

STORRINGTON & SULLINGTON AND WASHINGTON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN
PUBLIC CONSULTATION RESPONSE SCHEDULE
10TH JULY 2017 – 4TH SEPTEMBER 2017

No	Date	Comment	Steering Group response
1	13/7/17	<p>In response to the public consultation for the NP, I wish to say that although I wholeheartedly support the plan overall I cannot support the inclusion of the Angells sandpit site.</p> <p>When the pit was infilled and permission granted for the 4 houses at the front, it was a condition that the remainder of the site was to be returned to heathland and handed over to the National Trust - a condition that was never enforced.</p> <p>This aside, the site is unsuitable as a result of the detrimental effect that development would have on the Grade II listed building of Chestnut Cottage/School Cottage, which are protected by the HDPF.</p> <p>The proposed access along Heather Way is considered unsuitable. This is a single track road amounting to not much more than a driveway and is unsuitable for the additional traffic that would be generated. Proposals to 'upgrade' it would change the nature of the area, which is that of a secluded country lane. The proposed exit onto Manleys Hill would result in additional traffic going an extremely busy road where queuing traffic is not at all unusual, especially at peak times or when there is an event on in the area.</p> <p>The type of houses proposed are not what is required.</p> <p>Views to and from the National Park would be affected.</p> <p>For all of these reasons I cannot support this site but DO support the remainder of the plan.</p>	<p>Historic England have been asked for advice regarding the setting.</p> <p>WSCC have confirmed that the site had been fully restored in accordance with the approved plans and that it entered the 5 year period of aftercare. Accordingly, in 2015 the permission was 'completed' and is therefore no longer a county site. The site was never transferred to the National Trust.</p> <p>Outcome. Historic England states that the development of the former sandpit would not encroach upon the openness of the grounds of the listed building so would not give rise to the same concerns raised by the Appeal Inspector.</p> <p>It is understood that discussions are underway with the landowner regarding access via Heather Way. WSCC Highways comments also suggest that improvements to the access would be required as part of the planning application.</p> <p>Following discussions at the Steering</p>

**STORRINGTON & SULLINGTON AND WASHINGTON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN
PUBLIC CONSULTATION RESPONSE SCHEDULE
10TH JULY 2017 – 4TH SEPTEMBER 2017**

			Group meeting on 17th November 2017 – this allocation will remain in the Plan.
2	18/7/17	<p>I write to confirm my full support for the Plan & its objectives. This community continues to face development pressures which have little if any connection to local need, & scant regard for the consequences. As a member of Storrington & Sullington P.C. I voted for adoption of the Plan. I do however have some comments to make:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Land at Angells Pit. Ref policy 2; v., & 4.31; this land was, as part of a previous planning commitment to be returned its original condition as an extension to the adjacent Warren. To have lost this contribution to green space & for it to be used for homes we don't need is hard to accept. 2. Glebe Field; DC/16/2108; 4.73; this development has already been permitted, but despite claimed desperate urgency relating to funding availability appears now to be in suspension. We do need improved medical facilities, but I still have serious concerns about the impact of this green space development. 3. Old Mill Drive. Ref policy 2; vi; reserve sites; p26; potential for residential housing is identified. This site is now topical in that the owner of the bus turning circle land is seeking a stopping up order and the provision of minimal bus parking/stop arrangements, to the detriment of market activities & traffic movement. <p>Finally I would like to thank all those involved in the years of work to bring the Plan together.</p> <p>I confirm I am a member of Storrington & Sullington Parish Council. The views I have expressed are entirely personal & are not necessarily supported by the council.</p>	<p>See comments above regarding this site allocation.</p> <p>The remaining Green Space will be included in the Local Green Spaces List. (See Local Green Spaces addendum Nov 2017)</p> <p>This Planning application has since been withdrawn</p> <p>Noted.</p>
3	19/7/17	<p>This letter is written in support of the NP. May I at the outset thank you and the steering committee for all the time and very diligent work that you put into writing it.</p> <p>I have two requests. The first is that the Angells sand pit site is withdrawn. Development on this site would have a detrimental effect on the setting of the grade II listed building of Chestnut Cottage/School Cottage. I understand that this is already protected in the HDPF.</p>	<p>See comments above re this site.</p>

STORRINGTON & SULLINGTON AND WASHINGTON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN
PUBLIC CONSULTATION RESPONSE SCHEDULE
10TH JULY 2017 – 4TH SEPTEMBER 2017

		<p>In addition the access to the site along Heather Way is unsuitable as it is a single track and upgrading it would be a significant change to the character of the area. The exit onto Manleys Hill is dangerous. This site should revert to Heathland as intended. We do not want or need this type of housing. Our housing need is fully met in the remainder of the plan.</p> <p>My second issue is the omission of the Milford Grange Park. This now open, has full public access and is a most valuable public amenity. Can it now be included please.</p>	<p>Site has been reviewed and will be included in the Local Green Spaces. (Local Green Spaces Addendum Nov 2017)</p>
4	25/7/17	<p>I understand the Neighbourhood Plan helps to determine where local development will take place over the next few years. I am also told that financial benefits for the community from development are increased for the community as a result of having an adopted plan. I know a great deal of work has gone into producing this plan and I therefore support it.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
5	31/7/17	<p>I am requesting an amendment to the Neighbourhood Plan regarding Sullington Lane and A283.</p> <p>I am requesting that the amendment state that no building or any form of development, no road and no sand extraction take place on this place of natural beauty.</p>	<p>Amendment to policy 8 wording to be included</p>
6	01/8/17	<p>I am in agreement with the proposed Neighbourhood Plan as it stands at present although the field at the top of Downsview Avenue designated as a green space would appear to be a non starter since it has been totally enclosed by fencing apart from the public footpath. In addition surveyors have been active during recent weeks in both the above field and the two adjoining fields which could be accessed through Downsview Avenue or via an extension of Water Lane.</p>	<p>A review has been undertaken regarding this site and the conclusion is that it will remain as a Local Green Space allocation. (Local Green Spaces Addendum Nov 2017)</p>
7	1/8/17	<p>I fully support the Neighbourhood Plan</p>	<p>noted</p>
8	1/8/17	<p>I support the Neighbourhood Plan and the inclusion of the land at Angel Sandpit.</p>	<p>noted</p>
9	1/8/17	<p>I am writing to support the inclusion of the land at Angels Sandpit.</p>	<p>noted</p>
10	2/8/17	<p>We write generally to STRONGLY SUPPORT the Pre- Submission SSWNP (July 2017).</p> <p>Nevertheless, we make the following comments and suggestions with a view to strengthening parts of the Plan whilst retaining its positivity.</p> <p>1) Page 24 - Para 4.15 – Criteria used to Justify a BUAB Modification.</p>	<p>Noted</p>

**STORRINGTON & SULLINGTON AND WASHINGTON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN
PUBLIC CONSULTATION RESPONSE SCHEDULE
10TH JULY 2017 – 4TH SEPTEMBER 2017**

	<p>In the fourth bullet point after the word “of” insert the words “suitable and safe” (see NPPF Paras 32 and 35).</p> <p>To give greater flexibility and in the spirit and furtherance of Localism we suggest in the fifth bullet point that before the word “planning” the words “significant negative ” should be inserted and the word “of” should be replaced with the word “or” and the following words should be added at the end “or there are other material planning objections”.</p> <p>Add a sixth bullet point as follows “The site generally complies with the requirements of HDPF 2015 Strategic Policy 4 – Settlement Expansion”.</p> <p>2) Page 36 – Policy 14 – Design.</p> <p>In our view much more should be done to reduce Light Pollution in Storrington as well as Washington bearing in mind the close proximity of the SDNP and the other environmental and economic benefits. This would better comply with NPPF 2012 Para. 125. External lighting in all developments should be strictly limited and the use of street lighting generally during night time hours should be reduced.</p> <p>3) Page 37 – Policy 15 – Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity.</p> <p>In Paragraph i omit the word “and” in the first line but for completeness insert the word “Banks” after the word “Trees” and after the word “Ponds” insert the words “Watercourses and other important Landscape and Natural Features” (to accord with HDPF Policy 33.6 –Development Principles).</p> <p>4) Page 40 – Policy 18 – Traffic and Transport.</p> <p>In order to strengthen the hand of the Parish Councils and in the spirit and furtherance of</p>	<p>agreed</p> <p>Comments noted but the SG feels that the current wording is sufficient.</p> <p>agreed</p> <p>Please see para 4.73 of the SSWNP regarding the SDNPA role in protecting the dark skies above the National Park.</p> <p>Comments noted and wording agreed.</p> <p>Unfortunately the Parish Councils</p>
--	--	---

**STORRINGTON & SULLINGTON AND WASHINGTON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN
PUBLIC CONSULTATION RESPONSE SCHEDULE
10TH JULY 2017 – 4TH SEPTEMBER 2017**

	<p>Localism we suggest the following words are added to the third line “ and the Parish Councils”.</p> <p>Towards the end of the third paragraph we suggest the addition of the word “including” after the word “ Bridleways” in order to make it more comprehensive.</p> <p>5) Site Assessment Report – Appendix 3 – Small Sites.</p> <p>Seven small Sites are listed which were submitted for Development by Landowners but due to their size and potential yield were judged to be more suited to consideration under HDC Windfall Sites or as Infill as described in Policy 1 of the Neighbourhood Plan. Most of these sites do seem to be small Infill Sites.</p> <p>However, the last Site listed is 0.4 hectare south of Kithurst Lane, Storrington submitted in May 2016 by the Norbertine Order for development of 1 or 2 dwellings.</p> <p>In our view this last Site does not accord with the Definitions of “ Infilling” or “ Windfall Site” in the HDPF 2015 (see Pages 154 and 163). The land is a sizeable Greenfield Site and is not within the BUAB. Also, under the NPPF given its significant planning history (see below) the land cannot realistically (as required by the NPPF) be described as a Windfall Site.</p> <p>Clearly, additional detached dwellings in large grounds are not the housing priority in Storrington Parish (see SSWNP Page 21 Para 4.2) but even if the potential housing yield was greater than the 1 or 2 dwellings now suggested by the Landowner this Land would not be suitable for housing under the Planning Policies of The NPPF 2012, HDPF 2015 or the SSWNP as the Relevant Facts and Planning History briefly set out below demonstrates :-</p> <p>(a) The Land is the 0.4 hectare frontage of a 0.91 hectare pasture field on the south side of Storrington. It has a 100 meter wide frontage and a large field immediately to its east</p>	<p>do not have this level of power.</p> <p>The inclusion of this word would not make sense in this paragraph.</p> <p>This site has now been put forward for up to 12 homes and will therefore be subjected to the site assessment process. It is noted that there are two planning applications pending.</p> <p>Outcome: The site assessment process concluded that this site is not appropriate for inclusion as an allocation in the NP. Site Assessment Report January 2017</p>
--	--	---

STORRINGTON & SULLINGTON AND WASHINGTON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN
PUBLIC CONSULTATION RESPONSE SCHEDULE
10TH JULY 2017 – 4TH SEPTEMBER 2017

		<p>side (now called Matts Meadow, a proposed Local Green Space under Policy 16 SSWNP Page 38). It is a Greenfield Site adjacent to but outside the BUAB in countryside leading southwards towards the SDNP about 200 meters away. It is in a “Particularly Sensitive Landscape” (see Inspectors Report 2007 HDPF Site Specific Allocations of Land DPD). Kithurst Lane is part of a well-used Public Footpath leading to the SDNP and South Downs Way.</p> <p>(b) Planning Consent for 4 Detached Dwellings on the same 0.4 hectare Site was Refused on Appeal 18/12/2015 (Ref: App/Z3825/W/15/3121528) because the Planning Inspector held that development, “would have a harmful impact on the Character and Appearance of this rural edge of Storrington” and be undermining of the aims of HDPF Policies 4 (Settlement Expansion), 25 (Protection of Landscape Character), 26 (Countryside Protection) and 33 (Development Principles). This recent Planning Appeal Decision is an important Material Consideration.</p> <p>(c) A previous Planning Appeal in respect of a proposal for 8 Ecologically Secure Dwellings for the Elderly on the same 0.4 hectare was Refused on 13/11/2008 for similar Landscape reasons (Ref: APP/Z3825/A/08/2075649).</p> <p>(d) Another Planning Appeal in respect of a very low density development proposal of only 3 detached dwellings on the whole 0.91 field was Refused 18/01/2009 (Ref: T/APP/Z3825//A/99/1029049-P5) for similar Landscape Character reasons. The Planning Inspector also found it was not Infilling because the land has a 100 meter wide frontage and a large field immediately to its east side.</p> <p>(e) Residential development of this land would not comply with the NPPF 2012 Core Planning Principles - Para 17 and Section 11- Conserving and Enhancing the Natural Environment – Paras 109 and 111 and the HDPF 2015 (see Sub. Para.(b) above) and The Storrington and Sullington Design Statement SPD 2010 as well as the Pre-Submission SSWNP (July 2017) and has been consistently opposed by the Parish</p>	
--	--	--	--

**STORRINGTON & SULLINGTON AND WASHINGTON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN
PUBLIC CONSULTATION RESPONSE SCHEDULE
10TH JULY 2017 – 4TH SEPTEMBER 2017**

		<p>Council, HDC and the Planning Inspectorate on Appeal and Examination of Development Plans. Countryside Policies Apply.</p> <p>(f) Access to the Land is via dangerous single track Lanes with no footpaths (contrary to NPPF Paras.32 and 35 and HDPF Policy 40-Sustainable Transport- Sub Paras. 1,2,6 and 9) extensively used as rat runs and a congested, inadequate and dangerous junction at the Tesco mini-roundabout and another inadequate and dangerous junction at Fern Road/ Monastery Lane/School Lane/Kithurst Lane/Cemetery Lane.</p> <p>(g) The Land is assessed on the August 2016 SHELAA as an excluded greenfield site (ie. SA 250) being a part of SA 021 (the whole 0.91 hectare field) which is assessed as “ NOT CURRENTLY DEVELOPABLE “. Although Available it is found , “ NOT SUITABLE “ and, NOT ACHIEVABLE “ for development.</p> <p>THIS LAST SITE IS CLEARLY NOT SUITABLE FOR DEVELOPMENT UNDER ANY RELEVANT PLANNING POLICY.</p>	
11	3/8/17	<p>I am concerned for this green field at the end of Downsvie Avenue, Storrington. Mr Pocket, the current owner, has fenced it in to stop access with a view to selling to Builders. This field has an Ancient Woodland alongside it as well as a public path and I am very concerned about building on this field. The Plan says it is not suitable for building which myself and my neighbours backing onto this field agree with. Also across this field is a water pipe which is continually leaking, this goes into the Industrial Estate where Paula Rose was. I have again telephoned the Water Board advising that once again, this pipe is leaking. Can they gain access? I just do not know, but they will have to contact Mr Pocket for the third time in about six weeks.</p> <p>Please note the objections from the houses at the end of Bannister Gardens for any building on this field.</p>	<p>A review has been undertaken regarding this site and the conclusion is that it will remain as a Local Green Space allocation. (Local Green Spaces Addendum Nov 2017)</p>

STORRINGTON & SULLINGTON AND WASHINGTON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN
PUBLIC CONSULTATION RESPONSE SCHEDULE
10TH JULY 2017 – 4TH SEPTEMBER 2017

