i>“Access via Heather Way is completely impractical compared to access onto Water Lane. Heather Way is a private road, maintained in parts by a Residents' Association. It is very limited in width as historically some householders have paid for the covenant to be lifted to extend a garden.”</i>
Ref #68	Support LGS Site 17: Longbury Hill Wood	1. <i>I would like to state that I believe that Longbury Hill Wood, Washington/Sullington should be included as a local “Green Space” in the future Neighbourhood Plan for all the reasons stated on your Website.</i>
Ref #69	Support LGS Site 17: Longbury Hill Wood	1. <i>“Very strong support for the retention of Longbury Hill Wood for Local Green Space as a ‘green space’ as allotted in the Neighbourhood Plan.”</i>
Ref #70	Support LGS Site 17: Longbury Hill Wood	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Strong support for Longbury Hill Wood to be designated as a local green space. 2. Mentions that whilst it was ‘unfortunate’ that a license was given for the felling of trees with loss of wildlife and habitat that was there. However, the planning condition did state that the site was to be replanted with it’s temporary exit to be removed after 12 months. 3. <i>“Longbury Hill Wood should return to being a beautiful forested area in due course and should be retained in due course and should be retained as a natural environment.”</i>
Ref #71	Oppose Policy 2 &16 Pages 17-20, 23-32 and 38- 40	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Representation relates to the field at the top of Downsview Avenue which has been proposed for Local Green Space. 2. This site is being promoted by the landowner for development. 3. The site has been fenced off as the public were trespassing without the permission of the landowners. It was previously used for maize production and is still classified as agricultural use. 4. Reference is made to Paragraphs 76, 77 and 78 of the NPPF. 5. The site does not meet the criteria set in paragraph of the NPPF. As <i>“Downsview Avenue has no local significance, the public do not have permission to use the land for recreational purposes and has no wildlife of any specific importance. In our view the land has been allocated as Local Green Space to prevent development rather than support it and therefore the Neighbourhood Plan is in direct conflict with the policies stated within the NPPF. The land is an agricultural field and the local community have a right of way to cross the field but do not have permission to use the field for recreational uses. The landowner has constructed a fence to restrict access to the wider fields.”</i>

		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 6. It is also felt that the plan's proposal to designate Downsview is in complete conflict with Planning Practice Guidance. The PPG states that the plan must approach the landowners early on about designating the area as LGS, the consultants have asked the landowners if the plan did so and they replied no. They further argue again, that this is in direct conflict with the NPPF and PPG, and is <i>"simply to prevent a potential development site from coming forward and to prevent development in a sustainable location"</i>. 7. The site adjoins the settlement boundary and has footpath links to the centre of Storrington. 8. The Horsham District Planning Frameworks states that neighbourhood plans should produce at least 1500 homes between them, SSWNP originally set out 229 homes over the life of the plan, but at Regulation that number is now 194. This new number only equates to 21.7% of the local Objectively Assessed Needs. Therefore, sustainable sites should be promoted for development not LGS, such as the Downsview site. 9. It has been noted that in Policy 16, there are 21 sites that have been put forward as LGS, arguing that it is quite a lot for a neighbourhood plan. 10. <i>"Policy 4.84 indicates that "the policy will resist all proposals for development unless it can clearly demonstrate that they are minor, they are ancillary to public recreational use or a required utilities development". This policy will have a long-term effect on the land and considering the landowners have not been consulted during the process it should be given significant weight when deciding whether the Neighbourhood Plan can be sound."</i> 11. <i>"Site Assessment Report Appendix 2 there has been a review of the field at the end of Downsview Avenue. The conclusion of this report is that the site is not considered suitable for inclusion in the plan, primarily due to its designation as Local Green Space. This conclusion cannot be seen as significant as this site has not yet been allocated as Local Green Space but is proposed to be. To place such a significant allocation on the site would have a long-lasting impact for the landowners, whilst also preventing a sustainable site from coming forward."</i> 12. <i>"there is a public right of way that follows the western boundary but the remainder of the site has been fenced off by the landowner. The report states that the site is used for "general sporting and play activities". The landowners rejects that this activity has been happening on the site, and if it has it has been without their consent. Apart from the public right of way, the remainder of the land is private and any public use could be classed as trespassing."</i>
Ref #72	Support LGS Site 17: Longbury Hill Wood	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>"Longbury Hill Wood should be protected as a local 'green space'. The area in Storrington and surrounds needs to maintain these green buffer zones to avoid over development of housing and to preserve spaces for the important protection of wildlife. The existing development projects in and around Storrington are already placing increasing burdens on the infrastructure in this area."</i>

Ref #73	Support LGS Site 17: Longbury Hill Wood	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>"I live adjacent to Longbury Hill Wood and would like it to become local green space, in order that it remains a quiet and visually appealing area where wildlife can continue to flourish. It has been this way for many years and Longbury Hill Wood is very much part of the unique and peaceful Heath Common area."</i>
Ref #74	Modifications Policy 2 (vi) Policy 5 Policy 6	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Policy 2 (vi) Reserve Sites – Land at Old Mill Drive ('The Diamond'), Storrington. The plan refers to this as land that may be developed in future. The plan states that development on the site will be supported if there is a net of 20 dwellings with the retention of commercial and retail floor space. 2. Mentions the approval of Waitrose's proposal in 2017, to which SSWNP feels the northern end of the site now needs to be addressed. However this application has now lapsed, with Waitrose no longer wishing to extend their food store. 3. Requests the Diamond site include Waitrose 4. <i>"request that the SSWNP reserve site (Policy 2 vi) is extended to include the garage site to the south in order to provide a more comprehensive redevelopment site to benefit Storrington Town Centre and to provide much needed housing on a sustainable town centre brownfield site."</i> 5. Mention the recent draft NPPF, which calculates a new annual housing need for Horsham (from 650 to 974 dwellings per annum). With stronger protections for Green Belt and building on brown field. 6. Requests that the <i>"site is considered as a current 'Site Allocation for Redevelopment' in Policy 2 of the SSWNP and not a 'Reserve Site', as, subject to planning, the site would be ready for redevelopment within 5 years."</i> 7. Policy 5: Storrington Village Centre Retail Area is agreed to by Waitrose in principle but they do not feel it should <i>"extend as far as the garage site and the SSWNP Land at Old Mill Drive ('The Diamond') Reserve Site as Waitrose does not consider this to be the core village centre. The primary shopping area should be concentrated along the High Street. The need for flexibility to maintain sustainability, vibrancy and prosperity on High Streets is more prevalent now than ever before with a reported decrease in footfall and increase in online shopping leading to the decline of High Streets and the closure of a number of major national retailers."</i> 8. Policy 6 should be amended to as <i>"Waitrose considers a flexible approach should be adopted when considering the redevelopment of important brownfield town centre sites"</i>.
Ref #75	Oppose Policy 2 &16 Pages 17-20, 23-32 and 38- 40	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Strongly opposes the designation of Downsview Avenues as a LGS. 2. Should be allocated for housing Policy 2, not Policy 16 Local Green Space and the evidence base that supports LGS is 'insufficiently robust'. 3. Goes against paragraph 77 of the NPPF and are concerned by the methodology used to designate Local Green Space.

		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. Compares Downsview Avenue with the following sites and explains why they are better suited for Local Green Space: Sullington Recreational Ground, Storrington Recreation, Washington Recreation Ground, Windmill Copse and Jockey's Meadow. 5. Mentions the previous Examiner's report was critical of the plan's approach to LGS. 6. <i>"Policy 2 seeks to allocate sites to deliver 194 dwellings through housing allocations, amounting to just over 13% of the District's total Neighbourhood Planning requirement"</i>. Whilst the reduction is down due to a buffer zone against the South Downs National Park, it is felt that this is small. This is only 21.7% of the plan area's Objectively Assessed Need. Given this is a small town and large village in the HDPF, it is felt to be 'reasonable' for the plan to meet more of its Objectively Assessed Need. Feels that Towns like Storrington & Sullington have a significant role to play in housing delivery and by going for a lower number could jeopardise Horsham Council's OAN. 7. It is felt that Downsview could provide for the shortfall in this number from Policy 2(iv) Ravenscroft Allotment Site. 8. Mentions paragraph 3.13 of the submission plan which states that <i>"It is considered that any shortfall for the provision of housing as part of the current wave of Neighbourhood Plans can be reviewed through the HDPF review....Given that the HDPF review is imminent, as a general principle we consider that it would be short sighted to designate so many Local Green Spaces. While there are obvious merits to the proposed designation of many of the sites, the Field at the top of Downsview Avenue, for example, might otherwise present an opportunity to boost housing delivery"</i>. (page 5-6) 9. Disagrees with the plan's Appendix 2 of the Site Assessment Report (January 2018) which states that the <i>"site is not considered suitable for inclusion in the Plan primarily due to its designation as Local Green Space"</i> as a reason for not including the site in Policy 2.
Ref #76	Support LGS Site 17: Longbury Hill Wood	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Full supports Longbury Hill Wood being designated as a Local Green Space. 2. Notes it being is a historic site, having Cultural value with connection to Vera Pragnell, tranquillity and special character, provides a sound barrier to the A24, important as a green corridor, evidence of protected species on site. 3. It is a sanctuary for wildlife. It is outside the defined Built Up area. To replant with a wide variety of trees that would improve, even more, the biodiversity of the site.
Ref #77	Support with modifications. Sullington Fields. Policy 8 and Para 4.60	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Concerned by the lack of protection for the so called "Sullington Fields" (the agricultural fields at the junction between the A283 Washington Road and Sullington Lane). 2. Protection given Policy 8 and Para 4.60 is minimal, it should state no development or roads are to happen on these fields.

