

Dear Mr Slater,

Can I register my deep concern that following the formal examination of the Storrington Neighbourhood Plan, further assertions from those with self-interested financial concerns about the viability of Angells Sandpit are being put forward and published on the Plan website.

The facts seem clear: Storrington Parish Council originally excluded the site and only included it at the last minute due to pressure exerted on them; myriad construction and environmental factors clearly mitigated against inclusion of the site; the contamination of the land is severe and could have unforeseen health and safety consequences for very many years for local residents including occupiers of the proposed houses; the impact on the listed building is obviously of consequence, particularly the overbearing nature of the proposed development; the purpose of the restoration scheme was to return the site to amenity heathland which has not been complied with; building on the site would make a travesty of the conditions imposed in the restoration scheme and negate the expressed hope for wildlife to extend into the site as vegetation and trees established; replacing vegetation with buildings and hard standing would introduce drainage and flooding problems; the overall negative impact on the rural character of the area, the SDNP and the SSSI would be profound; the large executive homes proposed are neither needed nor desirable in Storrington; access from Heather Way is inadequate and the QB is strongly opposed to any access from Water Lane.

As an aside, ECE Planning also scathingly accuse the District Council of misleading and distorting facts and conclusions, a charge that not only do I think is reprehensible but instead I would direct at ECE Planning when they assert that the site was not quarried on the west side and that where it was, the quarried depths were quite shallow. We have overlooked the quarry for 30 years and I can assure you that nearly all the west side was quarried and to similar depths as the rest of the site.

It was my understanding that the examination was intended to be conclusive except where you requested further information from specific bodies. I also note that you specifically stated that at any site visits oral input would not be accepted, a fact that appears to have escaped the notice of Mr Sykes of ECE Planning who references the site visit and comments that were made in detail. To have uninvited further submissions put forward at this late stage seems contrary to the precepts of natural justice and just plain wrong, particularly as those behind the latest submissions are interested solely in financial gain and not in any of the significant issues your examination uncovered.

The developer and his supporters are clearly motivated solely by the prospect of making a significant financial gain, a fact inadvertently made by ECE when they point out that the developer would live in one of the houses thereby escaping capital gains tax on their current dwelling, a well known ruse of developers. My understanding was that neighbourhood plans above all else were not about financial gain but about balancing the need for housing development against social, environmental, feasibility and community issues.

You have an onerous role but one that I have confidence you will discharge impartially and with the interests of the community and the impact on residents firmly in mind. I thank you for that.

Yours sincerely,

Dr Julian Aviss