12	3/8/17	<p>I appreciate this is a generic email to people and although I read the documents when they were released in July, I omitted to complete the relevant form which I will do shortly. Frankly I really feel the enormous amount of work that has gone into this exercise by you and others involved cannot really be appreciated. It's such an important document for our village and will shape it's future if, as I hope it is supported in the Referendum.. It is very comprehensive and informative, although I confess I found the Sustainability Assessment pretty hard going, perhaps more a reflection on me than the authors/contributors I feel. One question is on Policy 16 that describes the Green Field Space no. 3 as Hormare Filed but on the Policies Map as Hurston Lane Field. Is this the same location? As a resident I really appreciate the enormous amount of work that must have been undertaken to get this project so far, quite remarkable.</p>	<p>noted</p> <p>Map amended to read Hormare Field</p>
13	<p>3/8/17</p> <p>4/9/17</p>	<p>I refer to your email received today with regards to the neighbourhood plan. We have no specific comments and are happy with the proposed plan as it currently stands. Our thanks to all involved - it has been quite a task!</p> <p>We should like to add the following comments to our previous email. We would like to see the following included in the Plan:</p> <p>Angell Pit to be removed from the Site Allocation for Development</p> <p>Millford Grange Country Park to be re-established as a green space in the Neighbourhood Plan</p> <p>Sandgate Park to be re-established as a green space in the Neighbourhood Plan</p> <p>Warren Hill to be re-established as a green space in the Neighbourhood Plan</p> <p>The area now known as Water Lane Country Park to be added to the list of green spaces</p> <p>With thanks for all the work that has gone into this Plan and for the ongoing work.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>See previous comments about this site.</p> <p>Now included as a LGS</p> <p>Now Included as a LGS</p>
14	4/8/17	<p>The latest version of the neighbourhood plan has changed significantly from the one produced eighteen months ago, particularly in the selection of sites for new dwellings in Storrington. Sites have disappeared and other sites have appeared. One such new site is Angell's Pit on Washington</p>	

STORRINGTON & SULLINGTON AND WASHINGTON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN
PUBLIC CONSULTATION RESPONSE SCHEDULE
10TH JULY 2017 – 4TH SEPTEMBER 2017

		Road. I have two comments on this site:- 1. The choice of two and three bedroomed houses is not really in keeping with the four houses already built on the site, or with other houses in the neighbourhood. 2. It seems illogical to propose access via Heather Way along a narrow, unmade private road. Access should be from Water Lane, either by the existing entrance to the Angell's Pit development or by a new entry point further up Water Lane.	Refer to previous notes about this site
15	4/8/17	I am writing to let you know that I fully support the Neighbourhood Plan. However I would prefer the green space at Milford Grange to be included. Many thanks for your hard work on this. Let's hope it goes through this time and has an impact on the future development of Storrington. On another note, please can you send me the link to the Gladman proposal off Fryern Road.	Noted – site now included as a proposed LGS (Local Green Spaces Addendum Nov 2017)
16	4/8/17	Huge thanks to everyone who has contributed to the Storrington & Sullington & Washington Neighbourhood Plan - it must have been a mammoth and, I suspect, thankless task! We obviously have to shoulder some of the burden for future housing development in the area and the Parish Council has identified some reasonable sites. Infrastructure and air quality are always going to be of major concern but you seem to have policies in place to cope with the problems of the future. Good luck with everything and thank you again for working so diligently on behalf of the local community.	Noted
17	4/8/17	I approve in the main to the development proposals. I am sure I share the concerns of residents about the increased volume of traffic that enters the village along with the educational requirements of an expanding village. We hope that developments will include afford housing not just for young people but for older residents who may wish to downsize in the future. The plans for retaining and creating green space are excellent.	Noted
18	7/8/17	I fully support the Neighbourhood Plan and pass on my thanks to the group of dedicated people who have worked so hard on it.	noted
19	7/8/17	Dear Tracey, please be advised that we both agree with the latest version of the Neighbourhood Plan.	noted
20	7/8/17	I see quite a change in the site selection methodology, but pleased that the Bax Close site now referred to as	

**STORRINGTON & SULLINGTON AND WASHINGTON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN
PUBLIC CONSULTATION RESPONSE SCHEDULE
10TH JULY 2017 – 4TH SEPTEMBER 2017**

		<p>the "Land off Amberley Road" is not included. However what does SHLAA/SHELAA mean? Will it come under consideration after 11 years? this would be well withing the NP's time frame of 15 years so will it be automatically offered for development?</p> <p>Also I noticed that the Clay Lane site (no 18) was considered, but found to be not developable, which is great. I don't remember seeing is under the old Policy 2 site list. Who introduced it? By the way there is a reference to Bax Close under the Site Planning History section. For consistency it should now refer the Land off Amberley Road site name.</p> <p>Many thanks for all your had work on this. It's been a long road but I do hope it will now pass with flying colours. I intend to support the NP and will encourage others to do the same.</p>	<p>The NP covers the period to 2031 but reviews will be undertaken in line with the HDPF.</p> <p>Noted and site name to be amended</p> <p>noted</p>
21	7/8/17	<p>I have read the proposed neighbourhood plan and am writing with my broad support for the proposals.</p> <p>I recognise the need to provide additional housing in our village but obviously this needs to be at a level that the village can support. One doctors surgery, no secondary school and the choking traffic would seem to limit our capacity for much more.</p> <p>I also recognise that it is easy to support development "not in my back yard". I strongly favour those developments with minimal impact on existing residents and ideally on sites close to the village but away from any substantial existing residential areas.</p> <p>As a resident of Melton Drive I am pleased to see that the housing development there is not currently viable though astonished to see the suggestion of a 1000 home development option. This would be an extraordinary level of development for the village to contemplate.</p> <p>So I would support the proposals as they stand and am pleased to see this very protracted process close to a conclusion. We need to avoid the risk of opportunistic development attempts.</p> <p>I applaud the resilience of the parish council members in seeing this through. You may not get the credit you deserve but from me, you do. Great job and thank you for the commitment.</p>	<p>A planning application for a new medical centre and 9 homes has been approved on the Glebe Field. There are policies in the NP relating to education and traffic.</p> <p>The site at West Wantley Farm was assessed and considered inappropriate for inclusion as an allocation in the NP.</p>

STORRINGTON & SULLINGTON AND WASHINGTON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN
PUBLIC CONSULTATION RESPONSE SCHEDULE
10TH JULY 2017 – 4TH SEPTEMBER 2017

22	8/8/17	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this document. I have now re-read it and have nothing to add. I feel the document is very comprehensive and frankly, I'd like to think our estate agents will (once passed) draw it to the attention of people moving into the area as they will find it very informative. It certainly identifies some challenges for the community and of course the Parish Council with issues such as: traffic congestion, air quality, broadband etc. that will need to be addressed. I also note the vision "By 2031 we will have shaped a community that has grown and developed to accommodate its needs in such a way that we have preserved its character and "essence", as I shall be 82 by this date, any effort to accelerate the timetable would be much appreciated.</p> <p>Seriously, a good quality report and thank you again for the opportunity to comment.</p>	noted
23	10/8/17	<p>I am pleased to confirm my support for the Neighbor Hood Plan. I must also reiterate my immense gratitude for and admiration of those who have worked so diligently to progress this infinitive for our community.</p> <p>However I gather it now includes a development not originally but forward. That being the Angells sandpit. This development is clearly opportunistic and stretches any consideration for reasonable development to the limit. Manleys Hill is already over loaded with properties and has consistent traffic congestion occurring along it. Further I believe it is inappropriate for any more properties to be built or planned to be built in this parish that are not considered affordable or for that matter considered "social housing".</p> <p>I cannot support this particular site but I do support the remainder of the plan.</p>	Refer to previous comments about this site
24	10/8/17	I support the Neighbourhood Plan	noted
25	10/8/17	I have full support for the Neighbourhood Plan	noted
26	10/8/17	I fully support the Neighbourhood Plan	noted
27	10/8/17	I fully support the Neighbourhood Plan	noted
28	10/8/17	<p>My comments on the Storrington Neighbourhood Plan are as follows.</p> <p>1. Green spaces. In my opinion Newtown Green in Cootham should be included in the list of Green Spaces and given conservation status for this historic site. This Green should be preserved so that it should not ever be built upon. The oak trees in the Green should have TPO's on them. Parham Estates, who own the Green, have recently cut down a mature oak tree to the consternation of the locals.</p>	This area has been reviewed and was not considered to meet the criteria for inclusion as a LGS (Local Green Spaces Addendum Nov 2017)

STORRINGTON & SULLINGTON AND WASHINGTON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN
PUBLIC CONSULTATION RESPONSE SCHEDULE
10TH JULY 2017 – 4TH SEPTEMBER 2017

		<p>2. Bax Close. We support that this patch of land should not be included in the Plan so that it is not developed for housing. The problems of extra traffic it would create at the two ends of New Town Road is not acceptable. An exit on to the Amberly Road would also be not acceptable on traffic considerations.</p> <p>3. Clay Lane. Again we support the non inclusion of Clay Lane in the Plan. This would extend the housing limit too far into the countryside.</p>	<p>This area is not allocated for development in the NP.</p> <p>This area is not allocated for development in the NP.</p>
29	13/8/17	<p>Storrington does not need more building in its centre, now that the Glebe field has gone the allotments remain the lungs of the village. We are probably the most air polluted village in the country and still we keep adding to the problem by building yet more houses! Browns Lane is a rat run for motorists trying to avoid congestion through the village, most speed through regardless of the nursery school in the Guide Hut and elderly residents of Orchard Gardens and Manor Close. It is only a matter of time before there is a fatality. 70 plus houses on the allotment site will mean at least another 100 cars using Browns Lane leading to more congestion in Church Street which is already gridlocked for most of the day.</p> <p>The new site for the allotments needs to have soil suitable for growing organic produce., We also need water, security, car parking and a toilet and a shed for each holder. Unlike the last eviction from Post View allotments, we will need help with transport, plants, tools, equipment and compensation for plants that need years to establish e.g. Asparagus.</p> <p>We still believe the Parish Council should be fighting WSCC over this development.</p>	<p>As a result of feedback received during the public consultation and discussions with South Downs National Park Authority the number of homes on this site has been reduced.</p> <p>The NP Steering Group will work with the developers to provide the best facilities possible at the new allotments</p>
30	16/8/17	<p>I have noted that the most recent version of the Neighbourhood Plan has altered since the one produced 18 months ago, especially regarding the development of housing in Sullington. I refer particularly to the selection of the new site on Angell's Pit on Washington Road.</p> <p>To extend the dwellings on the rear of this site with 2 and 3 bedroom houses is certainly not in keeping with the 4 houses already built on this site and indeed is not in keeping with others in the area.</p> <p>I am at a loss to see how these new properties can possibly be accessed from Heather Way short of driving through someone's private property. What is wrong with access from Water Lane?</p> <p>I also wish to comment on the fact that in the revised version of the Neighbourhood Plan you have omitted to include the protection of the fields at the corner of Sullington Lane and the A2893, which are within the National Park. These fields provide a wonderful scenic view on the approach into Storrington. it would be a very sad day if we were to lose this.</p>	<p>See previous comments about this site.</p> <p>There is a policy within the Plan to protect views (policy 8)</p>

**STORRINGTON & SULLINGTON AND WASHINGTON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN
PUBLIC CONSULTATION RESPONSE SCHEDULE
10TH JULY 2017 – 4TH SEPTEMBER 2017**

		I regret that I would be unable to support the referendum if either of these projects goes ahead.	
31	14/8/17	<p>Thanks for the email, I am sorry I missed the site visit, due to my phone I only found the email this morning.</p> <p>As a newcomer I would be very grateful to be able to carry on where ever the new site! I only have one question at present, will all the existing plot holders need to transfer to make the new site viable?</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>No</p>
32	21/8/17	<p>We are concerned about several issues and did not want to appear apathetic to your request for views. However we have found the plan extremely difficult to negotiate. We visited the library in the hope that the paper copy would be easier to understand and comment on but that was hopeless. There was one copy and several people waiting for it.</p> <p>So I thought I would tell you about the issues that are of the greatest concern to us. There is the pollution from the A283 and the seemingly inability of the powers that be to limit the heavy lorries that ruin Storrington. We have now lived here for seven years and this has been discussed all that time along with the need for public conveniences. I could scarcely believe my eyes when I read that Storrington could be promoted as a tourist centre for walkers etc. Must be a joke with no loos. We find it difficult enough. You can't even go to the library as there are no facilities there why not, Crawley and Horsham have good provisions. As for pollution it really is disgraceful that bordering a national park we have unacceptable levels of air pollution. All I have seen can be summed up as procrastination it could go on for years more.</p> <p>The new surgery and associated facilities is much needed but why should we be held to ransom having to accept village centre housing which was not part of the previous local plan.</p> <p>It seems to us that the parish and district councils are abdicating responsibility for these important issues</p>	<p>Please see policy re air quality.</p> <p>The issue of HGVs using this area is being addressed independently of the SSWNP. A Traffic Regulation Order has been approved which will prevent HGVs from using the junction at Manley's Hill / School Hill.</p> <p>Plans are underway to install a public toilet facility during 2018</p>
33	21/8/17	<p>I have really struggled through the huge package of documents associated with the SS&W Neighbourhood Plan!!</p> <p>I am sure the Parish Councils are forced to follow detailed process guidelines resulting from the localism act but to expect a sensible set of comments from individual voters on what you have published is optimistic in the extreme!</p> <p>I believe rather than planning being shaped by well-intentioned local people it should be handled by full time professionals in my view.</p> <p>It seems to me that when the Neighbourhood Plan is accepted it is likely to lead to planning</p>	<p>Following the examiner's report in March 2015. The SG has worked with HDC and independent professionals in an effort to produce a robust NP that will be a statutory planning document.</p>

STORRINGTON & SULLINGTON AND WASHINGTON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN
PUBLIC CONSULTATION RESPONSE SCHEDULE
10TH JULY 2017 – 4TH SEPTEMBER 2017

		applications being in the hands of lawyers not the residents because we do not have qualifications in planning law. One definition of “Bureaucracy” is “over concerned with procedure at the expense of efficiency or common sense”. Having ploughed through your papers, it leads me to comment that this exercise is a bad example of this definition of bureaucracy! I am sorry but I am incapable of further detailed comment.	
34	22/8/17	I am in full support of the Neighbourhood Plan in its current form.	Noted
35	23/8/17	<p>Comments:</p> <p><u>Local Green Spaces report</u></p> <p><u>Exclusion of Warren Hill on the basis that it is not close to a settlement.</u> It is as close to a settlement as Longbury Hill which is included. Warren Hill is part of the National Trust land in that area, within the SDNP and a much used public open space. Excluding Warren Hill on the basis of proximity makes little sense. If it was excluded on the basis that it is under the protection of the NT and within the SDNP that would be understandable.</p> <p><u>Paragraph 4.4 Millford Grange Country Park</u> The report states that the site is under construction and not yet open to the public. There has been public access to the site since at least February 2017.</p> <p><u>Sandgate Park</u> The description of Sandgate Park is incorrect in the LGS report and there is a discrepancy between the Sandgate Park referred to in the Pre-submission Plan and the Sandgate Park referred to in the LGS report. This points to a mix-up between the HDC owned public open space called Sandgate Park and the Cemex Sandgate Quarry which appears as Sandgate Park on maps. For example HDC Sandgate Park is not a working quarry and neither is the Cemex Sandgate Quarry only 30 acres. Whether at only 30 acres HDC Sandgate Park is too extensive to be included is debateable as NT Warren Hill at approximately 70 acres has not been excluded on the basis of being too extensive.</p> <p><u>Phase 1 Sandgate Country Park</u> In terms of the Cemex Sandgate Quarry perhaps mention should be made of the area north of the quarry (adjacent to HDC Sandgate Park) which is due to become open to the public as part of Phase 1 of Sandgate Country Park under the terms of the planning permission for the Millford Grange</p>	<p>Warren Hill has been re assessed and the conclusion is that it does not meet the criteria. However, it is indeed protected by the National Trust.</p> <p>Milford Grange Country Park to be included in the LGS</p> <p>This area owned by HDC is now included in the LGS</p> <p>Please refer to Local Green Spaces Addendum (Nov 2017)</p> <p>Please refer to Community Aim number 1.</p>