		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. <i>"The view across these fields is probably the finest view of the Downs in the Storrington area and it has changed little over centuries. It needs to be preserved. It also looks towards the only grade 1 listed building in the whole of Storrington and Sullington."</i> 4. 60 letters were sent supporting the allocation of these fields as LGS. 5. "Clear threat to the fields" with one owner determined to build a road across them. 6. Previous version of plan <i>"The local Parish Council, and HDC agreed to its inclusion (and the inspector did not object)."</i> Modify the plan to state explicitly that no development in these fields, in particular construction of a road, will be supported.
Ref #78	Support LGS Site 17: Longbury Hill Wood	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>"Longbury Hill has countryside designation & should continue to be preserved and protected as a natural environment. This is crucial to protecting the character of the Heath Common area, by ensuring that no further harm is done to the general ecology & environment"</i>.
Ref #79	Support LGS Site 17: Longbury Hill Wood	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Fully Supports the designation of Longbury Hill Wood as a LGS. 2. <i>"it is essential to retain and look after our dwindling green spaces. The area should be retained as both a buffer zone and conduit for both wildlife and plants. This area is rich in many species that are under threat e.g. crested newts, dormice, many birds and wild orchids to name a few."</i>
Ref #80	Support with modifications. Policy 16 to include Water Lane Country Park. Policy 8 Para. 4.60	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Opposes the omission of Water Lane Country Park as a designated Local Green Space and seek modification. 2. In previous plan Milford Grange did not meet the LGS criteria in paragraph 77 of the NPPF. Since then the park has met the tests and this should set precedent to enable Water Lane Country Park to be designated. 3. Refers to planning permission to make Water Lane a country park. 4. Mentions comments made by Cemex regarding recent activity on the site to assess ground water activity. With clear intentions to open the site to the public. 5. Fields adjacent to Sullington Lane. Not protected well enough, considering the neighbourhood plan supports roads going across these fields for tourism and minerals uses. <i>"The views across to the South Downs from the fields adjacent to Sullington Lane and the A283 are a prime example of an area worthy of this protection."</i> 6. <i>"As it is known that proposals have been made for a road across the fields to support a "tourism development" and minerals extraction I do not consider the wording "The views across to the South Downs</i>

		<p><i>from the fields adjacent to Sullington Lane and the A283 are a prime example of an area worthy of this protection” to be sufficiently robust to afford the necessary protection against future development.”</i></p> <p>7. Modifications proposed: designate Water Lane Country Park as a LGS and to re-word policy 8 and paragraph 4.60 to ensure they protect the fields.</p>
Ref #81	Support LGS Site 17: Longbury Hill Wood	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Fully supports Longbury Hill Wood as a Local Green Space. 2. Asks “if indeed the land is being made ready for commercial homes to be built and or is this potentially something that can occur in the future?” and what will be done to protect wildlife.
Ref #82	Support LGS Site 17: Longbury Hill Wood	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>“I am writing to add what I understand is already a strong representation from local residents that the wood be included within the Neighbourhood Plan as a local “green space”. I trust the council will ensure that the now decimated pine area is in accordance with license regulation re-planted and over the years restored to its pre-felled state and any suggestion of building development strongly denied.”</i>
Ref #83	Support	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>“express our thanks and appreciation for all the many hours and months that the Steering Committee and all those concerned who have brought this document to this present stage. This document is vital to maintain these Parishes in good order for generations to come.”</i>
Ref #84	Support with modifications	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Oppose the omission of Water Lane Country Park as a designated Local Green Space. Water Lane Country Park and Milford Grange Long Term Management Strategy provided part of Barratts to meet conditions for a recently approved application DC/10/1457. 2. Report written by the SDNPA shows states that Milford Grange has some merits as LGS was seen as not meeting the Local Green Space but not suitable for development. 3. Refers to planning permission to make Water Lane a country park. 4. Mentions comments made by landowners regarding recent activity on the site to assess ground water activity. With clear intentions to open the site to the public. 5. Fields adjacent to Sullington Lane. Not protected well enough, considering the neighbourhood plan supports roads going across these fields for tourism and minerals uses. 6. Modifications proposed: designate Water Lane Country Park as a LGS and to re-word policy 8 and paragraph 4.60 to ensure they protect the fields.

Ref #85	Support LGS Site 17: Longbury Hill Wood	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>"This area should remain as a sanctuary for local wildlife in this unique area where it can be left undisturbed and from the Protected Species Walkover Survey (addendum 9) this has until now been very successful."</i> 2. <i>"Because it has been undisturbed this can only improve the bio diversity of the area and provide a green corridor with the amenity of local National Trust areas and with the proposed country park. The current clearance of the fir plantation and should be replanted with mixed woodland to improve the biodiversity of this area."</i>
Ref #86	Support Sandgate Country Park, Sullington	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>"Please don't let this area be built on. This is a beautiful and historic area and should be kept as such."</i>
Ref #87	Support LGS Site 17: Longbury Hill Wood	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Has concerns about proposed development of "Longbury Hill Wood" and "Heath Common". 2. "Given the Air Quality and Public Health issues relating to pollution and the increased pressure upon the local roads" see no justification for deforestation. Trees contribute to mitigation of CO2 and asks if we can afford to "continue to decimate our landscape of Trees?" 3. Short term profit cannot be justified for the destruction of this part of West Sussex. 4. Glebe Surgery is the only GP in the community with further strain expected. 5. More development on Rock Road will make traffic worse. 6. Has found any proposals which mitigate any effects any impacts on the area's infrastructure. 7. Mentions land banking by developers and asks how many unused plots and empty properties there are in the district.
Ref #88	Support with modifications Page 14, Paragraph 2.17 Policy 8 And Policy 2v	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Finds aims and vision to be "very reassuring" but concerned there is "no full protection" for fields near Sullington Lane (at the junction of the A283 and Sullington Lane). 2. <i>"the sanctity of this area and the associated views was recognised by Horsham District when unauthorised development of the area north of the Old Rectory was prevented, as was the replacement of temporary farm hand accommodation nearby."</i> 3. Objects to the Angell Sandpit development and stipulates access via Water Lane should be the preferred option.
Ref #89	Support with modifications	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Fully supports the designation of Longbury Hill Wood as a LGS. 2. 'Page 13 S&S weaknesses' – traffic congestion into and along the high street needs further action.

		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. 'Page 14 S&S opportunities/challenges' – supports the development of a new centre including toilet facilities. 4. 'Page 21 Vision' – supports the Vision statement however I am not sure the issue of traffic congestion is included in the objectives even by inference in the last sentence. I think we should make some sort of statement like ".....managed growth including appropriate control of traffic congestion to acceptable limits?" 5. 'Page 22 Community facilities and Aims' -would also like to see a strong message of support in the SS&W NP for all local charities, including support to volunteers to assist in the organisation and running. 6. 'Page 26 Land at Robell Way' – The policy regarding mitigation of effects of traffic movements should include specific mention of the need to address the potential dangers at the (current) mini roundabout location on the junction of Water Lane with Thakeham Road.
Ref #90	Support LGS Site 17: Longbury Hill Wood	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>"Please note that I would like to register my support for a proposal that the area known as Longbury Hill Wood should be designated as a Green Space."</i>
Ref #91	Support	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>"support for the NP consultations thanking them for their commitment to keep the rural appearance and character of Kithurst Lane and Fields and for it to remain undeveloped."</i> 2. <i>"There appears to have been many planning applications and refusals as recently as 21/2/18 and 22/2/18 (DC17/1990 AND DC17/1989) both assessed as not suitable and not achievable and not currently developable."</i> 3. <i>"We understand that the Storrington Conservation Area has recently been extended and that the Kithurst Lane Field falls within the Landscape Fringe of this being identified as being of High Sensitivity to Change."</i>
Ref #92	Support LGS Site 17: Longbury Hill Wood Page 40 4.82	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>"Longbury Hill Wood has been included in the above Plan as a local Green Space, but it needs to be emphasised that we need to have specific protection for this area, over and above the recommendations. It is a vital link for the wildlife in that it joins Warren Hill, Sandgate Park and Sullington Warren as a track they can use away from the roads. It also needs to be protected from any future building development. Already certain animals, plants and insects are in decline as their habitat is being eroded, and this area needs special protection."</i>
Ref #93	Support LGS Site 17: Longbury Hill Wood	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>"We wish to record our support for Longbury Hill Wood to be included as a local 'green space' in the the Neighbourhood Plan. This site is an important part of an outstanding local landscape and needs to be preserved for the existing local community, future generations and very importantly the retention and protection of wildlife."</i>