STORRINGTON & SULLINGTON AND WASHINGTON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN
PUBLIC CONSULTATION RESPONSE SCHEDULE
10TH JULY 2017 – 4TH SEPTEMBER 2017

		<p>housing development. <u>River Stor and Environs</u> It is not clear what is meant by River Stor and Environs as the river flows through a mix of publicly accessible and private land and therefore it is understandable that it would not qualify as a local green space. However I think there is a case to be made to include the section of the River Stor and the Riverside Walk between Mill Pond and Fryern Dell. While the area is long it is narrow and therefore not particularly extensive.</p> <p>Site Assessment Report <u>Former sandpit off Water Lane</u> It is disappointing to see the former Angel Sandpit designated as available for development. I understand that the pit had been restored to heathland and its restoration represented the most significant increase in the area of heathland in West Sussex for many years</p>	<p>This area is now included as an LGS (Local Green Spaces Addendum Nov 2017)</p> <p>Noted – please see previous comments</p>
36	23/8/17	<p>Many thanks for your recent email about the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>We have posted our response, giving the Plan our full support, today.</p> <p>When reading the ‘Site Assessment Report’ section we noticed a few minor typos and we have listed these below as, if they have not already been picked up, we thought you would want to correct them.</p> <p>Section 3.3 - in 3rd line “no” should be ‘not’.</p> <p>Sect. 3.4 - in the penultimate line we think “and” should be “east”.</p> <p>Sect. 3.7 - in the last line “falls” should be “falling”.</p> <p>Sect. 5.5 - in the penultimate line the colon should be a comma.</p>	<p>Noted and typos will be rectified</p>

STORRINGTON & SULLINGTON AND WASHINGTON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN
PUBLIC CONSULTATION RESPONSE SCHEDULE
10TH JULY 2017 – 4TH SEPTEMBER 2017

		<p>Sect.6.2 - in the first bullet point “ explicitly included by included details” is odd.</p> <p>Sect.6.4 - in 3rd line delete “are” before “help”.</p> <p>Sect. 6.4- in the bullet point on flooding (4th from last) delete “is” between “site” and “contains”.</p> <p>These suggestions are offered purely in the spirit of helpfulness - not as a criticism !</p>	
37	24/8/17	<p>Thanks to all Parish Council members for all their hard work in progressing this plan. My main interest is as a plotholder on the Ravenscroft Allotments, earmarked for development in the plan. Assuming that this development will happen at some stage in the future, I would like to be involved in the process of determining how the transfer to the new site should take place. At a recent meeting it was also agreed that we should have a chance to visit the new site as soon as possible.</p>	Noted – this person will be contacted at the appropriate time.
38	29/8/17	<p>Approved – Well done loads of work. So many thanks.</p>	Noted
39	30/8/17	<p>Following our earlier objections to the proposed development of Land of Amberley Road, we are naturally pleased that this site is no longer considered suitable for development. We are also very pleased that the Land adjacent to Clay Lane has been deemed unsuitable for development. Regarding the plan as a whole. We think it clearly sets out the rationale behind the recommendations in the re-drafted Plan and demonstrates the thorough approach adopted by the Parish Council and its Steering Committee in dealing with issues which will affect the local community for years to come. We should like to give the Plan our full support.</p>	Noted
40	30/8/17	<p>We request that you remove “Matt’s Meadow” from the planned designation as a local green space under policy 16 of the Neighbourhood Plan and from map Inset 2. We note that the Local Green Spaces Report dated March 2017 which was prepared for your neighbourhood plan included “Matt’s Meadow” (which we refer to as Matt’s Wood) as item x of the evaluated sites without any consultation with us.</p> <p>The report incorrectly states that the site is “publically accessible” in spite of there being a clear sign at the entrance gate to the cemetery lane which gives access to Matt’s Wood. This sign states: “Our Lady of England Priory PRIVATE LAND</p>	<p>This site has been reassessed and the conclusion is that it continues to meet the criteria for inclusion in the LGS (Local Green Spaces Addendum Nov 2017)</p>

**STORRINGTON & SULLINGTON AND WASHINGTON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN
PUBLIC CONSULTATION RESPONSE SCHEDULE
10TH JULY 2017 – 4TH SEPTEMBER 2017**

		<p>No Public Right of Way Cemetery Access Access to Matt’s Woodland Field on the left with permission (01903) 742150” We or the parish priest have from time to time closed the gate for a period. This land is leased by the Norbertine Order Canons to Chemin Neuf Community until 6th July 2065 and we are therefore replying as the registered proprietor.</p>	
41	30/8/17	<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Sandgate Conservation Society</u></p> <p style="text-align: center;">Comments on latest iteration of Neighbourhood Plan</p> <p>Sandgate Conservation Society objects most strongly to the amendments to Section 4 Vision Objectives and Policies.</p> <p><u>Policy 2 Site Allocation for Development</u></p> <p>v. Land at Angell Pit – Objection to inclusion for the following reasons:-</p> <p>The original planning permission for the excavation of Angell Pit contained a clause for the restoration of the area to the original land contour, once mineral abstraction ceased. The land remains green and development should not be allowed</p> <p>The restored area is outside of the Built Up Area Boundary and development should not be allowed.</p> <p>The site is clearly visible from the South Downs Way and development would be detrimental to the view. It should not be allowed.</p> <p>Angell Pit should be removed from the Site Allocation for Development</p> <p><u>Green Spaces – request to reinstate Sandgate Park, Millford Grange Country Park and Warren Hill</u></p>	<p>Please see previous comments</p> <p>Please see previous comments regarding these sites</p>

STORRINGTON & SULLINGTON AND WASHINGTON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN
PUBLIC CONSULTATION RESPONSE SCHEDULE
10TH JULY 2017 – 4TH SEPTEMBER 2017

	<p>Warren Hill</p> <p>Warren Hill is not a long way from the local population. It is a well used recreational area and although owned by the National Trust, the Society believes that it should be included in the list of green spaces. With today's transport arrangements, the easy access by motor vehicle along Georges Lane makes it close to the local population, not far away. The Society is promoting the concept of a strategic, green footpath from Storrington to Washington, whereby with only a few exceptions it will be possible to walk between the two villages without resorting to the public highway. This leads to Warren Hill and adds to its accessibility.</p> <p>Warren Hill should be re-established as a green space in the Neighbourhood Plan..</p> <p>4.90 Sandgate Country Park.</p> <p>Sandgate Conservation Society has promoted the concept of the Sandgate Country Park for many years. Whilst we live in an area of green open countryside, most of it is not available for the residents and the public to use for recreation. The Society has always understood the need to recognise phasing of the formation of the Country Park. In fact we made this comment to the Inspector during the public examination of the South Downs National Park Boundary.</p> <p>Phasing must not be allowed to eliminate obvious green spaces that will eventually form part of the Sandgate Country Park. Comments that the quarries are still operational are too 'short term'. Quarrying has taken place since World War 2. We understand that reserves are dwindling and it may only be a few years before quarrying ceases. It is absolutely essential that the Parish Council begins to take an interest in the future of the whole area on the north side of the A283, between Water Lane and Hampers Lane.</p> <p>Whilst the quarry itself is not a 'green space', the surrounding area between it and Sandgate Park has been donated by Cemex as a public open space. This was carried out in conjunction with Millford Grange Country Park following long negotiations with Sandgate Conservation Society.</p>	<p>Please see previous comments</p> <p>Please refer to Community Aim number 1 in the NP.</p> <p>This area has been assessed and</p>
--	--	---

STORRINGTON & SULLINGTON AND WASHINGTON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN
PUBLIC CONSULTATION RESPONSE SCHEDULE
10TH JULY 2017 – 4TH SEPTEMBER 2017

		<p>Cemex have to complete the footpath and other furniture such as signs and seats and this should be completed within the next few months. The company has already completed a safety fence around the quarry. This area is now referred to as Water Lane Country Park and affords a very pleasant green area and a footpath which will connect into Sandgate Park.</p> <p>The area now known as Water Lane Country Park should be added to the list of green spaces.</p> <p>Sandgate Conservation Society has promoted the idea of green space accessibility in the Storrington/Washington area for many years. We have worked with Horsham District Council to both maintain the existing open spaces and to create further areas of public access. The Neighbourhood Plan is both a plan for the future and an ideal reference document for residents, the public and tourist visitors to establish what is available for them as opportunity to enter the countryside and for recreation. Leaving these existing green spaces from the list in the Neighbourhood Plan removes the best countryside opportunities.</p> <p>Regards Sandgate Conservation Society</p>	<p>may be designated as an LGS in the context of its future use</p>
42	30/8/17	<p>I am writing on behalf of my wife and I to register our strong objection to the new site at The former sand pit off Water Lane.</p> <p>Our objection is to the access from Heather Way. This seems an extremely odd option for access. It is along an unmade private road, very narrow in parts. There are few places vehicles coming in opposite directions could pass each other and we would argue it is unsuitable for the inevitable increase in cars that would result from the proposed development. A few photographs of the private road are attached to show the poor quality of the road surface and its narrowness.</p> <p>A more obvious and logical choice for access would be from the Water Lane end which is significantly closer to the proposed site and offers options for where the entrance could be located. There is already an entrance from the Water Lane end at the Angel Sands development.</p>	<p>Previous comments are relevant</p>

**STORRINGTON & SULLINGTON AND WASHINGTON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN
PUBLIC CONSULTATION RESPONSE SCHEDULE
10TH JULY 2017 – 4TH SEPTEMBER 2017**

		<p>We would ask that the Parish Council make a review of the proposed access and give serious consideration to access from Water Lane.</p> <p>On a point of detail in Appendix 2 to the plan, Distance to Schools shows Rydon Community School to be 0.4823km from the former sand pit site. This seems incorrect if access is from Heather Way.</p>	Noted – distances are measured from the site
43	30/8/17	<p>Thanks very much for your email about the Neighbourhood Plan. My main concern in commenting on previous versions related to the proposal by BOVIS to build houses on a site close to Bax Close. I note with satisfaction that the draft Plan does not seem to allow this possibility (although there is a reference to building 11 new homes).</p> <p>I believe that there is merit in our having a Neighbourhood Plan and I am happy to support the Draft which now exists. I hope that it may quickly move from being a Draft to becoming a fully approved Plan.</p>	Noted
44	30/8/17	<p>This to advise that I believe the Storrington & Sullington and Washington Neighbourhood Plan is essential to containing this parish's expansion and accordingly I support the proposed plan.</p>	Noted
45	31/8/17	<p>We have seen with some concerns the proposals suggested for the removal of areas which hitherto have been designated as Green Spaces.</p> <p>We back on to Sandgate Park and frankly cannot see any justification for the removal of the following sites</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Angell Pit should be removed 2. Milford Grange Country Park should be re-established as a green space 3. Sandgate Park which is adjacent to our property should be re-established 4. Warren Hill should also be re-established. <p>The Sandgate Conservation Society have made very forceful representations which we support wholeheartedly.</p>	Previous comments are relevant

STORRINGTON & SULLINGTON AND WASHINGTON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN
PUBLIC CONSULTATION RESPONSE SCHEDULE
10TH JULY 2017 – 4TH SEPTEMBER 2017

		<p>The proposals put forward to alter the area contain a number of errors highlighted by the SCC.</p> <p>Policy seems to change annually and the present proposals seem to contradict para 2.3 of the South Downs policy set out in the evaluation document.</p> <p>We as a family urge a serious rethink.</p> <p>Yours sincerely</p>	
46	31/8/17	<p>We have reviewed the revised Storrington, Sullington and Washington Neighbourhood Plan and wish to make the following comments:-</p> <p>1. We are happy with the development sites proposed in the revised plan. The plan addresses the overwhelming view of residents to limit building of new homes to existing brown field sites. Whilst some allotments sites are also proposed, alternate sites are earmarked which should satisfy and compensate existing allotment owners.</p> <p>2. It is a pity that the plan cannot be more influential in addressing Storrington residents' concerns about traffic volumes and the resultant levels of air pollution from cars using the B2139 Amberley Road and A283 Pulborough Road as cut-throughs from the congested A24. We accept this is probably not in the scope of this Plan and that other bodies are responsible for traffic issues but the problem is still of major concern for most Storrington residents and needs to be addressed at some stage in the near future.</p> <p>Overall we are very supportive of the revised Neighbourhood Plan and hope that this time it will be adopted and implemented. Our thanks go to all those involved in producing this comprehensive document.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Storrington & Sullington Parish Council is working with WSCC Highways and the Air Quality Management Group to address some of these issues independently of the Neighbourhood Plan</p>
47	30/8/17	I fully support the Storrington, Sullington and Washington Neighbourhood Plan	noted
48	31/8/17	<p>We would like to offer our support for the Neighbourhood Plan, which reflects all the hard work over the past months.</p> <p>Let us hope that it achieves the desired result and that planning is controlled in a sensible and</p>	noted

STORRINGTON & SULLINGTON AND WASHINGTON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN
PUBLIC CONSULTATION RESPONSE SCHEDULE
10TH JULY 2017 – 4TH SEPTEMBER 2017

		sustainable manner.	
49	31/8/17	We think that access to the village via Browns Lane and Meadowside is too restrictive. Browns Lane has many parked cars and is too narrow for lorries and cars to access the village. There is a playschool operating at the guide hut and there is a lot of congestion at this point. The end of Browns Lane is very narrow and there is only room for one car at a time. We strongly oppose the projected development at the allotments in Ravenscroft.	Number of dwellings has been reduced following feedback and discussions with SDNPA. The Steering Group notes no objection from WSCC Highways Dept on its inclusion
50	31/8/17	I am responding as a resident. I have no specific objections to the proposals in the Plan; just full of admiration for the amount of work that has gone into its production. I simply hope that the Plan, when accepted, will have enough ‘teeth’ to prevent its recommendations being ignored by developers when refused applications are referred to appeal. One item I missed was any mention of future plans for the Library in Storrington. Good luck with the approvals and the referendum.	Noted WSCC is responsible for the library and the Steering Group is not aware of any future plans
50	31/8/17	Ravenscroft Allotment Site 70 houses. The Infrastructure will never take another 140 cars. We are frightened to step into the road. Before long a child will be seriously injured as there is no pavement at the pre-school area. Cars do not slow down as Browns Lane is a RAT RUN. Where will the children go to school? When will we be able to get a doctor’s appointment. The area takes a large amount of rain water straight off the Downs and if this large field I concreted over will Brown’s Lane be flooded again as it was years ago. We now have to keep windows closed at night because of traffic pollution. Nobody carries a week’s shopping from Waitrose they will travel by car especially if they are ordinary working families as nobody can afford to shop at Waitrose.	Please see previous comments regarding this site