Ref #94	Oppose Policy 2 (iv) Ravenscroft Allotment Site	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Outlines context of Neighbourhood Plans within the NPPF. Further evidence submitted (Landscape Assessment, Site Layout and info. On standardised methodology). 2. States that the amendment (70 dwellings to 35) to the Policy 2 (iv) Ravenscroft Allotment Site will not be delivered. 3. <i>“The proposal was in essence relatively uncontroversial. This view is supported by the Site Assessment Report for the allocation (Reference: Site 4), which records either positive or neutral effects for all categories except the SDNP. The SDNP category is recorded as a negative effect purely because the methodology employed requires any proposal, in this case new allotments, within the SDNP to be given a negative score. The negative score does not therefore necessarily amount to harm.”</i> 4. The changes made to the site were purely on the basis of what the SDNPA said, without any consideration for the validity of the site. 5. <i>“SSWNP Steering Group has not updated the supporting text in Section 3 of the SSWNP, which at paragraph 3.12 makes the contradictory statement that the SSWNP provides for 194 no. dwellings, which equates to just over 13% of the total minimum requirement of 1,500 no.dwellings. Had this section been updated correctly it would have confirmed the proportion had in fact reduced to just below 13%.”</i> 6. <i>“The change to draft Policy 2 (iv) to halve the level of housing envisaged from the site from 70 no. dwellings to 35 no. dwellings is at odds with the evidence base, both in terms of the Housing Alignment Study and, the adopted Local Plan. In this respect the change fails to meet Basic Conditions a. and e.”</i> 7. <i>“A detailed landscape and visual appraisal report is attached at Appendix 1.”</i> 8. Mentions practical delivery issues, as WSCC (land owner of current allotments) will only accept the replacement if they are like for like in size. And the developer will not be able to deliver this for reasons of validity. 9. Regulation 14 allocation had a better impact than the Regulation 16 allocation on Ravenscroft. 10. Since change in allocation, there has been no update site assessment. 11. Makes suggested modifications on Policy 2 (iv), paragraphs 4.31 – 4.34 including houses going back up to 70 Policy 2 (iv) (a) and replace ‘A’ with ‘As part of a future Full Detailed Planning Application a’ in Policy 2 (iv) (d). Paragraph 4.31: Delete ‘primarily affordable’ before adding ‘including a substantial proportion of affordable housing’. Paragraph 4.32: add ‘open market and’. Paragraph 4.33: remove ‘with access and parking to be ‘achieved via Ravenscroft.’ 12. Paragraph 4.34: <i>“The new allotment space should be furnished with small communal buildings for storage and include a supply of provisions and services such as water supply. Built structures and sheds to be kept to a minimum so as not to conflict with the scenic beauty of the National Park.”</i>
Ref #95	Support LGS Site 17:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>“With respect to paragraph 4.82 of the SSWNP, I would like to support the view of Washington Parish Council that Longbury Hill Wood must remain as a Local Green Space.”</i>

	Longbury Hill Wood	2. <i>"I would like to support the view that the wood remains a green space, to maintain the semi-rural character of the area, which is highly valued by all local residents including myself. The local area is just not geared up for significant development, particularly with respect to infrastructure. A housing estate built on Longbury Hill Wood would be a blight on the landscape, situated as it is right next to the South Downs National Park. It would also have an extremely adverse effect on local air quality and noise (both during and after building) and would ruin the special and cherished nature of the Heath Common/Sleepy Hollow area."</i>
Ref #96	Support LGS Site 17: Longbury Hill Wood	1. <i>"it is vitally important that this area of beautiful woodland is allocated as green space. The area is rich in diverse plant and wildlife which we must protect for generations to come."</i> 2. <i>"At a time where there is extensive house building works taking place within Storrington and the surrounding areas (for example the large water lane development) and the proposed development of the existing Thakeham Tile Works site to become a development of at least 100 houses, it is vital that areas, such as Longbury Hill Wood are protected."</i> 3. <i>"I hope that conserving that natural environment and looking after our diverse wildlife takes priority over what could become yet another damaging development."</i>
Ref #97	Support LGS Site 17: Longbury Hill Wood	1. <i>"Until the recent clearing of trees and shrubs this was an untouched green space for wildlife. According to the landowner in the application form for DC/17/2117 his intention is that "the site can be brought back into active management, ensuring that the woodland remains healthy and productive in perpetuity". Therefore wildlife can once again flourish in Longbury Hill Wood after the current drastic harvesting and thinning has been completed. The protection of Green Space status will ensure this outcome."</i>
Ref #98	Support LGS Site 17: Longbury Hill Wood	1. <i>"support the proposal for Longbury Hill woods to be a designated green space as development of the area will irreversibly destroy, or contribute to the destruction of, the general look, character and ambience of the area. It may also lead to undesirable consequences such as fly-tipping. It is a tranquil area currently and has been for many years and is an integral part of the local area from a visual and environmental perspective as a green space for nature."</i>
Ref #99	Support LGS Site 17: Longbury Hill Wood	1. Fully support Longbury Hill Wood as a LGS. 2. <i>"agree with the suggestion of a Washington Parish Councillor, that it would be a great idea to open Longbury Hill Wood to the residents to allow them to use the green space. What a much more philanthropic idea rather than what local residents fear - that self-interest and greed result in another executive housing development that does little to solve the housing problem and irrevocably destroys the character of an area for the residents and wildlife."</i>
Ref #100	Support	1. Fully supports the Longbury Hill Wood being designated as a LGS.

	Page 40, ref 4.82 Longbury Hill	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> its extremely important to also preserve the area for future generations to enjoy and in honour of the legacy left behind by Vera Pragnell. The area needs to be protected from potential future development and including it in the neighbourhood plan as a local green space is a logical and essential way to achieve this.
Ref #101	Oppose Pages 28,30 (4.35, 4.36, 31 (4.37) Policy 2	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Objection made to Angell Sandpit <i>"6 houses will totally overwhelm the listed building Chestnut Cottage as the development is proposed to start just 45 metres from the cottage."</i> Recent application DC/16/1904 was rejected due to its impacts on the listed building. <i>"To now propose development of 6 houses which will be far more visible and detrimental to the setting of Chestnut Cottage is simply perverse and should not see the light of day. I am staggered that the Council can oppose one modest unobtrusive development one day and almost the next day wholeheartedly propose and support a much larger and more intrusive development which would be totally out of keeping with the area and the setting of the listed building."</i> Proposed house are out of keeping with the listed building. Reference is made to original application of 4 homes which proposed to restore the Heathland (a condition of the original application). There has been ground water run-off issues in the past, flooding the garden of the listed building.
Ref #102	Support LGS Site 17: Longbury Hill Wood	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>"fully support the neighbourhood plan in its entirety."</i> <i>"In particular Policy 16, Local Green Spaces and the land at Longbury Hill. Since the Heath Common Design Statement was issued the land opposite our house has been stripped of the pine trees (with the exception of a small area in the middle) - we objected to this at the time along with over 100 local residents."</i>
Ref #103	Support LGS Site 17: Longbury Hill Wood	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Fully supports the allocation of Longbury Hill Wood as a LGS. The area has a wide variety of wildlife. Very important local area. Should not be used for additional housing. Modifications: <i>"Allow for the Woodland's management and not its destruction"</i>
Ref #104	Support LGS Report Appendix 1 (xxiii)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>"I feel that this area is of great value to the local community and to the varied wildlife in this area"</i>