STORRINGTON & SULLINGTON AND WASHINGTON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN
PUBLIC CONSULTATION RESPONSE SCHEDULE
10TH JULY 2017 – 4TH SEPTEMBER 2017

51	31/8/17	<p>I wish to make my objection to further development of this site. Access via Heather Way would be suicidal, residents of Heather way of which I am one can wait several minutes to gain access to the road into Storrington, only when cars wait and allow you to cross are we able to get out of the road at all. To say one could cycle using this road would be extremely dangerous. The beautiful view to the South Downs must be protected. How many accidents have occurred at the junction with water lane</p>	<p>Please see previous comments regarding this site</p>
52	1/9/17	<p>The Worthing Cycle Forum (WCF), is a group of local enthusiasts seeking to increase the use of cycling as a safe, efficient and sustainable mode of transport.</p> <p>For many years WCF has had an aspiration to see a 'segregated' cycle path, designed to the latest DfT standards, starting in the centre of Worthing and following the line of the A24, through Findon Village, and onward to the Washington Bostal – to connect with the South Downs Way and the National Park – and then down to The Pike (A283).</p> <p>We have submitted an outline proposal to West Sussex County Council (WSCC) and now know that the scheme has been chosen for an initial two stage feasibility study with – stage 1 from Findon Valley to Findon Village centre – planned to be undertaken hopefully this autumn and phase 2 in 2018.</p> <p>Most members of WCF, local cycling clubs, and other cyclists no longer use the A24 due to the dangerously high traffic speeds and the failure to repair road surface damage that might not fall within the national criteria for intervention, but which creates specific danger for cyclists. But we are aware it is still used by some intrepid individuals, mainly to commute to and from colleges or work in Worthing and also to a limited extent for recreation.</p> <p>The opportunity to cycle separated from the danger of road traffic and its associated air pollution will not only improve connectivity between the surrounding towns and villages and the National Park, but also encourage a healthy lifestyle through exercise that would be more pleasurable.</p> <p>It is clear that, traffic segregation will also encourage the use of electric bicycles and cyclists who 'park &</p>	<p>The Steering Group is very interested in this proposal and will contact WCF further.</p> <p>Feasibility plans for Phase 1 of the A24 cycle path from Findon Valley to Findon Village have been worked up with construction due 2018/2019. The Feasibility Study for Phase 2 of the project to extend the path to Washington is scheduled for 2018/2019 with construction 2019/2020.</p>

STORRINGTON & SULLINGTON AND WASHINGTON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN
PUBLIC CONSULTATION RESPONSE SCHEDULE
10TH JULY 2017 – 4TH SEPTEMBER 2017

		ride', both of which will bring immediate benefits in reducing traffic and road congestion.	
53	1/9/17	<p>I would like to make the following comments on the Neighbourhood plan.</p> <p>Land at Angell Pit: I would strongly object to the inclusion of this land for development. The original plan was to restore this site to original contour and state and it is green land backing directly onto National trust green land and any access from the A283 (even if via Heather way) or water lane contributes to further dangerous junctions on this already busy road. It is outside the Built up area boundary and development should not be allowed.</p> <p>I also raise strong objection to the removal of the following Green spaces and they should be reinstated as Green space. Namely Sandgate Park, Millford Grange Country Park and Warren Hill.</p> <p>Millford Grange Country Park has just had a path created through it by the developers as part to the planning for Millford Grange and is currently accessible to the public. It forms part of a plan to open up a public path from Sullington to Washington which includes access through Sandgate park and Warren hill. This would provide a facility to link the parishes by a path away from the extremely busy A283 and provide a country walk environment for all to enjoy. There is no point in getting Developers to do this type of work and provide such facilities as part of a development application if it is promptly ignored and used for further development.</p> <p>Sandgate park itself is well used and is an important heathland and woodland area and should be reinstated as a green space.</p> <p>Warren Hill owned by the National trust is also a well used recreational space and maintained by the National trust. In conjunction with the above areas it forms a continuous green space from Sullington to Washington which is also part of the view enjoyed by those</p>	<p>Please see previous comments</p> <p>Previous comments apply</p>

STORRINGTON & SULLINGTON AND WASHINGTON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN
PUBLIC CONSULTATION RESPONSE SCHEDULE
10TH JULY 2017 – 4TH SEPTEMBER 2017

		walking the local parts of the Long distance South Downs way path. To exclude areas of green space on the grounds that they are extensive and not close to local communities in my view is an extremely dangerous policy and likely to lead to allowing development of these areas leaving just small parcels of land open to public enjoyment similar to city parks.	
54	1/9/17	<p>Under the heading Site Assessment Report Planning Policy Background we dispute the fact that Storrington has a good range of service facilities. 1. More buildings means more traffic will impact on the high pollution already present on access/exit to the village. The recent loss of Rydon College is already going to impact on traffic / pollution with coaches running in and out of the village, without extra families moving in. 2. The village lacks an adequate medical practice some residents now having to commute to find one. 4 (sic) There has been a lot of talk about sewage problems which we have not been able to find that there has been any solution to, another problem relating to extra housing.</p> <p>Under the Housing Needs. There has been a major expansion in the Horsham Area which seems to prefer the building of homes for the lower/upper middle class residents with the children of Storrington residents having to move out of the village to be able to get on the property ladder. This is totally unacceptable.</p> <p>Under the Summary of Sites. The Ravenscroft site will impact upon Meadowside, Browns Lane and Manor Close. These all being residential areas are used as a rat run and bearing in mind the road is narrower than an ordinary village road with residents cars being parked on it, it is extremely dangerous for everyone including children, elderly residents and mothers pushing prams. The road has both a play area and a nursery school on it which we cannot get either signs nor speed reduction put in place. Part of the Browns Lane road where the nursery school is situated there is no footpath and is only wide enough for one car. The main exit/access into Church Street, which is also used for parking is congested most of the day. It has been stated that there would be no impact from the vehicles to and from the proposed site as the buildings would be within walking distance of the village but that as we know is not the case these days people would rather drive 200 yards to a shop rather than walk. 90 per cent of the households in this area have at least two cars which would be the same for the new residents. One complaint this week was about a 7.5 tonn lorry exiting Church Street in to Browns Lane with one wing mirror scraping the protected wall one side and the opposite one damaging a hedge. The whole of this area needs looking into before the new properties are built.</p>	<p>The Steering Group feels that the right balance has been met to address the local housing needs whilst taking into consideration the constraints of the neighbourhood plan area.</p> <p>The Plan aims to provide more affordable housing and employment opportunities and facilities for young families.</p> <p>Previous comments apply and the Steering Group notes that the County Councillor is investigating the issues associated with this particular area being used as a cut through by drivers attempting to avoid congestion.</p>
55	01/9/17	I wish to make the following observations to the revised plan:	

STORRINGTON & SULLINGTON AND WASHINGTON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN
PUBLIC CONSULTATION RESPONSE SCHEDULE
10TH JULY 2017 – 4TH SEPTEMBER 2017

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site known as Angell Pit should be removed. There is no justification or proven need for homes to be built in this area which is designated as Countryside – outside the BUAB. The plans for road access are unlikely to be viable, as they rely on the use of a private lane which is not fit for purpose. The new area of Country Park above Milford Grange now has full public access, and should be included as protected Green Space. Sandgate Park provides valuable green space, and should also be re-included in the plan. 	Previous comments apply
56	1/9/17	<p>These Comments are made of behalf of Mr and Mrs xxxxx who own the Chardonnay restaurant on Old London Road Washington and who propose to convert the premises to 3 x 2bed apartments with associated parking</p> <p>The Key Housing Objectives are supported insofar as promoting the need for a mixture of housing types especially smaller private dwellings for the first time buyers and down sizers. This is in the context of there being only 41 apartments within Washington ie 5% of the total housing stock, compared to 17% district wide</p> <p>Objectives which seek to improve car parking, including public car parking are also supported</p>	Noted
57	1/9/17	<p>I am a resident of Storrington.</p> <p>Representation on Policy 2 (iii) Land off North Street (Old Ryecroft allotments).</p> <p>I support the principle of residential development on this site, but I object to part of the requirement in criterion b) of the policy.</p> <p>The site is very well located, being within a very short walk of many of the shops, services and facilities within Storrington as well as the bus turning bay which has a variety of regular bus services. Hence the location is ideal for some residential development.</p> <p>Criterion b) of the policy for this site requires that "the site is developed in accordance with the findings of a detailed Flood Risk Assessment and that no habitable rooms are provided on the ground floor".</p>	Please see results of the Sequential Test.

STORRINGTON & SULLINGTON AND WASHINGTON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN
PUBLIC CONSULTATION RESPONSE SCHEDULE
10TH JULY 2017 – 4TH SEPTEMBER 2017

		<p>The first part of the criterion is entirely justified, but the the requirement that there are no habitable rooms on the ground floor is arbitrary, unnecessary, inconsistent with the Council's own site assessment evidence (Document Appendix 2 site assessment for site 3) and would artificially constrain the design of any housing, acting against the achievement of the most effective use of this site and thus failing to achieve sustainable development.</p> <p>The Council's detailed site assessment states that approximately 50% of the site is in flood zone 2. Thus the other half of the site is not at risk of flooding. As required by the first part of criterion b), the design and layout of the development should accord with a detailed Flood Risk Assessment (FRA). In accordance with national policy, this would minimise the risk of flooding and ensure that future residents were safe in times of flood. There is no need to be more specific and there is not the evidence to be more specific at this stage.</p> <p>The requirement that no habitable rooms be provided on the ground floor is usurping the role of the FRA. It is an arbitrary requirement which is not based on any evidence. If the requirement became part of a formal development plan policy it would have a substantial impact on the design of the development. It is difficult to envisage how it could be made to work in practice, and could well put off prospective developers from commissioning the necessary FRA. Sustainable development of the site may well be prevented.</p> <p>This part of the policy should simply be deleted. If criterion b) is not amended this policy would not meet the "basic conditions" which have to be considered by the Examiner because the plan would not be contributing to the achievement of sustainable development.</p>	
58	1/9/17	<p>I write to offer my support for the current version of the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>After many variations and rewrites I believe it offers the best balance we are likely to achieve.</p>	Noted
59	1/9/17	<p>As a member of Sandgate Conservation and a resident of Sullington parish My wife and I wish to state our support of their proposals outlined in their response to omit some areas which should be included.</p>	Noted
60	2/9/17	<p>I am writing concerning the latest version of the above plan.</p> <p>I am disappointed that the plan no longer includes Sandgate Park, Millford Grange Country Park</p>	

STORRINGTON & SULLINGTON AND WASHINGTON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN
PUBLIC CONSULTATION RESPONSE SCHEDULE
10TH JULY 2017 – 4TH SEPTEMBER 2017

		<p>and Warren Hill as green spaces and suggest that they should be reinstated. I also suggest that the area now known as Water Lane Country Park should be included.</p> <p>The recommendations by the South Downs National Park are a retrograde step. With today's personal and public transport, nothing within the Parishes is too remote for public access. None of it can be too large. Where they are in the course of preparation, the work will be completed in a few months and will be open to the public.</p> <p>Sandgate Conservation Society has worked for many years to reach the current position and the Parishes should recognise this work with the inclusion of the hard won green spaces within the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>I object to the inclusion of Angell Pit as a building site. (Site Allocation for Development)</p> <p>This pit was restored to original ground contour and the original planning consent required the surface 1500mm to be of sandy loam to encourage heather growth. Heath land is increasingly rare and this was seen as a way of adding to it. The land remains 'green land' and as such should not be developed. It should be removed from the list of sites allocated for development.</p>	Previous comments apply
61	2/9/17	<p>I am a member of the Heather Way Residents Association, living on the Washington Road close by the old Angel sandpit.</p> <p>I am deeply concerned by the proposal to include the restored part of the Angel pit within the Neighbourhood Plan as a proposed development site.</p> <p>My concerns are twofold:</p> <p>Firstly, the rear of the pit was restored under the supervision of West Sussex CC to provide an extension to the heathland of Sullington Warren. It was I understand a condition of the original Planning Permission that this area would be designated as green land and protected from future development. It is also outside the Storrington built up area. If this land were to be developed I am sure it would only be a matter of time before development permission would be granted on The Warren and Sandgate parks.</p> <p>Secondly, the proposed access via Heather Way, a private road owned, surfaced and maintained by</p>	Previous comments apply

STORRINGTON & SULLINGTON AND WASHINGTON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN
PUBLIC CONSULTATION RESPONSE SCHEDULE
10TH JULY 2017 – 4TH SEPTEMBER 2017

		<p>the residents would be wholly inadequate. The branch known locally as the Spur is only 3.5-4 metres wide between property boundaries, this leads to a winding unsurfaced track with several fine and protected trees in its verges, it is nowhere more than a single cars width. I attach several photographs to illustrate this. On a map this track is shown as a white road, similar to Heather Way, this is extremely misleading. Even supermarket delivery vans are unable to access properties via this track and must use the main road.</p> <p>To summarise, the Angel Sandpit is green heathland with inadequate access, it must not be used for housing and must not be included in the Neighbourhood Plan. The residents of Heather Way and other local property owners, will canvass all within this area to reject the Plan in its entirety if the inclusion of Angel Pit proceeds.</p>	
62	2/9/17	<p>As a member of the Sandgate conservation Society, I support their comments on the neighbourhood plan as follows;</p> <p>Angell Pit should be removed from the Site Allocation for Development Millford Grange Country Park should be re-established as a green space in the Neighbourhood Plan</p> <p>Sandgate Park should be re-established as a green space in the Neighbourhood Plan</p> <p>Warren Hill should be re-established as a green space in the Neighbourhood Plan</p> <p>The area now known as Water Lane Country Park should be added to the list of green spaces.</p>	Previous comments apply
63	2/9/17	<p>Here are some comments on the Draft Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>It seems to me that some of the clarity of the previous version has been lost, probably as a result of the Inspector's comments asking for more details. As a result there is a great deal of repetition within and between documents. There is probably nothing to be done about that.</p> <p>That being said, the documents clearly analyse the state of the parishes, and what policy priorities the parishes have identified, as well as the impacts of these policies on land use within the parishes. Some more detailed comments / questions for clarification follow below.</p> <p>PRE-SUBMISSION PLAN</p> <p>The document provides a very clear analysis of the state of the parishes, in particular through the SWOT analysis.</p>	Noted

**STORRINGTON & SULLINGTON AND WASHINGTON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN
PUBLIC CONSULTATION RESPONSE SCHEDULE
10TH JULY 2017 – 4TH SEPTEMBER 2017**