Ref #105	Modifications Policy 2, 10, 11, 13, 17, 18	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Policy 2 (iii) Land off North Street (Old Rycroft Allotments) and Policy 2 (iv) Ravenscroft Allotment Site, Storrington should be taken off these sites as it will affect the character of the area and the landscape of the National Park and is not sustainable to build on the boundary of the park. <i>“Putting a housing estate right by a national park fails to follow NPPF 109,115 and 116. ...What is needed is a buffer like the allotments instead of having houses right on the boundary of the park”.</i> 2. <i>“Policy 10: The policy does not appear to make sense how can a development be in the built up area and the Southdowns National Park at the same time. It needs to be reworded to make sense....need to say what size & sort of Hotel and what size and sort of hostel they propose to build.”</i> This conflicts with paragraphs 109,115 and 116 of the NPPF. 3. Policy 11: <i>“The proposals are too vague giving developers carte blanche to build whatever they want wherever they want. The plan needs to state clearly what sort and size of school is being proposed and whom the students would be. The plan also needs to state clearly where the school will be built”.</i> Proposes school be built on the site of Rydon Community College. 4. Policy 13: existing allotments will be maintained. 5. Policy 17: <i>“This policy must be amended to say that no large development will be allowed if Air Quality is made worse. It simply is not sustainable to increase the Air traffic pollution levels further when my understanding is that health safety levels may have already been exceeded in Storrington in places. The phrasing given at point i) is not acceptable - if the development makes Air Quality worse it is not sustainable and should not be allowed”</i> 6. Policy 18: <i>“The policy needs to be amended to say that if development makes roads more congested, more noisy, more polluted or more of a nuisance then the development is not sustainable and will not be allowed.The roads through Storrington are extremely dangerous and congested at the moment. The policy must determine if the development is going to make a bad situation worse. The phrase "or can be mitigated to the satisfaction of the local highways authority" is not acceptable as it implies that even though a development may bring unsustainable increase in traffic problems it would still be allowed if the Local Authority can reduce the problem a small bit. The NPPF means that we he have to ask is a development sustainable , if increased traffic means worse road problems than at present and more pollution then the development is clearly not sustainable. Any new development will bring new traffic and it will be impossible to avoid the extra traffic or mitigate it unless new roads are built, so the whole first paragraph is misleading and unclear”</i> 7. <i>“The plan needs to include a whole new section which incorporates effective planning controls on what can be built - the council appear to have failed to incorporate such controls into the plan”.</i> 8. This is followed by a series of suggestions that allows local residents more planning powers to block ‘unwanted developments’, ‘overdevelopment’, ‘any development which will hurt the amenity of neighbours’, ‘any development which adversely effects their property’ and ‘council to enable all those affected by a development to vote on whether or not a development goes ahead’. 9. <i>“Amongst other controls the following need to be inserted into the plan:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Any new development of 2 or more houses between the Downs and Storrington should be considered unsustainable as it damages the character of the area , the Character of the South Downs National Park and destroys agricultural land and should not be allowed.</i>
----------	--	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Any new development which leads to increased road congestion, increased traffic nuisance and noise to people should be considered unsustainable and should not be allowed.</i> • <i>Any new development which leads to any harmful deterioration in Air quality should be considered unsustainable and should not be allowed.</i> • <i>Any new development which leads to the loss of any amenity of the present citizens of Storrington and will likewise affect future generations should be considered unsustainable and will not be allowed."</i>
Ref #106	Support LGS Site 17: Longbury Hill Wood	1. Supports the designation of Longbury Hill Wood as LGS.
Ref #107	Oppose Policy 2	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This refers to the omission of Chantry Industrial Estate and Chantry Quarry, the former was seen as deliverable by the SHELAA (6-10 years) 2. This is also a brownfield site. 3. It has been proven along with Natural England that the site will not affect nearby SSSI. 4. Information given to the previous examiner in 2016 on both sites was 'either incorrect or incorrect information had been submitted by the SSWNP and indicated these are to be looked at again'. 5. <i>"Conflicting advice appears to have been given in regards to local employment"</i>. The exclusion of these sites contradicts Policies 2i paragraph 2.24 and Policy 2v paragraph 4.35. 6. Lists the benefits found by the GTA Civils preliminary report on Chantry Industrial Estate and Chantry Quarry. 7. The sites are sustainable due to their distances to the centre of Storrington. 8. "Any minimal flooding in the past 30 years in Chantry Lane is, we understand, only caused at times by blocked culverts. Which is the responsibility of Highways Authority to maintain. 9. <i>"The proposals are consistent with the development plan policies set out in Horsham District Core Strategy and Horsham District General Development Control Policies."</i> 10. The new plan for the quarry commercial concept proposals have stipulated a new access for the Water Lane/Sullington Lane A283 crossroads. 11. It is considered the redevelopment of Chantry Lane Estate and Chantry Quarry will be a positive impact for the area. Delivering much needed housing and modern commercial employment.

Ref #108	Support LGS Site 17: Longbury Hill Wood	1. <i>"I would like to record my support to preserve Longbury Hill as a local 'Green Space'. As a local resident, I believe that areas such as this are important to retain for the public general amenity and for the look and feel of our village and surrounding area"</i>
Ref #109	Support	1. <i>"All my previous objections have been dealt with satisfactorily."</i>
Ref #110	SDNPA	<p>1. <i>"The Parish Council should be congratulated on producing such a comprehensive plan that clearly covers a range of issues that are important to the community and the local area."</i></p> <p>2. <i>"We are pleased that our comments made at the last Pre-submission stage regarding the Ravenscroft Allotments site have been taken into account in this Submission version. The policy has been revised to remove the new allotments from within the National Park and now includes the requirement for the creation of a wide landscape buffer between the new housing and allotments site and the boundary with the National Park."</i></p> <p>3. <i>"We note however that some of our other previous comments have not been taken on board, in particular our comments regarding Policy 1: Spatial Strategy and how this relates to the settlement of Washington; Policy 3: Employment Uses and Policy 4: North Park Farm, Wiston Estate. We have concerns that these policies will conflict with the policies of the emerging SDLP with the potential to harm the special qualities of the SDNP. We have therefore repeated these comments below."</i></p> <p>4. <i>There then comments and recommendations:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Chapter 2 State of the Parishes; Introduction to the Parish of Washington.</i> <i>Include of reference to Washington as a gateway location for the South Downs Way.</i> • <i>Policy 1: Spatial Plan for the Parishes.</i> <i>We have concerns regarding the second paragraph of this policy which relates to development outside the settlement boundary of Washington as we think it is confusing and conflicts with the emerging SDLP Development Strategy policy SD25. We recommend the deletion of the second paragraph of this policy and the criteria associated with it.</i> • <i>Policy 2: Site Allocations for Development iv) Ravenscroft Allotment Site, Storrington.</i> <i>We welcome the proposed changes that have been made to this policy.</i> • <i>Policy 3: Employment Uses.</i> <i>"refers to that part of the A24 corridor within the National Park, is over generalised and will cause confusion and potentially conflict with the Core Policies of the SDLP which relate to National Park primary purposes and also its employment policies, SD34 and SD35. We recommend that this policy specifically excludes the A24 Corridor within the National Park. To this effect we recommend that criteria ii) of this policy is deleted and that criteria i) contains additional wording to say: "They are within the Built Up Area Boundary of</i>

		<p><i>Storrington and Sullington or they comprise previously developed land within the A24 Corridor that lies outside of the South Downs National Park.”</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Policy 4: North Farm, Wiston Estate, Washington.</i> Amend para 4.48 last sentence to say “The SDNPA has endorsed the Wiston Whole Estate Plan. This has been produced to guide the sustainable management of the Estate and to support the positive stewardship of the local landscape. Applicants for planning permission will therefore need to have positive regard to the relevant aspects in the Whole Estate Plan when considering proposals for development relating to the Wiston Estate”. We also recommend the inclusion of an additional criteria in Policy 4 relating to providing suitable connections to the existing Public Rights of Way network. Delete either para 4.50 or 4.52. • <i>Policy 9: Green Gaps.</i> This policy refers to the ‘Broad location of green gaps.’ We are concerned that this will have little meaning/effect in practice unless these are shown on the proposals map. Define Green Gaps on proposals maps. • <i>Policy 10: Tourist Accommodation.</i> We note the policy wording does not specifically seek Sustainable Tourism development. Include support for sustainable tourist accommodation in the policy as well as cycle parking. • <i>Policy 13: Allotments.</i> This policy needs to ensure that allotments (which have associated development such as sheds, fences, other structures and parking etc.) do not cause harm to the special qualities of the National Park and its purposes. Include reference within this policy to Policy 2 - criteria iv) Ravenscroft Allotment Site, Storrington The policy should also state that proposals for allotments within the National Park or its setting need to be informed by an assessment of the landscape context and do not cause harm to its special qualities by virtue of their location, layout or design. • <i>Policy 15: Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity.</i> We welcome this policy. • <i>Policy 16: Local Green Spaces.</i> The last paragraph of this policy only refers to the recreational value of a Local Green Space whereas the NPPF states that LGS designation is about protecting spaces that are valuable to the community as a result of their beauty, historic significance, recreational value, tranquillity and wildlife. Recommendation: Consider replacing last paragraph of this policy with alternative wording relating to development that is necessary to preserve the value of the Local Green Space to the community. Lavant Neighbourhood Plan (as modified) has quite a good example of a local green space policy. This refers to the proposed development being of benefit to the community and will not detrimentally impact the particular local significance of the space. https://www.southdowns.gov.uk/planning/planning-policy/neighbourhood-planning/neighbourhood-development-plans/lavant-neighbourhood-plan/ • <i>Policy 18 (Traffic and Transport).</i> Recommend including supporting text to explain the meaning of ‘locally generated CIL receipts.’ Include a map showing existing and proposed/ aspirational access routes.
--	--	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community Aims. “In terms of Aim 1- Creation of Sandgate Country Park, the SDNPA would encourage heathland restoration of the site. Recommend inclusion of some introductory text to explain how the difference in planning status between this section and that of the NDP policies section. Consider using a similar approach set out in the Patching NDP. Please see https://www.southdowns.gov.uk/planning/planning-policy/neighbourhood-planning/neighbourhood-development-plans/patching-neighbourhood-plan/ Consider including an aspiration to restore heathland on the site in the supporting text. • Infrastructure. “Para 5.6 –The NDP steering group should identify or start to think about the infrastructure project preferences they would like to suggest in the Neighbourhood Plan. SDNPA and West Sussex County Council have an aspiration to provide a safe off road or segregated cycle path from the Findon Valley Roundabout A27/A24 junction in Worthing to connect with Washington and enable access into the National Park. This is mentioned in our draft Cycling and Walking Strategy and also identified in West Sussex CC’s Walking and Cycling Strategy. It is likely to come forward for a feasibility study led by WSCC. Recommendation: Include reference to SDNPA as well as HDC in terms of collecting funding from CIL. Consider the inclusion of a list of priority infrastructure projects. Consider mention of the segregated cycle-path as a potential infrastructure project in the supporting text.
Ref #111		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Representation made with regards to the rejected site land off Fryern Road. 2. Appendix 1 GVA - Assessment of Housing Need in Storrington & Sullington and Washington Parishes. “The conclusions of this assessment suggest that the SSWNP is planning for significantly less development than is necessary to maintain and enhance the vitality of Storrington (as principal settlement of the SSWNP most capable of accommodating growth) conflicting with Paragraph 55 of the Framework and the Horsham District Development Framework (HDPF)” (1.1.9). 3. Appendix 2 Location Plan – Land off Fryern Road, Storrington 4. “disappointed that the site has been assessed inconsistently with proposed allocations of the plan and this results in serious flaws with the Site Assessment Report and Sustainability Appraisal (SA) used to inform the plan.” (1.1.3) 5. “They are required to plan positively for new development, enabling sufficient growth to take place to meet the development needs for the area and assist local authorities in delivering full objectively assessed needs (OAN) for housing. Policies that are not clearly worded or intended to place an unjustified constraint on further sustainable development from taking place are not consistent with the requirements of the Framework or the Neighbourhood Plan Basic Conditions (1.1.7).” 6. “The SSWNP should not seek to include policies in Neighbourhood Plans that have no planning basis or are inconsistent with national and local policy obligations.” (1.1.8) 7. Paragraphs 2.1.1 to 3.1.6 looks at legal requirements, national policy, judgements and adopted Development Plan

		<p>8. <i>“Requirement of at least 505 dwellings during the plan period, 341 more dwellings than is currently planned for” (4.2.6).</i></p> <p>9. <i>“This policy seeks to carry forward the Built Up Area Boundaries (BUAB) of Storrington and Sullington, whilst defining a Built Up Area Boundary for Washington, with amendments for site allocations within the SSWNP. Gladman mirror the concerns of HDC regarding the defining a settlement boundary for Washington...Further, Gladman object to the use of BUABs if these would preclude otherwise sustainable development from coming forward. The Framework is clear that development which is sustainable should go ahead without delay. The use of development limits to arbitrarily restrict suitable development from coming forward on the edge of settlements does not accord with</i></p> <p>10. <i>the positive approach to growth required by the Framework and is contrary to basic condition (a).”</i></p> <p>11. <i>“Gladman note comments made by HDC to the Steering Group which provided advice regarding the proposed housing requirement. These comments set out that in recent appeals much discussion is made of housing targets and that the 1,500 homes that neighbourhood plans will deliver should be a minimum, not a ceiling figure and this should not only be met but it should be ensured that the local need is also met. Gladman agree with this analysis and</i></p> <p>12. <i>have provided what we consider to be a more accurate determination of local housing need. If the housing figure the SSWNP plans for is not revisited, the SSWNP will not meet basic conditions (a) and (d), and should not proceed to referendum.</i></p> <p>13. Policy 1: <i>“object to the use of BUABs if these would preclude otherwise sustainable development from coming forward. The Framework is clear that development which is sustainable should go ahead without delay.” (4.3.5)</i></p> <p>14. Policy 2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>“Policy 2(i) Land at Robell Way (‘Paula Rosa’), Sullington now has outline planning permission and should no longer be included within the site allocations policy.”</i> • <i>“2(ii) Land at Old London Road (‘Vineyards’), Washington was recommended to be deleted by the previous Examiner, Mr McCreery, yet the allocation has been retained in this iteration of the SSWNP. This therefore means as drafted the plan yet again does not meet basic conditions (a) and (d), as it could be said to be supporting unsustainable development.”</i> • <i>“Policy 2(iii) Land off North Street (‘Old Ryecroft Allotments’), Storrington site falls within flood zones 2 and 3 and Gladman question whether a robust sequential test has been undertaken to support this allocation. Gladman submit that there are reasonably available sites that could accommodate the proposed development in an area with a lower probability of flooding as per Paragraph 101 of the Framework. If evidence cannot be produced that a robust sequential test has been undertaken this site allocation should not remain within the plan. These concerns are reiterated by HDC who have raised concerns with potential impacts on the Conservation Area. Having no habitable rooms on the ground floor could have a negative visual impact on the Conservation Area.”</i>
--	--	---

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Policy 2(iv) The quantum of development at Ravenscroft Allotment, Storrington has been reduced since the previous Regulation 14 consultation due to the sites proximity to the South Downs National Park.....Considering development to be appropriate in this location conflicts with the main reason why Land off Fryern Road has been rejected for allocation.”</i> • <i>Policy 2 (v): “Natural England are concerned about the delivery of the site without harm to the adjacent heritage asset and Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). Gladman reiterate these concerns and suggest that this site allocation is removed from the plan.”</i> <p>15. <i>“Gladman raise serious concerns with each of the proposed residential allocations and submit that fundamental issues raised by the previous Examiner have not been addressed. Paragraph 4.21 of the SSWNP sets out that provision is made for approximately 229 homes in the plan period and that this is considered the appropriate quantum of development, striking the right balance between meeting housing needs and reflecting environmental constraints of the parishes. Following changes to allocations in the Plan, the figure from allocated sites is now 164 dwellings, leaving a shortfall of 65 dwellings from what is considered appropriate by the Steering Group, and at least 341 dwellings short of what Gladman consider appropriate.”</i></p> <p>16. <i>Policy 8: “This policy does not accord with the core planning principles of the Framework which does not seek to protect the countryside, instead stating that the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside should be recognised”. Suggest removing this policy as the protection should not be extended to areas which do not have landscape designation.</i></p> <p>17. <i>Policy 9: Suggest policy be removed as this is already set out in Policy 27 of the HDPF.</i></p> <p>18. <i>Policy 16: “many of these areas cover vast swathes of land and are therefore considered to be extensive tracts of land contrary to the advice and guidance issued by the Secretary of State.” (4.3.23)</i></p> <p>19. <i>The SEA/SA has “significant flaws and Gladman contend that when assessed fairly and consistently land off Fryern Road, Storrington would have a positive effect on the sustainability objectives in the SA Framework and would therefore be suitable for allocation within the SSWNP for development. Without amendments it cannot be said that the plan meets basic condition (f)” (5.4.6).</i></p>
Ref #112	Support with modifications LGS Report Addendum Policy 8 Policy 16	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Water Lane Country Park should be included as one of the Local Green Spaces. 2. Attached Appendix: Appeal Decision (APP/Z3825/A/12/2176793) and Barratts Homes Long Term Landscape Management Strategy. 3. Mentions the Storrington & Sullington and Washington Neighbourhood Plan Local Green Spaces Report Addendum (November 2017) prepared by the South Downs National Park Authority and the planning history of Milford Grange Country Park. 4. Quotes the reports assessments of Water Lane Country Park, including a lack of public access.