	<p>The analysis of the planning framework is very detailed. Some highlighting of the key points, notably the calculation of the housing contribution for SSWP, would make reading easier.</p> <p>Section 4 (Vision, objectives and policies)</p> <p>It would be helpful to have a synthetic table summarising each policy (eg as per the Sustainability Appraisal). The layout of the document could also be modified to maintain the hierarchy within each section. Also, maybe there should be an explanation somewhere as to why some sites, but not all, are given their own policy number?</p> <p>Should the document be amended more clearly to indicate the status of the Glebe Field? Should the Glebe Field not be identified as a green space in para 4.71 (even with a proviso, as specified in another part of the document, that all things being equal, the remaining part of the Glebe Field will be given to Storrington Parish, and should qualify as a green space). Similarly, other documents such as the Local Green Spaces Assessment, refer to the plans for the Glebe Field. Should they not all be updated?</p> <p>In Policies Map inset 2, the land identified for Ravenscroft allotments includes the land East of Greyfriars Lane. It was my understanding that that field is to be used to replace the existing allotments, not as a site for development. Should that not be clearly indicated in the map? In its current state it looks as though the two sites (the existing allotments and the planned replacement land) are identified as suitable for development. Might this leave hostages to fortune?</p> <p>SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL</p> <p>There is also a lot of overlap with the pre-submission plan, and maybe the reasons for the repetitions this should be spelled out in both documents. The document is difficult to understand, in particular the tables.</p> <p>Confusing to use "-" for neutral and "o" for not relevant. This is not standard procedure. Surely it would be more intuitive to have "+" for positive, "0" for neutral "-" for negative, "?" For unknown and "n/a" for not relevant?</p> <p>There are still a few typos. Here are those that I spotted:</p> <p>"Principles" not "principal" in para 4.73 of the pre-submission plan</p>	<p>Sites proposed for housing development are all included in one policy (policy 2) Sites for other types of development (eg North Farm Policy 4) are dealt with separately.</p> <p>The Glebe field is included as a proposed LGS (Local Green Spaces Addendum Nov 2017)</p> <p>The map should be amended as per this suggestion</p> <p>Noted and typos will be corrected</p>
--	--	---

**STORRINGTON & SULLINGTON AND WASHINGTON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN
PUBLIC CONSULTATION RESPONSE SCHEDULE
10TH JULY 2017 – 4TH SEPTEMBER 2017**

		<p>"Robell" not "Robwell" in multiple places, notably the Site assessment report para 9.3, and in the Sustainability Appraisal</p> <p>What are "wildlife affects" (para 7.33 of sustainability appraisal)? Or for that matter what are "wildlife effects" or should it be "effects on wildlife"?</p> <p>I hope this helps. I'm sorry that this is so rushed.</p>	
64	2/9/17	<p>Comments: We feel that this proposal to convert the allotments in Ravenscroft to accommodate 70 houses will cause many problems locally including: -</p> <p>Drainage, both surface and sewage disposal</p> <p>Extra pressure on our already over loaded Doctors surgery</p> <p>Access roads to new housing complex will cause additional road traffic</p> <p>70 houses occupied by couples will mean 140 persons, and if they have 1 child, that will increase number of people to 210 and so on.</p> <p>Our village is already congested with both through and local traffic, more housing will add to this also. While we accept that there is a need for more housing in the South, there are other more suitable locations that can be utilised and generate communities to fulfil these needs. There are already too many housing properties gong up around the outskirts of Storrington.</p>	See previous comments
65	2/9/17	<p>Please note that we wish to register our approval of the proposed neighbourhood plan for Storrington/Sullington/Washington.</p>	noted
66	3/9/17	<p>I live at XXXXXXXX Heather Way.</p> <p>I have received a copy of Mr XXXXX submission regarding the proposed allocation of this site for development. I wish to associate myself with his remarks, in particular the suggestion that access to the site should be allowed via Heather Way. This is a private road, part of which is an unmade track, which is entirely unsuitable for the heavy construction traffic which would be associated with such a development.</p> <p>I strongly object to the allocation of the proposed site for development.</p>	See previous comments with regard to this site.
67	3/9/17	<p>We fully support the neighbourhood plan drawn up by the Storrington, Sullington and Washington parish council.</p>	

**STORRINGTON & SULLINGTON AND WASHINGTON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN
PUBLIC CONSULTATION RESPONSE SCHEDULE
10TH JULY 2017 – 4TH SEPTEMBER 2017**

		We also would like to see the Angell pit should be removed from Site Allocation for Development, and that Milford Country Park, Sandgate Park and Warren Hill should be re-established as a green space in the neighbourhood plan.	Previous comments apply
68	3/9/17	<p>Policy 2 Site Allocation for Development</p> <p>I object most strongly to the proposal to use the restored Angel’s Pit for housing.</p> <p>As long term residents, we supported the restoration of Angel Pit in accordance with the original planning approval. That approval explicitly stated that the on the cessation of sand excavation the land would be restored to heathland. The detail included the requirement for a surfacing layer of 1500mm of sandy loam in order to encourage the growth of heather. It was further required that the land must be restored to as near the original contours as possible.</p> <p>In good faith we accepted this restoration on the basis that it would be completed in accordance with the planning requirements and we can confirm that this has taken place under the supervision of West Sussex County Council.</p> <p>This land therefore remains <u>green land</u> and not subject to development of any sort.</p> <p>The land is outside the Storrington Built Up Area. Inclusion of the land within this Neighbourhood Plan gives the first indication to developers that the Parish Council would be prepared to sanction a change of use from green to developable land. You must not allow this to happen. Once the idea is on paper, it will be accepted as a ‘fait accompli’ by the development community and it will be impossible to prevent development taking place.</p> <p>This land must not be proposed for development</p> <p>I know the remaining residents do not wish to have our road used as an access for construction traffic. I have seen the effect this has on other streets and the cost of damage caused cannot be legally recovered from the developer. You cannot indicate to developers that they can have access via our private street without our permission and that permission will be withheld, regardless.</p> <p>Heather Way must not be proposed as an access road for development of adjacent land.</p> <p>A Neighbourhood Plan is designed to inform the population of the current situation within the Villages, or in this case, 2 Villages. It is not an opportunity for developers to subvert the planning process by allowing them to submit land, currently in the green belt, for development.</p> <p>This is an incorrect use of the process.</p> <p>Angel’s Pit is a green heathland, restored in accordance with West Sussex County Council planning rules. It must not be used for housing and it must not be allowed to be included in the Neighbourhood Plan. The residents of Heather Way will canvas all friends, acquaintances and Associations within the Parishes to</p>	Please see previous comments regarding this particular allocation

**STORRINGTON & SULLINGTON AND WASHINGTON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN
PUBLIC CONSULTATION RESPONSE SCHEDULE
10TH JULY 2017 – 4TH SEPTEMBER 2017**

		<p>object and reject the Neighbourhood Plan in its entirety if the proposal to develop Angel' Pit (whether or not it proposes the use of Heather Way for access.) This use of the Neighbourhood Plan is deeply disturbing.</p>	
69	3/9/17	<p>I should like to make the following observations on the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The area now known as Water Lane Country Park should be added to the list of green spaces. 2, Angell Pit should be removed from the Site Allocation for Development. 3 Warren Hill should be reinstated as a green space. 4. Sandgate Park should be reinstated as a green space. 5. Millford Grange Country Park should re-established as a green space. 	Previous comments apply to all of these points
70	3/9/17	<p>Re: Former sand pit (Angell Pit) off Water Lane</p> <p>I am a resident of the local area, close to the aforementioned site. I have recently become aware of the proposal to include this site within the Neighbourhood Plan for future development. I would like to object in the strongest possible terms.</p> <p>Not only does the selection of this site seem to be a complete rewriting of the planning rules that are designed to protect both the neighbouring Warren (National Trust land) and South Downs National Park, but the site itself is entirely unsuitable due to compromised access. It is my belief that the inclusion of this site, would negatively impact the local environment, wildlife and safety of current/future residents.</p> <p>The proposal includes specific reference to access being via Heather Way, rather than Water Lane itself. Heather Way runs at the back of my property and is well known to me. It is exceptionally narrow and features undulating surfaces and substantial tree growth on either side. It is little more than an unmade track at numerous points. These characteristics mean it is barely suitable for the limited traffic it currently services, let alone that generated by further residential property or indeed the sizeable construction equipment that would be required for its construction. Heather</p>	Previous comments apply

**STORRINGTON & SULLINGTON AND WASHINGTON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN
PUBLIC CONSULTATION RESPONSE SCHEDULE
10TH JULY 2017 – 4TH SEPTEMBER 2017**

		<p>Way at the end that adjoins the land in question is primarily used as a pedestrian route for dog-walkers and local residents (including many elderly people or young families like my own) to safely access the Warren.</p> <p>In addition to this, Heather Way joins straight onto Washington Road. Washington Road suffers from extremely high levels of traffic, that can both be stationary during congested periods or fast-moving (often above the speed limit) when free-flowing. Turning onto Washington Road at all points (including Heather Way) can be very difficult and often dangerous due to the limited visibility.</p> <p>Whilst I accept that this is not an approval for development at the site, its inclusion would appear to be inappropriate and ill-thought out.</p>	
71	3/9/17	<p>Please find below my comments on the neighbourhood plan, in particular the proposed site on the Ravenscroft allotments.</p> <p>Having moved to Browns Lane 18 months ago, I have been witness to many traffic problems on my road. Drivers use it as a rat run during times of traffic congestion, and drive often at unacceptable speed down a road that was designed as a quiet residential street. The road has sections which are only single track. There are sections which have no pavement, forcing pedestrians to walk in the road. The road leading to the junction with Church Street is particularly narrow, and bizarrely has no width restrictions, though it is most definitely unsuitable for vans and lorries. I have been witness to several near misses along this road, most frightening was where an elderly gentleman on a mobility scooter was practically run off the road by a speeding BMW. My partner is a Type 1 diabetic, and has almost been run over getting out of his car on several occasions. My son is suffers from Autism and has also suffered the same fate and finds it very disconcerting. This area also houses a preschool, where small children are in the road when being picked up and dropped off (more often than not in large 4x4 vehicles which in themselves cause more traffic. This road should definitely be closed to through traffic. It could very easily be gated, and the police hold an access key in times of severe emergency.</p> <p>The prospect of 70 houses being built off Ravenscroft will increase the traffic in Browns Lane exponentially. It is completely unrealistic to assume that being 'affordable' homes will mean the inhabitants do not have cars.</p>	Please see previous comments

STORRINGTON & SULLINGTON AND WASHINGTON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN
PUBLIC CONSULTATION RESPONSE SCHEDULE
10TH JULY 2017 – 4TH SEPTEMBER 2017

		<p>Each house will have at least two or three cars. They will have delivery vans (Amazon/Supermarkets/refuse/tradespeople) on a regular steady stream. Being 'affordable' homes the inhabitants are more likely to be tradespeople themselves, increasing the number of polluting vans and trucks still further. There will be a greater population of teens who are more likely to be speedy drivers (we have already made a study of the cars which speed in our road and they are mostly young drivers and van drivers). The main entrance to Meadowside is off a very busy main road. There is a playground on the corner of a road with NO speed restriction beyond the mandatory 30mph. There should be a blanket restriction of 20mph all over this area.</p> <p>I was delighted to discover the allotments in such close proximity to my dwelling, and immediately took on a plot. I can walk to it, and due to its close proximity to the village centre, so do most of the Allotmenters. In view of the current traffic pollution problem in the village, this prevents additional carbon monoxide emissions. These allotments have taken many years to be established, many Allotmenters are elderly pensioners, and have spent many years and pounds getting them up to a cultivatable state. Several have taken them on from their parents. It takes an average of 5 years to establish asparagus and rhubarb, for example, fruit trees take many more. Soil quality does not happen overnight.</p> <p>The relocation of the allotments to a far distant field halfway up greyFriars Lane will immediately prevent a lot of the current Allotmenters from taking part. Many are elderly, and will not be able to walk so far to tend their plot. Many do not have cars. They do not have the energy to start a plot from scratch, as I have already stated above they take many years to get to be cultivatable. The new plots will need PROPER irrigation - the proposed field is practically under water every winter. They will need a hardstanding area and a shed and greenhouse provided. They will need the plot to be dug over, pernicious weeds removed, manure to be applied, raised beds to be established. There will need to be a regular supply of water, a properly secured rabbit proofed enclosure to prevent thieves and vandals. And most of all they need an investment of time, and an assurance that the same process does not repeat itself in a decade or two's time. Being as how this land will be under private ownership, (I understand that a housing development company is in the process of purchasing this land!) I cannot see how this assurance can be given.</p>	
72	3/9/17	<p>I would first of all like to congratulate and thank the team for their efforts and for sticking with it through all the trials and tribulations of a very arduous process. I also note that there are a lot of improvements in this latest version, notably in the evidence base and site selection criteria.</p> <p>1. My major disappointment is that specific protection for the "Sullington Fields" (Fields adjacent to</p>	There is a policy in the Plan to protect

STORRINGTON & SULLINGTON AND WASHINGTON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN
PUBLIC CONSULTATION RESPONSE SCHEDULE
10TH JULY 2017 – 4TH SEPTEMBER 2017

		<p>Sullington Lane and the A283) has once again dropped out of the plan.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. It seems to me that previous consultation rounds have demonstrated a clear community desire for its inclusion (thus providing part of the evidence base). It is possibly the finest view of the Downs in the Storrington area and it has changed little over centuries. It needs to be preserved. The view also looks towards the only grade 1 Listed building in the whole of Storrington and Sullington. b. There is a clear threat to the fields (with the owner publicly expressing his determination to build a road across them). c. The Steering Group, Parish Council, and Horsham District Council have previously agreed to its inclusion (and the inspector did not object). d. The chairman’s objection that “it is not possible to arbitrarily allocate protection for one field over any others in the parishes” is unsatisfactory. If indeed there are other fields or views, especially ones within the SDNP, which attract significant community support for protection, then they too should be considered. The essence of a Neighbourhood plan is that as far as possible it seeks to embrace the wishes of the local community. <p>Although not part of my submission, I attach a copy of a postcard which was sent in 1929. The view was taken from quite close to the junction between Sullington Lane and the Washington Road. The trees have grown quite a bit (both on the downs themselves and around the Mediaeval Fish Pond) and there is now a black tarmac surface to the road, but not a lot else has changed.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. I do not think that the former Angell Sandpit should have been included as a site for possible development. Following its restoration, this land is green and outside the built-up area. I note the chairman’s point that it is much easier to put something in and then take it out, than be forced to do the reverse. 	<p>views and this particular area will be referred to in this policy.</p> <p>Previous comments apply</p>
73	3/9/17	<p>We are grateful to you for passing on our comments to the relevant people. However, we have no expectation that our views will be considered in the slightest, after our experience of what happened regarding the application for the building of houses on the Glebe Field. That proposal was unanimously rejected by the parish council and the vast majority of the village, and yet it is going ahead anyway. We feel extremely angry, upset and let down that this piece of green space in the centre of the village, with its open, distant views of the parish church, is to be lost forever.</p>	

STORRINGTON & SULLINGTON AND WASHINGTON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN
PUBLIC CONSULTATION RESPONSE SCHEDULE
10TH JULY 2017 – 4TH SEPTEMBER 2017

		<p>We live at 3 Abbey Cottages, Browns Lanes, and have done so for the past 9 years. We wish to lodge a strong objection to the building of dwellings on the Ravenscroft Allotment site as set out in the Pre-Submission Plan SSWNP (July 2017). Our objections are as follows:</p> <p>1) The building of 70 dwellings will greatly increase traffic flow along Browns Lane and Meadowside. It would be unrealistic to expect otherwise, as the public transport links out of the village are limited, and most houses along Browns Lane and Meadowside are 2 car families (and in one instance, a 6 car household) already. This will increase pollution, in an area already with illegal levels of air pollution. There is the question of road safety along an already narrow country lane, with many parked cars, poor visibility round the corner over the river, and the speeding of some vehicles which use the route from Church Street to the Worthing road as a "rat run". This is a danger to the many dog walkers, horse riders, hikers and children on bikes that use Browns Lane and Meadowside, especially in the parts where there is no footpath or the footpath is blocked by parked vehicles. The proposed access via Ravenscroft will just add to the traffic going both left and right from the Ravenscroft turn out.</p> <p>2) We also object on the grounds that the development will go against Policy 8 (4.54) which states "Views to the countryside are important to local people". The view from our house to the countryside of the National Park, which is extremely important to us, will be blocked and spoiled by the development.</p>	<p>Please see previous comments regarding this site</p>
74	3/9/17	<p>We are writing with regard to the consultation on the neighbourhood plan for Storrington and Sullington. We wish to register our support for Sandgate Park to be included as a green space, reflecting its place in the locally as an area of natural beauty and for community use. We wish to see this space preserved as managed heath and woodland for the benefit of local people, without being compromised by development.</p>	<p>Previous comments apply</p>
75	3/9/17	<p>I would like to make the following comments on the Neighbourhood plan.</p> <p>Land at Angell Pit: I would strongly object to the inclusion of this land for development. The original plan was to restore this site to original contour and state and it is green land backing directly onto National trust green land and any access from the A283 (even if via Heather way) or water lane contributes to further dangerous junctions on this already busy road. It is outside the Built up area boundary and development should not be allowed.</p>	<p>Previous comments apply to each of the points raised here.</p>