		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. "Sandgate Conservation Society believes that the above includes a incorrect description of the area referred to a Water Lane Country Park and that consequently the site may have been wrongly assessed in the LGS report." 6. Looks at Milford Grange's planning history including housing application DC/10/1457 and Appeal Decision of the Planning Inspectorate under reference APP/Z3825/A/12/2176793 and dated 19 November 2012 with web links attached. 7. <i>"both the Millford Grange site and Water Lane Country Park both form parts of the single Long Term Landscape Management Strategy produced by Barratts to meet the conditions set by the Planning Inspectorate when approving DC/10/1457 and are both within the first phase of Sandgate Country Park."</i> 8. Quotes HDC's reply to an inquiry made by the Sandgate Conservation Society with regards to the process of agreeing the final Water Lane landscaping with Barratts. 9. Argues that paragraph 4.74 of the Neighbourhood Plan sets the basis that the country park should be designated as Local Green Space. 10. Modification: the decision making body support Water Lane Country Park as a Local Green Space. 11. Policy 8 does not offer sufficient protection to the countryside, especially Fields adjacent to Sullington Lane. 12. Suggested modification to Policy 8: <i>"Revisions to the wordings of Policy 8 and Paragraph 4.60 to make clear that the Neighbourhood Plan is intended to specifically protect the Fields as a Policy and not just give them as an example of what it is seeking to protect."</i> 13. The Society supports the inclusion of Longbury Hill Wood as a Local Green Space on the basis that it meets most of the criteria listed in the Local Green Spaces report. 14. Local Green Site from the addendum (November 2017) states that Longbury Hill Wood fails the LGS criteria set in paragraph 77 of the NPPPF. 15. Its felt that the later report contradicts this. <i>"The Longbury Hill Woods addendum demonstrates that this assessment is flawed because it demonstrable does meet a number of criteria. Whilst there is no public right of way to the site it is clear that by local custom residents of the area do enjoy access to it. In fact the lack of general access enhances other aspects of the site namely that the Anglo-Saxon archaeology is not being degraded by excessive foot traffic and the relative lack of human activity makes the area a refuge for wildlife. While the recent timber harvesting activity has resulted in some disruption it is highly likely that the removal of the invasive rhododendron, removal of dense Scots pine and coppicing activity that has been carried out during the timber harvesting work will further enhance the site for wildlife."</i>
Ref #113	Support LGS Site 17:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>"Although there is no public access to the area, I do not feel this is a reason for the site not to be given a local green space listing. It is still an important part of our community and enjoyed by many people. This part of Storrington is already over populated, with far too many cars for the narrow roads and infrastructure."</i>

	Longbury Hill Wood	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. <i>"This is very dangerous for traffic coming both ways along Rock Road and I hope that the council will ensure that this is only temporary as was agreed."</i> 3. <i>"Are the council also able to ensure that the trees are replanted, again as should be the case and are there time limits on either of these?"</i> 4. <i>"Many local people are very upset to see what has happened to this site and I would urge you to help to protect the site by granting and maintaining it in perpetuity as a local green space."</i> 5. <i>"Have the council checked that the owner is complying with "The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010?"</i>
Ref #114	Support LGS Site 17: Longbury Hill Wood	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Supports the allocation of Longbury Hill Wood as a Local Green Space. 2. <i>"hugely contributing to the aesthetic beauty of the local area it provides habitation for wildlife and is a sound and pollution buffer from the surrounding roads."</i> 3. Claims wildlife has declined.
Ref #115	Support LGS Site 17: Longbury Hill Wood	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Supports the allocation of Longbury Hill Wood as LGS. <i>"allocate Longbury Hill Wood as a green space. Please do not allow this beautiful area to be developed."</i>
Ref #116	Support LGS Site 17: Longbury Hill Wood LGS Report Addendum	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Supports the allocation of Longbury Hill Wood as a Local Green Space. 2. <i>"Longbury Hill Wood sits directly opposite Gorse Bank Close, providing a tranquil and aesthetic backdrop to the vicinity. It's beauty, history and sanctuary for local wildlife should be protected and is considered special to the local community. Since the recent felling of trees, we have already noticed an increase in the activity of wildlife in Gorse Bank Close, having obviously been displaced."</i> 3. <i>The loss of such a large green space will undoubtedly have a negative effect on pollution and noise levels to the local "residents."</i>
Ref #117	Have Comments Policy 1	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Considers the Vision and objectives of the plan to have been positively prepared, with this approach the vision and objectives will help contribute to sustainable development. 2. Regard has been given to national policies and the vision and objectives are in general conformity with eHorsham District Planning Framework.

		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Paragraph 2 of Policy 1 be reworded to: <i>“Development proposals for infilling outside the Built up Area of Washington will be supported provided these accord with the provisions of the Horsham District Planning Framework or the South Downs Local Plan as applicable and the Neighbourhood Plan.”</i> 4. <i>“support the allocation of Land at Old London Road (“Vineyards”) as a site allocation in Policy 2ii”</i> 5. <i>“the proposed allocation of 15 dwellings is entirely appropriate in scale and function given the surrounding townscape context which will also, and in accordance with both paragraph 4.20 of the Neighbourhood Plan and paragraph 55 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), assist in maintaining the vitality of rural communities such as Washington by supporting local services. Whilst we do support the allocation, we suggest part d) of Policy 2ii requires modification. Part d) requires a scheme on the site to provide a minimum of 3 affordable dwellings. We suggest this requirement should be subject to viability testing in order to make it compliant with the requirements of the NPPF, as paragraph 173 requires plan-making and decision-taking to take account of costs and viability to enable the development to be deliverable. We therefore suggest the requirement for 3 affordable dwellings on-site could reduce development coming forward on the site and in so doing, result in the identified housing need of the parishes not being met.”</i> 6. <i>“Part d) of Policy 2ii should be modified to read as follows: The scheme provides a minimum of 3 affordable dwellings subject to viability.”</i>
Ref #118	Support LGS Site 17: Longbury Hill Wood	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Fully supports Sandgate Conservation Area Report 2. The removal of the Longbury Hill Wood ‘is treacherous to this area’ , anything other than replacement of trees is seen as ‘unacceptable’. 3. Claim there has been a 30/40% increase in traffic in the past 22 years contributing to local air pollution. 4. Thakeham housing estates have increased traffic and Rock Road does not have the infrastructure to cope with the increase in traffic that it has had.
Ref #119	Support LGS Site 17: Longbury Hill Wood p40 ref 4.82	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Supports the allocation of Longbury Hill Wood as a Local Green Space. 2. <i>“strongly object to Longbury Hill Wood being removed from the list of potential local green spaces. This area has been left untouched for many years and is a haven for wildlife. The fact that this area is not accessible to the public enables our local wildlife to live their life in peace and the sooner it is left untouched and returned to its former beauty the better. As a wildlife rescuer and rehabber for many years I am fully aware of the species of birds and mammals that live in and around this woodland and ask that you support Washington Parish Councils additional report (Local Green Spaces Addendum – Longbury Hill Wood January 2018). This demonstrates that the area is special to the local community with regard to its beauty history, recreation, tranquility and wildlife and therefore it remains as a proposed Local Green Space in the SSWNP.”</i>

Ref #120	Support with comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>"A sound plan but the designation of Sandgate Country Park is insufficient and there is no mention of the Water Lane Country Park that was supposed to be in operation Autumn 2017."</i>
Ref #121	Dowsett Mayhew Support Submission Plan and Sustainability Appraisal (incorporating Strategic Environmental Assessment)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>"It is considered the Vision and Objectives of the Plan have been positively prepared and set the direction, for the changes the local community would like for the future of Storrington, Sullington and Washington. Through this positive approach, the Vision and Objectives will contribute towards the achievement of sustainable development over the lifetime of the Plan. It is considered regard has also been had to national polices and it is considered the Vision and Objectives of the Plan are in general conformity with the strategic policies of the Horsham District Planning Framework (HDPF)."</i> <u>Policy 4: North Farm, Wiston Estate, Washington.</u> 2. Policy 4: <i>"The supporting text, para 4.48, confirm North Farm, is part of the Wiston Estate. It outlines how the Wiston Estate is working with the South Downs National Park (SDNP) on a Whole Estate Plan to guide the sustainable management of the Estate and to support positive stewardship of the local landscape. It also confirms applicants should therefore take into account any relevant aspects of this document on any further update."</i> 3. <i>"Policy 4: North Farm, Wiston Estate, Washington sets out how development proposals at North Farm, that sustain the local economy and/or support sustainable tourism will be supported where one or more of the identified 6 criteria are met."</i> 4. Policy 4 is in line with Paragraph 28 of the National Planning Policy Framework and HDPF Policy 10: Rural Economic Development. 5. <i>"Overall, the Policy has been positively prepared, is reflective of national guidance and takes a positive approach towards the achievement of sustainable development. In light of the above, it is considered that Policy 4 meets the requirements of the Basic Conditions."</i> <u>Sustainability Appraisal (incorporating a Strategic Environmental Assessment).</u> 6. The Sustainability Appraisal of the site in Policy 4 confirms that significant negative effect on nationally important landscape and sustainable transport being an issue before concluding that on balance the policy is positive with regards to sustainability objectives in the SA framework. 7. <i>"It is considered the appraisal provides a true and accurate assessment of the Policy against the SA framework."</i> 8. <i>"In light of the above it is considered the SSWNP does not breach, and is compatible with, EU obligations and therefore meets the Basic Conditions. It is submitted the SSWNP meets the requirements of the Basic Conditions by virtue of the fact that it has: had regard to national policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State; contributes to the achievement of sustainable development; is in general conformity with the strategic</i>

		<i>policies of the HDPF; does not breach and is compatible with, EU obligations. It is therefore respectfully submitted that the Submission SSWNP and associated documents should proceed to Examination."</i>
Ref #122	Savills Oppose Policy 2	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Promotion of the site Land at Bax Close, Storrington and presents a case for its inclusion in the emerging NP. 2. Site map of Bax Close attached to Appendix 1. 3. In revised plan the site is no longer allocated for residential development, it is apparent that the reason for this is as a result of appeal decisions made in 2016 (Appeal Refs: APP/Z3825/W/15/3128935 and APP/Z3825/W/15/3141250) which is mentioned in the SSWNP Site Assessment Report January 2018. 4. Conformity with the HDPF: <i>"Of the 194 units in the draft SSWNP, 98 already have planning permission (planning application reference: DC/15/2788). This planning permission was granted in December 2016, prior to the beginning of the plan period. The SSWNP therefore only effectively allocates an additional 96 units over and above existing permissions. Of these 96 units, 2 of the sites (circa 30 units), are identified as 'Reserve Sites', with the draft SSWNP identifying that these sites "...are unlikely to come forward in the near future but may become available during the Plan period" (paragraph 4.38). As an aside, the Neighbourhood Plan does not appear to contain a trigger for these reserve sites to come forward."</i> 5. HDC agreed to a three year review as part of their planning being adopted, with the proposed government standard methodology producing a housing requirement of 974 dwellings per annum (dpa) before the duty support Crawley's unmet need. With this now in motion, the neighbourhood plan should review their housing number in line with this. 6. <i>"The Site Assessment Report (January 2018) refers to two constraints identified in the appeal decisions, the impact upon the rural character of the area and views into and from the South Downs National Park, as well as the impact on the Listed Building. Significantly, when the appeals were determined the proposals were contrary to Policy 4 of the HDPF, in that the site is located outside the settlement boundary, HDC had recently adopted the HDPF, and there was a 5-year housing land supply in place. The relevant housing policies were therefore deemed up-to-date. Essentially, the housing need is such that there is a need for additional sites"</i> 7. <i>"A landscape-led proposal for 20-25 homes could overcome the landscape and heritage constraints whilst responding to the need for housing."</i> 8. <i>"Significantly HDC's Strategic Housing and Employment Land Availability Assessment (SHELAA) (2016) recognises the site as 'developable' for 20 units. The SHELAA states that "the site is well contained and could be an extension to the existing settlement", the assessment notes that the "northern portion of the site is considered developable in the longer term, provided access can be secured". As established in the previous planning applications and appeals, an access from Bax Close can be achieved."</i> 9. <i>Under provision coming from Neighbourhood Plans to achieve the HDPF housing requirement.</i>

Ref #123 WSCC	Comments and Modifications	<p>In addition to our previous comments at Regulation 14 please also consider the points below;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Policy 4 – Part of this site is at high risk of surface water flooding i.e. Annual Exceedance probability (AEP) of 33% in areas of the site. It is considered that any potential occupiers of the site should be made fully aware of this risk and the overall management of the site should encourage flood resilience to minimise the commercial / economic impact of this flooding that is a characteristic of the location. See also https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/preparing-your-business-for-flooding. 2. The Sequential Test Paper should be updated to amend, what appears to be a typographical error, at paragraph 5.12 on the North Farm Site that ‘The Environment Agency Flood Risk Map reports no areas at risk of surface water flooding towards the entrance to the site but nothing within the site itself’. This we considered should read with the ‘no’ removed from the sentence, as there are areas of surface water flooding towards the entrance to the site but nothing within the site itself. 3. Policy 11 - Education Uses you may wish to update paragraph 4.65 to reflect the changes that have not taken place. 4. Pages 13-15 identify weaknesses and challenges in both parishes to realise safe and convenient off-road non-motorised access, which has been captured by one of the Objectives on page 21 – ‘To protect and enhance our footpaths, bridle paths and cycle paths.’ It is though suggested the latter should apply across the entirety of both parishes rather than limited only to the SDNP. 5. The Public Rights of Way (PROW) network can help realise this in addition to and in support of the Local Plans. Enhancements can be made across the parishes, whether related to allocated sites or wider access improvements to benefit the area. To assist in this work, please find attached a list of suggested projects that could help deliver new routes to support the local PROW network. Any PROW proposals should be developed with WSCC as the highway authority. It is welcomed the Plan proposes to use local CIL funds for creating new foot, cycle and bridleways (policy 18).
Ref #124	Support LGS Site 17: Longbury Hill Wood	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Fully supports the designation of Longbury Hill Wood as a Local Green Space. 2. <i>“The recent clearing of trees in that area has I am sure has destroyed the habitat of the wild life that has called that part of the woods home. The loss of trees will pose a higher risk of flooding in that and surrounding area. Whilst I understand the shortage of housing I am concerned that in time to come this piece of woodland will become just</i>

		<i>another building plot for luxury homes that are not affordable by the local young people. I know builders usually put in a token few affordable homes to satisfy the planners .We need more homes but we also need to preserve our green spaces for now and future generations.”</i>
Ref #125	Support LGS Site 17: Longbury Hill Wood	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Fully supports Longbury Hill Wood as a Local Green Space. 2. <i>“My concern is that the land will be developed by a housing company. This would be wrong on so many levels. Firstly Rock Road cannot sustain anymore traffic”</i> 3. <i>“Secondly as Thakeham Tiles land is due to be developed do we really need two new housing estates in close proximity to each other?”</i> 4. <i>“Thirdly the wildlife has already been disturbed by the removal of the trees - let’s give them back their homes and plant more trees.”</i>
Ref #126	Support LGS Site 17: Longbury Hill Wood	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Supports the allocation of Longbury Hill Wood as a Local Green Space. 2. <i>“I believe that it is important that Longbury Hill Wood is allocated as local green space, and should continue to be preserved and protected as a natural environment.””</i> 3. <i>“This is crucial in protecting the character of the Heath Common area, by ensuring that no further harm is done to the general ecology & environment.”</i> 4. <i>“Therefore, I strongly support local green space designation.”</i>
Ref #127 Peter Brett Associates LLP	Oppose paragraphs 3.8, 3.11, 3.12, 3.13 Policy 2ii Policy 2iv Policy 2v Support with modifications paragraphs 4.5 & 4.6 Policy 1 Policy 2	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Oppose paragraphs 3.8, 3.11, 3.12, 3.13 2. Concerned by the number of homes proposed in the SSWNP, this was 285 dwellings in the previous plan but has now been reduced to 194. 3. The reduction in this number is a great concern for the wider strategic policies in the HDPF. Storrington & Sullington is categorised as a ‘Small Town and Larger Village in the second tier of the HDPF’s settlement hierarchy, requiring it to ‘provide substantial number of new dwellings’. 4. With an expected uplift in housing numbers from the Local plan review, from 800 per year to 974, <i>“the need to plan for significantly more dwellings in the SSWNP now is of even greater importance, so as to address likely future needs and maintain control of local housing delivery in the Parish”</i>. 5. Modification: review number of units proposed in the plan and reconsider the site at Melton Drive. 6. Support with modifications paragraphs 4.5 & 4.6: It is supported that the monitoring and need update of the plan is welcome, however, <i>“it is considered that a firm commitment to a full review is required, taking into account the increasing housing needs of Horsham DC”</i> in line with the new methodology.

		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 7. Support with modifications Policy 1: <i>“The general approach towards focusing development at existing built-up areas is supported; however, it is considered that greater allowance should be made towards development proposals adjacent to the Built-Up Area Boundary, taking into account the provisions of HDPF Policy 4.”</i> 8. <i>“SSWNP Policy 1 should be revised to include greater allowance of development proposals adjacent to the Built-Up Area Boundary in line with HDPF Policy 4.”</i> 9. Support with modifications Policy 2: The removal of Chantry Lane Industrial Estate (90 dwellings) and Land off Old London Road (dwellings) sees a loss of allocations for the plan. It is felt that this quantum loss needs to be made up. <i>“In light of the concerns expressed above, we would reiterate our recommendation that the site at Melton Drive be reconsidered as a site allocation in the SSWNP”</i> 10. Oppose Policy 2ii: Land at Old London Road ('The Vineyard'), Washington. <i>“Whilst it is noted that the Parish Council has undertaken further recent evidence base work of the proposed site allocations, it is not considered that the fundamental concerns regarding the location of development can be sufficiently overcome. The revised assessment for the site includes 5 red ‘negative effect’ indicators and acknowledges that the site is ‘some distance from the built up area boundary’ (Paragraph 9.2, Site Assessment Report); however, the site remains as a proposed allocation within the draft SSWNP. In our view there are other sites immediately adjacent to the built up area of Storrington which are far more suitable, available and deliverable for housing. It is considered that the proposed site allocation jeopardises the SSWNP and thus should be reviewed accordingly... In light of the concerns expressed above, we would reiterate our recommendation that the site at Melton Drive be reconsidered as a site allocation in the SSWNP”</i> 11. Oppose Policy 2iv: Allotments, off Ravenscroft, Storrington. <i>“We note that the proposed site allocation has increased from 20 units to 35 units. The proposed allocation now extends across a larger, more sensitive site outside of the Built-Up Area Boundary (BUAB) and which stretches further south close to the National Park boundary. The proposed allocation is also premised on relocation of the existing allotments to an alternative site within the National Park. It is considered that the amount of development now proposed in this sensitive location will cause harmful impacts on the landscape and scenic beauty of the National Park, and therefore the proposed allocation is unsuitable and unjustified.... In light of the concerns expressed above, we would reiterate our recommendation that the site at Melton Drive be reconsidered as a site allocation in the SSWNP”</i> 12. Oppose Policy 2v: <i>“The site was not previously considered suitable for residential development due to a number of constraints, including its location outside the BUAB, adjacent to a SSSI, in close proximity of a listed building, and 100m from the National Park... In light of the concerns expressed above, we would reiterate our recommendation that the site at Melton Drive be reconsidered as a site allocation in the SSWNP”</i>
Ref #128	Support LGS Site 17:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>Any development of this area would lead to increased problems in terms of the pollution of Storrington - the closest shopping area which already has traffic & car parking problems, & is already known to be dangerously polluted. I have just received notification of a possible 100 houses to be built on the site of Thakeham Tiles Ltd, less than half a</i>