**STORRINGTON & SULLINGTON AND WASHINGTON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN
PUBLIC CONSULTATION RESPONSE SCHEDULE
10TH JULY 2017 – 4TH SEPTEMBER 2017**

		<p>I also raise strong objection to the removal of the following Green spaces and they should be reinstated as Green space. Namely Sandgate Park, Millford Grange Country Park and Warren Hill.</p> <p>Millford Grange Country Park has just had a path created through it by the developers as part to the planning for Millford Grange and is currently accessible to the public. It forms part of a plan to open up a public path from Sullington to Washington which includes access through Sandgate park and Warren hill. This would provide a facility to link the parishes by a path away from the extremely busy A283 and provide a country walk environment for all to enjoy. There is no point in getting Developers to do this type of work and provide such facilities as part of a development application if it is promptly ignored and used for further development.</p> <p>Sandgate park itself is well used and is an important heathland and woodland area and should be reinstated as a green space.</p> <p>Warren Hill owned by the National trust is also a well used recreational space and maintained by the National trust. In conjunction with the above areas it forms a continuous green space from Sullington to Washington which is also part of the view enjoyed by those walking the local parts of the Long distance South Downs way path. To exclude areas of green space on the grounds that they are extensive and not close to local communities in my view is an extremely dangerous policy and likely to lead to allowing development of these areas leaving just small parcels of land open to public enjoyment similar to city parks.</p>	
76	4/9/17	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment and for all the work involved in delivering the final scheme.</p> <p>As usual I find it hard to come up with any meaningful comments. However, whereas I despair at the inability to find a solution to the issues to do with transport and other matters of infrastructure, I should like to comment on the wording in appendix 4, policy 2(iv) in connection with Ravenscroft allotments.</p> <p>The allocation is for around 70 units "predominantly .. for affordable homes". It should be a condition of development of this site that the housing should be affordable with no ambiguity.</p> <p>I am concerned as to access and the need to absorb the increased volume of traffic and this must be carefully managed given the inadequacy of feeder lanes.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>A Traffic assessment would be required</p>

STORRINGTON & SULLINGTON AND WASHINGTON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN
PUBLIC CONSULTATION RESPONSE SCHEDULE
10TH JULY 2017 – 4TH SEPTEMBER 2017

		<p>All other sites listed must be similarly managed to mitigate the inevitable increases in road use.</p> <p>There should also be provision, in the centre of the village, for an appropriate bus turning facility as at present, which is off-road.</p>	<p>as part of any planning application</p> <p>A Planning application for amendments to the Bus Turning Circle was submitted and the Parish Councils lodged an objection. The Planning application has since been withdrawn.</p>
77	4/9/17	<p>I was keen to express my concern over the proposed residential development for the former sandpit off Water Lane Sullington.</p> <p>I am currently a resident of the neighbouring Heather Way, Sullington.</p> <p>Although I have no objection to the actual development and the site, I am adamant that the access to the site is completely inappropriate. The access would cause considerable damage to the existing lane and pathway onto Sullington Warren – The National Trust Park.</p> <p>It also would significantly impact the houses on which the access would neighbour, especially ‘High Winds’, which currently is next to the footpath.</p> <p>I am struggling to understand why access was not considered via the recent residential dwellings built on the site, as they enter via Water Lane.</p> <p>I am keen to oppose any plans which include access via Washington road and via the existing track and pathway</p>	<p>Previous comments apply</p>
78	4/9/17	<p>I agree with the Neighbourhood plan.</p>	<p>noted</p>
79	4/9/17	<p>We want to express our concern over the proposed development at the Ravenscroft Allotment site in Storrington.</p> <p>Our main concern is the traffic that the site will generate, as we understand access will be via Ravenscroft. Browns Lane is already a road that has issues with traffic, which can only be compounded by such a development. Firstly, the road is used as a rat run to avoid traffic jams through the village, so that at certain times of day the volume of traffic is significantly higher than normal. Speeding is also common, particularly</p>	<p>Previous comments apply</p>

**STORRINGTON & SULLINGTON AND WASHINGTON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN
PUBLIC CONSULTATION RESPONSE SCHEDULE
10TH JULY 2017 – 4TH SEPTEMBER 2017**

	<p>at these times, creating significant danger for residents, many of whom are elderly or children. Secondly, the road itself is unsafe. There are a number of places where it is not possible for two cars to pass, and this is increased by parking along the road. Lorries and vans especially, which frequently use Browns Lane or deliver there, struggle to get through. In particular, the end of the road leading into Church Street is very narrow with poor visibility into Church Street. It is often gridlocked, with cars coming from both directions in Church Street, often wanting to turn into Browns Lane, and cars coming out of Browns Lane at the same time. We have been stuck there for several minutes on more than one occasion when this has happened, as once other traffic has come up behind there is nowhere to go. We have to reverse several times a week when using this stretch of road to allow other traffic through. We have spoken to the lady who lives on the corner of Church street and Browns Lane, and she frequently suffers damage to her property as vehicles pull into her drive to let others through. Lorries often end up reversing into Manor close to turn around, once they realise that the end of Browns Lane into Church Street is too narrow, and there have been a number of near misses here both to vehicles, property and residents themselves.</p> <p>At the other end of the road, you have Meadowside which leads onto Manleys Hill, a road notorious for tailbacks and traffic pollution already. Extra traffic pulling out here will also cause additional congestion on a stretch of road already prone to it.</p> <p>There are also significant stretches of road without pavement, leading into Church Street and outside the Guide hall, creating an additional danger to pedestrians. The position of the latter is particularly poor, as it is right outside a hall used as a pre-school and a meeting place for Guides, Brownies and Rainbows. There are often a large number of children arriving or leaving, and parents with children and pushchairs. At drop off and pick up time for all these traffic and parking in the road is increased significantly, and in the case of the evening clubs this coincides with rush hour and the road being used as a rat run.</p> <p>It is extremely naïve to state that increase to traffic as the result of up to 70 houses will be 'unlikely significant'. Most households have 2 cars, maybe more, and despite proximity to the village people will use their cars to get to work, drop children at school, go to the shops etc. The road cannot take this additional volume of traffic. In addition, the building of the site will involve large vehicles such as lorries and trucks using this road, which is simply not suitable for this type of vehicle.</p> <p>In addition to the traffic issues, we are concerned about the impact of the proposed development on the area for other reasons, including the proximity to the Southdowns. As well as affecting views towards the Downs, this area at the moment includes public rights of way and walking access to the Downs themselves across fields. It is not clear at the moment how this might be affected. Building so close to the Southdowns</p>	<p>It is understood that the County Councillor is in talks with residents about the road layout in this area and plans are underway to apply for a Community Highways Order to address the issues with the area being used as a rat run.</p> <p>The SDNPA has commented on this particular site and the level of development has been reduced as a</p>
--	--	--

STORRINGTON & SULLINGTON AND WASHINGTON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN
PUBLIC CONSULTATION RESPONSE SCHEDULE
10TH JULY 2017 – 4TH SEPTEMBER 2017

		<p>on what is currently green land is inappropriate and environmentally detrimental.</p> <p>We are also very disappointed by the consultation process itself, which we feel has been poorly publicised in the area. Many people who live in or near Browns Lane have not been aware of it, and we only found out myself a few days ago, barely giving us time to respond. Many residents are still unaware, while others will simply not have had time to look at the information (of which there is an awful lot) and respond themselves. It has also come at a time when many people are away or have their hands full with children off school.</p> <p>Overall, we feel that this development as it stands is inappropriate for this area and will have a significant negative impact on the area and its residents. It will increase the dangers which already exist with traffic, making serious accidents more likely.</p>	<p>result.</p> <p>The consultation has been widely advertised with posters and banners, articles in the County Times and Sussex Local magazine which is delivered to all homes in the NP area.</p>
80	4/9/17	<p>Para 4.74 and 4.75 indicates that further work needs to be done before Millford Grange and Sandgate Park can be nominated as Local Green Spaces.</p> <p>Steering group members are encouraged to do this when it is possible.</p> <p>Sandgate Park has long been recognised by HDC with their policy SG1 now covered by policy AL19.</p> <p>The delivery of land west of Hampers by CEMEX was recognised and required by the CEMEX/Millford Grange appeal decision. This was PI ref 2176793 under HDC ref DC/10/1457.</p> <p>The Inspector noted in the above appeal decision in para 88, that the Inspector who examined the DPD in 2007 found the Country Park policy AL19 to be sound.</p> <p>In relation to para 4.74 and the SDNPA concerns regarding progress towards delivery of the site, the developers have left the site and public access is available, together with, the National Trust providing resource to provide fencing and gating, including access across the field from Georges Lane to Hampers Lane. Some additional soft landscaping may become available in due course. In para 92 of the appeal decision the Inspector concluded 'it would provide a convenient and attractive recreational facility...'</p> <p>Members of the steering group are encouraged to give further consideration to inclusion of these two sites in the Local Green Spaces nomination.</p>	<p>These sites are to be included as proposed LGS</p>
81	4/9/17	<p>;As a current member of both Sandgate Conservation Society and Heath Common Residents Association and a past chairman of Washington Parish Council, I have been an enthusiastic supporter of the concept of a public open space for the area now known as Millford Grange Country Park and a pathway from Storrington to Warren Hill and Washington through woodland and the countryside away from the busy and noisy A283 and Rock Road.</p> <p>I am therefore concerned and disappointed that some of the members of the Neighbourhood Plan team do</p>	<p>The SG is supportive of these areas as LGS</p>

**STORRINGTON & SULLINGTON AND WASHINGTON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN
PUBLIC CONSULTATION RESPONSE SCHEDULE
10TH JULY 2017 – 4TH SEPTEMBER 2017**

		<p>not appear to be fully supportive of these projects which are so close to being achieved for the benefit of current Residents, who have waited so patiently over the year , and future generations.</p> <p>I fully support the detailed comments made by the Sandgate Conservation Society.</p> <p>I feel I should express my surprise at some of the errors made by the National Park planners-I wonder if or when ,they visited the areas concerned.</p> <p>Finally,I would hope that all the members of the Neighbourhood Plan team have visited the areas to see them for themselves.</p> <p>With my best wishes for the future and thanks for what has been achieved so far.</p>	
82	4/9/17	<p>I have read the Neighbour Plan and would like to make the following contribution: Angell Pit should be removed from the Site Allocation for Development Milford Grange Country Park should be re-established as a green space in the Neighbourhood Plan Sandgate Park should be re-established as a green space in the Neighbourhood Plan Warren Hill should be re-established as a green space in the Neighbourhood Plan The area now known as Water Lane Country Park should be added to the list of green spaces</p> <p>I live on Sandgate Lane which borders on some of these areas but more importantly I have enjoyed these green spaces and want to ensure that they remain green spaces.</p>	Please see previous comments.
83	4/9/17	<p>I totally support this revised plan</p> <p>Finally after many years and much consultation the final (surely) document is now available to be submitted. It has been drafted/redrafted with late input that wasn't made initially to the frustration of The Steering Committee. This, now, surely ticks all of the boxes and is such an important document for HDC to adopt as S&S are such an important Parish, which is why Washington, their neighbouring Parish chose to go with them to ensure that the area that we both represent should be fairly represented.</p>	Noted

STORRINGTON & SULLINGTON AND WASHINGTON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN
PUBLIC CONSULTATION RESPONSE SCHEDULE
10TH JULY 2017 – 4TH SEPTEMBER 2017

84	4/9/17	<p>The proposed Ravenscroft development fails utterly to take account of the impact on transport safety for pedestrians notably children, in the Browns Land and Meadowside “rat run” which feeds the proposed development.</p> <p>Browns Lane is used as a cut through for fast moving 2 way traffic, including large lorries, which use this route as an alternative to the High Street, with no restrictions, traffic calming or consideration for safety.</p> <p>The Browns Lane end is very narrow, with poor visibility, no pavement and includes a guide hall with a preschool. There have been numerous near misses and it can only be a matter of time before death or serious injury results. Before approving further development leading – inevitably – to increased traffic and greater risks, measures must be put in place to address these risks, including at least some of the:</p> <p>One way system, Ban on heavy and / or wide traffic, pedestrian access and priority at the narrow (Church Road) end of Browns Lane.</p> <p>This proposed development is incremental to the previously approved one at St Joseph’s Abbey which raised the same concerns and added noticeably to traffic despite Council assertions to the contrary. It is time to take this issue seriously.</p>	Please see previous comments
85	4/9/17	<p>I am a resident of Heather Way, a private street owned by me and the remainder of the residents.</p> <p>Policy 2 Site Allocation for Development – I object most strongly to the proposal to use the restored Angell Pit for housing.</p> <p>As long term residents we supported the restoration of Angell Pit in accordance with the original planning approval. That approval explicitly stated that on the cessation of sand excavation the land would be restored to heathland. The detail included the requirement for a surfacing layer of 1500 mm of sandy loam in order to encourage the growth of heather. It was further required that the</p>	Please see previous comments

**STORRINGTON & SULLINGTON AND WASHINGTON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN
PUBLIC CONSULTATION RESPONSE SCHEDULE
10TH JULY 2017 – 4TH SEPTEMBER 2017**

	<p>land Must be restored to as near the original contours as possible.</p> <p>In good faith we accepted this restoration on the basis that it would be completed in accordance with the planning requirements and we can confirm that this has taken place under the supervision of West Sussex County Council.</p> <p>The land therefore remains <u>green land</u> and not subject to development of any sort.</p> <p>The land is outside the Storrington Built Up Area. Inclusion of the land within this Neighbourhood Plan gives the first indication to developers that the Parish Council would be prepared to sanction a change of use from green to developable land. You must not allow this to happen. Once the idea is on paper, it will be accepted as a “Fait accompli” by the development community and it will be impossible to prevent development from taking place.</p> <p>The land must not be proposed for development.</p> <p>We as residents own Heather Way. I and I know the remaining residents do not wish to have our road used as an access for construction traffic. I have seen the effect this has on other streets and the cost of damage caused cannot be legally recovered from the developer. You cannot indicate to developers that they can have access via our private street without our permission and that permission will be withheld, regardless.</p> <p>Heather Way must not be proposed as an access road for development of adjacent land.</p> <p>A Neighbourhood Plan is designed to inform the population of the current situation within the Villages, or in this case, 2 villages. It is not an opportunity for developers to subvert the planning process by allowing them to submit land, currently in the green belt, for development.</p> <p>This is an incorrect use of the process.</p>	<p>regarding the opinions of Natural England and Historic England. Also comments made by WSCC with regard to access.</p>
--	---	--

STORRINGTON & SULLINGTON AND WASHINGTON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN
PUBLIC CONSULTATION RESPONSE SCHEDULE
10TH JULY 2017 – 4TH SEPTEMBER 2017

		<p>Angell Pit is a green heathland, restored in accordance with West Sussex County Council Planning rules. It must not be used for housing and it must not be allowed to be included in the Neighbourhood plan. The residents of Heather Way will canvas all friends, acquaintances and associations within the parishes to object and reject the Neighbourhood Plan in its entirety if the proposal to develop Angell Pit (whether or not it proposes the use of Heather Way for access).</p> <p>The use of the Neighbourhood Plan is deeply disturbing</p>	
86	4/9/17	<p>The fields next to Sullington Rectory and Sullington Lane + A283 is an area of outstanding beauty – a sanctuary for wildlife and a cultural heritage of SDNP. This is England at its most beautiful – future development / road building on this site would spoil it all. I have worked here for over 5 years and it gives me joy everyday.</p>	Reference to this area will be made in policy 8
87	4/9/17	<p>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. Therefore the fields are considered worthy of special mention within our plan to ensure that any further development including road building that would affect them does not spoil the natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage of the South Downs National Park.</p>	Please see above
88	4/9/17	<p>Firstly I congratulate the Parish Council on the production of a very clear, detailed and comprehensive plan. However I am extremely concerned about the proposal to build 70 new homes on the extended Ravenscroft site – a considerable increase on the number contained in the previous draft plan.</p> <p>My main issue is over the amount of extra traffic this will generate. The only access to the new homes is via Ravenscroft which means that vehicles will have to reach the site via Meadowside or Browns Lane. The suggestion that additional traffic is unlikely to be significant is rather ingenuous. Vehicle ownership is likely to well exceed the number of homes, as many families have 2 or more cars and plenty of single and elderly residents own car owners.</p> <p>The traffic along Meadowside and Browns Lane is already dangerous particularly during rush hour and especially along the narrow part at the Church Street end of Browns Lane. Cars drive at speed and there are no traffic calming measures in place. (I have on occasion tried to wave cars to slow down with no effect). There is no pavement at this end and no room for two cars to pass. Parents and young children are already at risk having to walk in the road to get to school or pre-school. I have seen many parents having to</p>	Please see previous comments

STORRINGTON & SULLINGTON AND WASHINGTON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN
PUBLIC CONSULTATION RESPONSE SCHEDULE
10TH JULY 2017 – 4TH SEPTEMBER 2017

	<p>negotiate this road with a pushchair plus several children carrying large school bags.</p> <p>The junction with Church Street is quite perilous with cars parked both sides of Church Street and a very narrow exit from Browns Lane. There are frequent near misses with cars trying to get in and out of Browns Lane and instances of gridlock with vehicles backed up and unable to go back or forward.</p> <p>The junction of Browns Lane and Manleys Hill is a high pollution area and more vehicles will add to the pollution. As with the Chantry Lane site, Browns Lane is a “narrow road single track in places” (even in the wider parts there are usually cars parked on the road making it single track) but unlike Browns Lane and Meadowside, Chantry Lane is not a highly populated area with many young families and elderly residents. Again as with Chantry Lane site, the main exit on to Manleys Hill via Meadowside <i>“joins onto the A283 which is often congested”</i>.</p> <p>Altogether seventy homes is a lot of buildings. Placing them on a greenfield site adjacent to the SDNP is an already highly developed area, where residents have recently had to contend with a large development on another adjacent site, would be extremely detrimental for this part of Storrington.</p> <p>In comparing the assessment of this site with the other sites there are further examples of constraints which appear to apply to them but not to the Ravenscroft Site, for instance.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why do you think “development on the (Clay Lane) site would impact upon the rural setting of this part of the settlement” but not on the existing residents of the Meadowside / Ravenscroft estate. This has not been mentioned in the Ravenscroft Assessment. • While I appreciate your concern for the allotment holders at the Ravenscroft site, I fail to see why “the impact on the rural character of the area and views into and from the SDNP” should be any less of a constraint here than at the Amberley Road site. Clay Lane site or any other site where this applies. • Proximity to the Air Quality Management site has been quoted as a constraint in the Chantry Lane site assessment. I am uncertain of the reasons why this should be a constraint but, as the crow flies, the Ravenscroft site is equally close. • Sites being adjacent to listed buildings is often quoted as another reason for assessing a site as unsuitable. Nevertheless the recent development adjacent to Browns Lane and Church Street went 	
--	--	--

**STORRINGTON & SULLINGTON AND WASHINGTON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN
PUBLIC CONSULTATION RESPONSE SCHEDULE
10TH JULY 2017 – 4TH SEPTEMBER 2017**

		<p>ahead despite being adjacent to one and very near several other listed buildings.</p> <p>I am also concerned about the lack of direct consultation with the current residents of the immediate area surrounding the Ravenscroft site. This is a large development and would have a considerable impact on the lives of people in the immediate area. I would particularly like to make the following points.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The consultation is taking place during July and August – a very busy time for families with end of school activities, school holidays and with many people going away. This is not a good time to choose for a consultation of this nature. • The consultation was not well advertised (I was unaware of it until mid-August just as I was about to go on holiday) • The consultation response form for comments was in pdf format. A form that can be filled in on line would have been easier to complete. <p>I am sure you wish to ensure that the consultation extends as widely as possible. I therefore would like to suggest an extension of time allowed so that all local residents in areas directly affected can be made aware of the potential impact of the proposed developments contained in the plan.</p>	<p>This could be said for each of the sites and this is why the proposed sites for development were on display throughout each consultation period.</p> <p>It is for this reason that the Consultation period was extended to 8 weeks.</p>
89	4/9/17	<p>I am a member of the Heather Way Residents Association, living on the Washington Road close by the old Angel Sandpit.</p> <p>I am deeply concerned by the proposal to include the restored part of the Angel Pit within the Neighbourhood Plan as a proposed site.</p> <p>My concerns are twofold</p> <p>Firstly the rear of the pit was restored under the supervision of West Sussex CC to provide an extension to the heathland of Sullington Warren. It was I understand a condition of the original planning permission that this area would be designated as green land and protected from future development. It is also outside the Storrington Built Up Area. if this land were to be developed, I am sure it would only be a matter of time before development permission would be granted on the Warren and Sandgate Parks.</p> <p>Secondly the proposed access via Heather Way, a private road owned, surfaced and maintained by the</p>	<p>Please see previous comments relating to this particular allocation.</p>

STORRINGTON & SULLINGTON AND WASHINGTON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN
PUBLIC CONSULTATION RESPONSE SCHEDULE
10TH JULY 2017 – 4TH SEPTEMBER 2017

		<p>residents would be wholly inadequate. The branch known locally as the Spur is only 3.5-4 metres wide between property boundaries, this leads to a winding unsurfaced track with several fine and protected trees in its verges. It is nowhere more than a single car's width. I attach several photographs to illustrate this. On a map this track is shown as a white road, similar to Heather Way, this is extremely misleading. Even supermarket delivery vehicles are unable to access properties via this track and must use the main road.</p>	
89	4/9/17	<p>We are writing concerning the proposed development at the former Sandpit off Water Lane, Sullington.</p> <p>We can foresee serious difficulties with access, which I would like to raise for your kind consideration, please, and have a concern about the suitability of the development.</p> <p>Of the several possible ways on to this potential housing development, I believe the least suitable would be along the unnamed, unmade track that runs East from Heather Way.</p> <p>My reasons are given below. I also enclose a link to a short video submission by way of supporting evidence.</p> <p>1. Unsuitable access to the A283</p> <p>1.1 The spur continues into Heather Way, which offers access to the A283. This access is already difficult. While visibility to the right (the West) is clear, the visibility of traffic coming from the left (the East) is restricted.</p> <p>1.2.1 The alternative access to the A283 affords even worse visibility and is hazardous. The road enters the A283 close to the apex of a bend, which is blind in both directions. Because of extremely limited visibility to both East and the West, it is not safe to make a right turn onto the A283 from the unnamed, unmade track that runs North to South from the spur East of Heather Way, separating Sandown House and Three Gates.</p> <p>1.2.2 In the interests of safety, residents often use that track only to turn left onto the A283 towards Washington, and even then, there is a risk due to the poor visibility of traffic coming from the right. Residents who wish to turn right towards Storrington often resort to using Heather Way.</p> <p>1.2.3 Increasing traffic along either of these two access points would increase both congestion and risk of an</p>	<p>Please see previous comments</p>

STORRINGTON & SULLINGTON AND WASHINGTON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN
PUBLIC CONSULTATION RESPONSE SCHEDULE
10TH JULY 2017 – 4TH SEPTEMBER 2017

	<p>accident.</p> <p>2. Unsuitable single-track road</p> <p>2.1.1 The track is unsuitable for two-way traffic. This is a bumpy single track lane without passing places. If vehicles met head-on, one driver would simply have to back up.</p> <p>2.1.2 To widen the track into two lanes or to create useful passing places would probably involve purchasing the track itself, which we understand is owned by the Hecks Estate, and possibly parts of the gardens of adjoining properties.</p> <p>2.1.3 There is a tight, blind bend in the single-track lane opposite the entrance to High Winds. There have been several near-misses here. Increasing the traffic around this bend would increase the risk of an accident.</p> <p>3. Unsuitable entrance into the Sandpit development</p> <p>3.1.1 Using this track as an entrance to the Sandpit would necessitate either tearing up a narrow pretty footpath running perpendicular to the track, and widening it substantially, along with creating a new footpath, or continuing into Clint House along the track owned by the Hecks Estate.</p> <p>3.1.2 This would also necessitate crossing the northern boundary to the track, (the bank running East to West), which belongs not to the Hecks Estate but to Clint House.</p> <p>4. Alternative access</p> <p>4.1.1 The obvious alternative to this narrow, unsuitable route with its hazardous access to the A283 and the potential issue of multiple ownerships (and purchases), is via Water Lane. This would be logical, simpler, shorter, more direct and should also be cheaper, by avoiding several land purchases and significantly more extensive road building.</p> <p>4.1.2 The recent Angell Sands development already exits on to Water Lane via a tarmac road. An aerial view suggests a corridor might exist between the two northernmost houses in the development along which the</p>	
--	--	--

**STORRINGTON & SULLINGTON AND WASHINGTON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN
PUBLIC CONSULTATION RESPONSE SCHEDULE
10TH JULY 2017 – 4TH SEPTEMBER 2017**

		<p>existing tarmac road could be extended a short distance at minimal cost and with minimal disruption. This would make best use of existing tarmac and allow access to the proposed new development from Water Lane.</p> <p>4.1.3 Another option could be to provide access higher up (further North) along Water Lane.</p> <p>4.1.4 Either of these options would involve substantially less road building and concomitant expense and disruption.</p> <p>5. Congestion into Storrington</p> <p>5.1.1 Inevitably, yet another batch of houses would exacerbate the already severe problem of traffic congestion into Storrington.</p> <p>6. Suitability of development</p> <p>6.1.1 The proposed houses could be out of keeping with those already constructed on Angell Sands and in the neighbourhood</p> <p>Appendix</p> <p>Video submission (3mins 31secs). This can be downloaded from Dropbox and is playable on most computers:</p> <p>https://www.dropbox.com/s/mo31uih7rvm8l21/Planning%20objection%20Sept%202017.m4v?dl=0</p> <p>Thank you for considering our concerns. Should you like to discuss anything further, please don't hesitate to call.</p>	
90	4/9/17	<p>I can well understand the lack of response to the plan due to the fact that it has had so many false starts. That said, although we were unable to keep certain aspects of the plan due to Horsham's plan creating conflict I do feel the overall plan has a lot to recommend it and we should now push to finally get as far as referendum. I sincerely hope that the sound advice given by Sandgate officers be taken on board and</p>	Noted

STORRINGTON & SULLINGTON AND WASHINGTON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN
PUBLIC CONSULTATION RESPONSE SCHEDULE
10TH JULY 2017 – 4TH SEPTEMBER 2017

		that we are not forced to modify things further.	
91	4/9/17	<p>As owners and residents of the xxxxxxxx on Sullington Lane, we are writing in response to the Public Consultation. We believe that Sullington Lane and the surrounding area are important components of the South Downs National Park in the rural setting offering homes to much wildlife and plantlife.</p> <p>Having reviewed the SSWNP Consultation Plan and supporting documents, we cannot support the plan at any future referendum due to the removal of the protection of the fields at the corner of Sullington Lane and A283. 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'. 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 spoil the natural beauty, wildlife, and cultural heritage of the South Downs National Park.</p> <p>Please contact us if you have further questions. Thank you.</p>	Please see previous comments
92	4/9/17	<p>I have read the Neighbour Plan and would like to make the following comments that are key to retaining the neighbourhood's current status:</p> <p>Angell Pit should be removed from the Site Allocation for Development</p> <p>Milford Grange Country Park should be re-established as a green space in the Neighbourhood Plan</p> <p>Sandgate Park should be re-established as a green space in the Neighbourhood Plan</p> <p>Warren Hill should be re-established as a green space in the Neighbourhood Plan</p> <p>The area now known as Water Lane Country Park should be added to the list of green spaces</p> <p>I live on Sandgate Lane which borders on some of these areas but more importantly I have enjoyed these green spaces and want to ensure that they remain green spaces.</p>	Previous comments apply

STORRINGTON & SULLINGTON AND WASHINGTON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN
PUBLIC CONSULTATION RESPONSE SCHEDULE
10TH JULY 2017 – 4TH SEPTEMBER 2017

		Please do what you can to retain the green open spaces that have been an integral part of this area for so many years. I remember growing up and playing in the woods - it would be such a shame for these to be lost and would materially change the locality.	
93	4/9/17	We wish to register our objection to the proposed housing development at Angels Pit, particularly with respect to access to the site. It is proposed that access, both for building traffic and subsequent residents, should be via Heather Way. This is a narrow, private lane which would struggle to cope with any increased traffic.	Please see previous comments
94	4/9/17	Having looked through the papers relating to the Neighbourhood Plan it is clear that a great deal of hard work has gone in to making this very comprehensive plan. The plan appears to me to be well thought through and provides a comprehensive and positive proposal for the way forwards for our parishes. It is to be commended and has my support.	noted

**STORRINGTON & SULLINGTON AND WASHINGTON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN
PUBLIC CONSULTATION RESPONSE SCHEDULE
10TH JULY 2017 – 4TH SEPTEMBER 2017**