	Longbury Hill Wood	<i>mile South on the same Rock Road, meaning even a shopping trip to my village would be problematic in terms of rural overload. In the last few years gross development has already changed this ambience, as in the development at the old engineering works adjoining Hampers lane, increasing the traffic on the A283 & more pollution. we don't even have a supermarket within 6 miles & developments like that would surely be demanded once the population has increased.</i>
Ref #129 Natural England	Comment with proposed modifications.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. SEA: Generally we agree with the findings of the SEA in terms of potential impact on the natural environment 2. NP: we do have concerns about the following NP policy: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy 2 v) – Land at Angell Sandpits. This site adjoins the Sullington Warren SSSI along its northern boundary. Our records show that we have previously advised that a 20m buffer between the SSSI and any proposed development, would be appropriate mitigation. However, I note that the policy wording includes the following: • “Policy 2 v)The development of the area will be required to: ... e. Provide a buffer zone of at least 15 metres to the Sullington Warren Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)...” This is contrary to our advice so we would need to see the justification for this reduction in mitigation. 3. Suggested modification: Community Aim 1 – Creation of Sandgate Country Park. “i)avoid causing harm to local biodiversity interest, in particular the deciduous woodland priority habitat within the site; and....” 4. Advisory Notes: ‘Opportunities and Constraints’ map, windfall sites, “this map does not show the entire plan area, some areas of ancient woodland and three sites of special scientific interest (SSSI’s) are missing. The SSSI’s in question are: Parham Park, Amberley Mount to Sullington Hill and Chanctonbury Hill, SSSI’s. It should be noted that there may be protected species using proposed sites and that where this is known or suspected, appropriate surveys should be undertaken prior to development. In addition, reference should be made in the plan to the need for similar surveys of windfall sites known/likely to be used by protected species, prior to determination of planning applications, to inform any decision. Care is needed, particularly on rural sites, where there are old or derelict structures and which include (or are close to) features such as mature trees, ponds, ditches and field boundaries, where protected species may be present. Their protection should be one of the central considerations at the detailed planning stage, and early reference to biological records would clarify where these issues may be acute.”
Ref #130	Oppose The SSWNP	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Representation is made with regards to respect to land at Clayton Kennels, Storrington Rd. 2. It is consider that the draft SSWNP does not meet the basic conditions set out in 8(2) of Schedule 4B of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended), specifically: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “8(2)(a) is not met where guidance from the secretary of state on the viability of housing delivery is ignored (see our previous reps)... Our evidence shows that the SSWNP needs to allocate at least 277 homes to meet the identified affordable housing need”

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>“8(2)(d): is not met where the plan does not contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, since the identified level of affordable housing will not be delivered with the present actual allocation of 164 homes.... This misses the opportunity to fully support a strong, vibrant and healthy communities in either Parish of Storrington & Sullington or Washington in accordance with paragraph 7 of the National Planning Policy Framework and fails this basic condition”</i> • <i>“8(2)(e) is not met where the plan makes no reference to HDPF Planning Policy 16 in regard to affordable housing. Although the plan purports to basing its housing numbers on the delivery of 97 units affordable housing, the proposed actual allocation of 164 means affordable housing in reality is 59% of the allocation. HDPF policy 16 seeks 35%. The plan is clearly not in general conformity with this strategic policy contained in the development plan for Horsham.”</i> <p>3. <i>“We consider that the built up area boundary (BUAB) is not up to date. This is pertinent in light of recent development at Milford Grange (see plan in Annexe 2 of our representations dated 4 September 2017), and has parallels as considered by the Examiner to the Thakeham Parish Neighbourhood Plan (TPNP). The SSWNP not being “up to date” and would mean it does not meet the basic conditions. Uses example of Thakeham Neighbourhood Plan Examination..... The Parish Council’s response to my question on this was that the development is not yet complete and that the boundary could be reviewed for the next plan, after completion. However, any review is likely to be some 5 years away. National policy is that plans should be up-to-date.”</i></p> <p>4. <i>“We consider, for the reasons set out in the section above on redrawing the BUAB, it should be redrawn to include Milford Grange and Clayton Kennels in line with considerations given for the Thakeham Parish Neighbourhood Plan.”</i></p> <p>5. <i>“The recommendations given below would remedy each of these matters and a future version of the SSWNP may meet the basic condition if it undertakes these suggestions:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The SSWNP Steering Group undertakes a call for sites to make up a significant housing shortfall;</i> • <i>Part of this should include looking again at sites in the Site Assessment Report and update each site assessment. This means land at Clayton Kennels in light of new evidence submitted via representations to the SSWNP and Inspectors decision that would address the concerns raised previously.</i> • <i>Revise the BUAB to include the completed housing development at Milford Grange and the de facto settlement boundary around Clayton Kennels”</i> <p>6. Annexe:</p> <p>A. Representations submitted in regard to Regulation 15 consultation of SSWNP dated 4 September 2017</p> <p>B. Examiners report to the Thakeham Parish Neighbourhood Plan dated November 2016.</p>
Ref #131	Support LGS Site 17:	<p>1 <i>“Longbury Hill Wood is immensely valued and, in my opinion, should be protected as a Local Green Space in the SSWNP....would like to see Longbury Hill preserved for recreation purposes. It is vital to retain this woodland</i></p>

	Longbury Hill Wood	<i>sanctuary alongside Rock Road as new housing developments emerge in this area. The residents need safe green spaces for exercise and well-being, ideally with defined rights of way."</i>
Ref #132	Support LGS Site 17: Longbury Hill Wood	1. <i>"It is not acceptable to reach this conclusion simply on the basis that there is no public right of way onto the site. Longbury Hill Wood is a significant site of local interest, offering history, beauty, recreation, and a safe refuge for local wildlife. It should therefore be protected as a Local Green Space in the SSWNP...This Wood is integral to the ambience and tranquillity to the area and deserves special attention rather than be lost forever."</i>
Ref #133	Support LGS Site 17: Longbury Hill Wood	1. <i>"There should be no possibility that the recent 'forestry management activity' should result in anything other a local 'green space' area available to local residents of Heath Common and surrounding area. This immediate area is not at all suitable as Rock Road now leads directly to an enhanced school area comprising Steyning Grammar (with boarders) and Thakeham school."</i>
Ref #134	Support LGS Site 17: Longbury Hill Wood	1. <i>"I live in the peaceful Heath Common area and would like Longbury Hill to become local green space in order that it remains a quiet and visually appealing area where wild life can continue to flourish. I therefore support Longbury Hill becoming a local green space."</i>
Ref #135	Support Policy 2 Land at Angell Sandpit	1. <i>"What a great use of brown field land. We should encourage more of these developments. And save our green fields."</i>
Ref #136	Support with modifications Policy 16 Millford Grange Country Park, Water Lane Country Park & Longbury Hill Woods	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>"The Millford Grange area has been assessed as a local green space because it exists as a green space with public access whereas the Water Lane area has been excluded as a local green space because it does not yet have public access."</i> 2. <i>"The assessment should acknowledge the Water Lane area as part of phase 1 of Sandgate Country Park and as such part of a development in the process of being completed. If it is inappropriate to allocate the Water Lane area as a Local Green Space it should be stated that it will be as soon on becoming accessible to the public."</i> 3. <i>"I support the assessment of Longbury Hill Woods given in the LGS report Longbury Hill Woods addendum. I believe that the addendum provides sufficient evidence that the site does meet the criteria required for it to be assessed as a Local Green Space, contrary to the assessment in the LGS report addendum (November 2017)."</i>

Ref #137	Support with Comments Horsham District Council	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Proposed development is appropriate and proportionate to the village after consideration of the constraints and opportunities in and around the village. 2. HDC acknowledges the new draft NPPF which is expected to be adopted later this year and any subsequent HDPF review could be the catalyst for a full or partial review of the neighbourhood plan within an appropriate timeframe. 3. Principle of support is given to the proposed LGS in the plan subject to each proposal meeting the criteria set out in NPPF. 4. The examiner is requested to give due consideration to the possible extension of the referendum area into Thakeham Parish given the southern part of Thakeham parish is contiguous with the built-up areas in both Storrington and Sullington Parish and Washington Parish.
----------	--	---