95	4/9/17	<p>Demographics</p> <p>In an attempt to portray Storrington as a large village and not a town, the quoted population of under 7,000 derived from the census in 2011 is grossly misleading. The recent planning permission for a new doctors surgery is to be greatly welcomed, but the current total of patients registered is 12,000 and this is expected to rise to 15,000 before 2020.</p> <p>Even if the built up areas of the outlying villages are not absolutely contiguous with those of Storrington (which all of them probably will be before long), the population of these villages depends upon Storrington for almost all services including medical. Storrington therefore requires an urban infrastructure, which will never be achieved while it is officially designated as a village.</p> <p>Social, Economic and Environmental Issues</p> <p>Storrington is not simply a hub; it is the main shopping and commercial centre in the District outside Horsham and the only one which still has all the main banks. The Air Quality issues do not arise solely from through traffic avoiding the A27 bottlenecks; a substantial proportion of poisonous NO2 pollution is also caused not only by local vehicles but by delivery vans supplying goods bought via the internet to properties throughout the area.</p> <p>The Air Quality Management area was declared in 2010. Despite a so called action plan, apparently reviewed annually, and an abandoned low emissions trial, absolutely nothing has yet been delivered to reduce pollution. The main A283 going straight through the centre of Storrington is a deeply unpleasant, unhealthy place to live in and in parts it is also extremely dangerous for pedestrians. Not only is the bottom of Manleys Hill the most polluted area, but also the most dangerous for pedestrians because neither side is wide enough for pathways to comply with the minimum official guidelines. Moreover, denying disabled people direct access on foot or by wheelchair without due consideration of viable alternatives is contrary to the Disability Discrimination Act.</p> <p>Residents of Manleys Hill are already leaving or considering leaving Storrington because of air pollution. This issue needs to be urgently addressed.</p>	<p>The surgery caters for patients from neighbouring parishes and therefore the number of patients is higher than the population of Storrington only.</p> <p>Policy 9 protects the gaps between villages</p> <p>The issue of Air Quality cannot be used as a reason to deny development and the problems associated with the AQMA are being addressed independently of the Plan.</p>
----	--------	---	--

STORRINGTON & SULLINGTON AND WASHINGTON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN
PUBLIC CONSULTATION RESPONSE SCHEDULE
10TH JULY 2017 – 4TH SEPTEMBER 2017

96	4/9/17	<p>I would like to comment on the proposals as set out in the last draft of the Storrington Neighbourhood plan.</p> <p>In particular I would like to raise concern over the proposed site off Water Lane. The allocation of 6 homes would have an unacceptable impact on the local amenity. The site is next to an area of special scientific interest and the development would be viewed from the adjacent national park.</p> <p>Access to the site via Heather Way would not be acceptable as the single track leading to the site is substantially unmade, narrow and unsuitable for traffic. The track is part recognised as a public footpath with access onto Sullington Warren. Additional vehicle movements would increase risk and be at odds with the rural setting. The track is abutted by narrow natural verges with several significant established (circa 150-250 year old) Oak, Scots Pine and other indigenous trees, some with protection orders and others that would have the potential for an order. Any increase in traffic (construction and ongoing) would result in soil compression and damage to the tree roots. This would significantly damage the sustainability of the local area, reduce biodiversity, and have a detrimental impact on the area with the risk of loss of rare (35m high) trees that currently form part of the local and National Park view.</p> <p>In addition, the traffic volumes and road speed along the Washington Road is such that additional housing would place unacceptable pressure on a road that is already high risk at junctions.</p>	Please see previous comments
97	4/9/17	<p>I know i've left it a little late, but wanted to share some thoughts and feedback as a relatively new member of the village before the clock ticks midnight! :)</p> <p>My wife and young son moved into Storrington in May, and have read the pre-submission plans and documents with interest, and in our view the sooner the plan can be submitted and reviewed by HDC the better.</p> <p>Development in the village in general is of concern, as from what we have experienced already in the few months we have been here, is the local infrastructure appears to be at breaking point already. Traffic congestion in the centre of the village attempting to get into/ out of Storrington (from Washington Direction), or attempting to get out of the village towards Arundel/ Amberley direction as many commuters use the roads as a cut through as extremely time consuming, waiting times for doctor appointments have</p>	Storrington is identified as a category 1 settlement which able to accommodate further housing. Any developers would have to demonstrate how their proposals would mitigate infrastructure issues caused as a result of their development but are not required to improve the current situation. Plans for a new surgery have recently been approved.

STORRINGTON & SULLINGTON AND WASHINGTON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN
PUBLIC CONSULTATION RESPONSE SCHEDULE
10TH JULY 2017 – 4TH SEPTEMBER 2017

		<p>been lengthy, and adding more house/ development into the mix is only going to make those issues swell further more.</p> <p>One particular area of interest within the plan is the protection of the proposed 'local green spaces'. I fully endorse and back the proposed plans and locations suggested, in particular, the field at the top of Downsview avenue is an absolute must. I note that the field itself is actually owned privately by a land owner - has he been consulted about the proposed plan? Do the Council have an obligation to seek permission from the land owner?</p> <p>Or does the fact that the field has been used by the village for the past 25-30 (according to the local residents) years suggest that it is a sought after, well used and extremely important area of the local community, and does this give the Village any power to prevent development on that area in particular - we would sincerely hope so. As someone who now lives close by, it is lovely to see 100's, and yes I mean 100's of different dog walkers use the field each and every day in addition to the significant numbers of runners, cyclists, walkers that use the field and the surrounding footpaths. I sincerely hope that the area can remain protected as it appears to be extremely well used, and enjoyed by our lovely village residents.</p> <p>I do note that a fence had been laid around the outside of the field (presumably as a pre-attempt either to isolate the field from being used, or for it to be explored as potential development a month or two ago - which was concerning), but i do also understand that some gaps had been left in the fence to allow dog walkers and residents to continue to enjoy the field, even so, it has caused some concern in the local community.</p> <p>Protecting spaces like this once is so important to the local community and we must warn off any attempts to ruin areas of local interest.</p> <p>Happy to provide further feedback across other areas, but you've probably read enough from me.</p> <p>I look forward to seeing the next steps with interest, and look forward to seeing the plan go through.</p>	<p>The LGS criteria have been reviewed for this site and it is considered appropriate for inclusion. (Local Green Spaces Addendum Nov 2017)</p>
98	4/9/17	<p>I am concerned by the reduction of provision for valuable GREEN SPACES in the draft plan, therefore I wish to see the following action in the final version:</p> <p>Angell pit to be removed from the site allocation for development.</p>	<p>Please see previous comments.</p>

**STORRINGTON & SULLINGTON AND WASHINGTON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN
PUBLIC CONSULTATION RESPONSE SCHEDULE
10TH JULY 2017 – 4TH SEPTEMBER 2017**

		<p>Milford Grange Country Park, Sandgate Park and Warren Hill to be re-established as Green Spaces in the Plan.</p> <p>The area known as Water Lane Country Park to be added to the list of Green Spaces in the Plan.</p> <p>I live in Sandgate Lane and so am intimately concerned with the area involved.</p>	
99	4/9/17	<p><u>Comments On Storrington & Sullington & Washington revised Neighbourhood Plan 2017 -2031</u></p> <p>Here are my comments - I would ask the council to change the plan to take into account my comments:</p> <p><u>Policy 2</u> Take the following areas off the development list : Land off North Street (Old Ryecroft Allotments) Ravenscroft Allotment Site</p> <p>No development should take place at these sites - building houses at these sites will destroy the character and nature of the village and damage an area close to the National park.</p> <p>It should be noted that any development at the Ravenscroft Allotments to inevitably damage the landscape and scenic beauty of the adjoining South Downs National park and therefore development at this site should not go ahead under any circumstances . It is absolutely not sustainable to keep building right on the edge of the SouthDowns National park - it will almost certainly damage any tourist potential the area has - because this plan will turn areas of countryside into built up areas. It will make life worse for people in Storrington now and in future generations so it's not sustainable.Putting a housing estate right by a national park fails to follow NPPF 109,115 and 116.</p> <p><u>Policy 10:Tourist Accomodation</u> This policy is far too vague. The council need to say what size & sort of Hotel and what size and sort of hostel they propose to build. The council also need to say where the hostel or hotel will be built. Policy 10 would give developers a carte blanche to build whatever they want wherever they want. The council must be more specific before the plan can be voted on. The council needs to clarify what's being proposed. The plan must be clear before people vote on it.</p>	<p>These sites have been assessed robustly – please see previous comments on Ravenscroft</p> <p>The Council is not proposing to build a hotel. The Steering Group does not think that the policy should be any more prescriptive. The Planning</p>

STORRINGTON & SULLINGTON AND WASHINGTON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN
PUBLIC CONSULTATION RESPONSE SCHEDULE
10TH JULY 2017 – 4TH SEPTEMBER 2017

	<p>The hotel should not be located in the south Downs National Park as this conflicts with NPPF 109,115 and 116. Any mention of putting the hotel in the National Park should be struck from the plan.</p> <p><u>Policy 11: Education uses</u> 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. The plan must be clear before people vote on it.</p> <p><u>Policy 17 - Air Quality</u> 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.</p> <p><u>Policy 18 Traffic and Transport</u> 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 plan needs to be amended to stop traffic coming through Storrington especially heavy lorries. The roads through Storrington are extremely dangerous and congested at the moment. The first paragraph of the Policy does not make much sense, it needs to be made clear what is meant, what does " their traffic impacts on the local road network can either be avoided" mean? 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 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.</p> <p><u>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</u></p>	<p>Application process would ensure that the proposals are appropriate.</p> <p>As above, the Steering Group supports the provision of education up to age 16 but does not want to restrict the type or location. The Planning Application process would consider whether the plans are appropriate.</p> <p>Any Planning application must demonstrate that any increase in air quality issues are mitigated.</p> <p>As above, this would be a matter for the planning application process. Storrington is considered capable of accommodating further development.</p>
--	---	---

STORRINGTON & SULLINGTON AND WASHINGTON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN
PUBLIC CONSULTATION RESPONSE SCHEDULE
10TH JULY 2017 – 4TH SEPTEMBER 2017

	<p>The plan needs to include effective development controls which will enable residents of Storrington to block any unsustainable development which will occur near them. The plan seems to propose a number of sites where builders can develop houses or other developments - but does not appear to give residents the tools to stop developments near them which are not sustainable. The council is there to represent the citizens of Storrington, yet this plan appears to be in favour of developers. Many residents of Storrington are going to find themselves next to unsustainable developments that they do not want, if local people do not want an unsustainable development then it should not go ahead.</p> <p>The plan needs to include controls which will enable local residents to block unwanted developments. The plan needs to contain controls which will enable residents to block overdevelopment. The plan needs to contain controls which will enable residents to block any development which will hurt the amenity of neighbours. The plan needs to contain controls which will enable neighbours to block any development which adversely affects their property. The council to enable all those affected by a development to vote on whether or not a development goes ahead - that's democracy.</p> <p><u>If there are no effective development controls to stop unsustainable developments then this is not a proper plan.</u></p> <p>Amongst other controls the following need to be inserted into the plan:</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Any new development which leads to any harmful deterioration in Air quality should be considered unsustainable and should not be allowed.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>The sustainability of each site has been considered as part of the site assessment process.</p> <p>These are not considered material planning considerations. However each individual planning application will be considered on its own merits and members of the public may comment on any applications submitted.</p> <p>This would conflict with the emerging South Downs Local Plan.</p> <p>As stated earlier any proposals would need to demonstrate mitigation of these issues.</p>
--	---	---

**STORRINGTON & SULLINGTON AND WASHINGTON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN
PUBLIC CONSULTATION RESPONSE SCHEDULE
10TH JULY 2017 – 4TH SEPTEMBER 2017**

		If my amendments in this email don't go in - I would ask that the council explain why the amendments have not gone in.	
100	4/9/17	<p>The Ravenscroft Plan. The plan to build 70 homes at Ravenscroft with the comment that the added traffic is 'unlikely to be significant' needs exploring. Each new home could have 2 vehicles making 140, not to mention Visitors, deliveries and collections etc. These vehicles will be either trying to turn out onto the busy main road from Meadowside, mostly single track with parked cars, or down Browns Lane again a single track road onto another single track road -Church Street. All these roads need care to negotiate and can be difficult at the best of times to obtain easy access onto the High Street. Also feeder roads such as Greyfriars lane,School lane, Monastery Lane and Fern road are all mostly single track roads. These next few years we are unlikely to see less traffic through Storrington and will all these proposed developments look carefully and realistically at their impact on traffic congestion and air quality for the residents?</p>	Please see previous comments – number of dwellings has been reduced.
101	4/9/17	<p>A copy of the following comments has been signed by 4 residents</p> <p>I note the protection for the fields adjacent to Sullington Lane which was in a previous version of the plan has been removed from this latest version. This is unacceptable. I regret to say that I shall be obliged to vote against the plan in the referendum unless there is wording precluding any development in these fields and in particular precluding any new access road either to development in the present quarry or to a quarry extension.</p> <p>Added to one submission (I also object to the development of the former Angel Sandpit site and therefore cannot support the proposal)</p>	Please see previous comments regarding the points raised here
102	4/9/17	A copy of the following comments has been signed by 3 residents	

**STORRINGTON & SULLINGTON AND WASHINGTON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN
PUBLIC CONSULTATION RESPONSE SCHEDULE
10TH JULY 2017 – 4TH SEPTEMBER 2017**

		<p>I would like to make two objections to the subject plan</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The view from the junction of Sullington Lane and the Washington Road should be protected, as in previous versions of the plan. Without this I may be unable to support the plan in the coming referendum. 2) The site of the former Angell Sandpit should not be included as one for potential development. This is Greenfield and should remain as such. 	Please see previous comments
103	4/9/17	<p>Although in general support of the overall Neighbourhood Plan I wish to make the following comments and representations-</p> <p>Millford Grange Country Park and Sandgate Park (as owned by Horsham District Council)</p> <p>I am strongly against the removal of Millford Grange Country Park and Sandgate Park (as owned and managed by HDC) from the latest draft. Both areas were included in the previous draft and, I understand, their designation as Local Green Spaces was fully approved by the Examiner who raised no concerns over their inclusion although he did so with regard to the lack of evidence justifying the inclusion of other sites.</p> <p>Of major concern is the fact that when consulted to provide evidence to support the designations of the Local Green Spaces supported by the Steering Group and included in the previous draft, the SDNPA only carried out a desk top review of these two areas which resulted in it reaching its conclusions by basing them on incorrect and out of date criteria.</p> <p>Turning to individual sites-</p> <p>Millford Grange Country Park.</p> <p>Although the SDNPA excluded the area in the Appendix 2 to its report having recorded that it did not fit the criteria as it was not completed and open to the public, other sections of the main report state-</p> <p>4.4 Site xxi. Millford Grange Country Park is proposed for LGS designation in the community's Local Green Space Report as a country park. The site is part of the landscape setting of a new development and is in the first stage of development as a country park. The site is currently under construction and is not accessible by the public. The evaluation of the proposed Local Green Spaces in this report is based upon the current uses</p>	Previous comments apply

**STORRINGTON & SULLINGTON AND WASHINGTON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN
PUBLIC CONSULTATION RESPONSE SCHEDULE
10TH JULY 2017 – 4TH SEPTEMBER 2017**

	<p>and qualities of the sites; following this approach, the site does not yet fulfil the criteria. It is recognised that the site will have a future role for the community for recreation purposes once the country park is completed and open, and the community may consider this role as being particularly important. The decision making body may therefore find this site suitable for LGS designation in the context of its future use.</p> <p>4.8 In addition, site xxi. Millford Grange Country Park, has planning permission for a country park and the construction of this is currently underway. The site will have a role for recreation purposes for the community once finished. The decision making body may find this site suitable for LGS designation in the context of its future use.</p> <p>I do not believe there to be any dispute that Millford Grange Country Park meets the criteria of a Local Green Space and as, in any event, the SDNPA stated twice that it left the decision with the decision making body I suggest there is no reason that it needed to be omitted from the list of Local Green Spaces and could not be reinstated without even the need to refer back to the SDNPA.</p> <p>I request the inclusion of Millford Grange as a Local Green Space and the reinstatement of Page 15 of the June 2016 LGS report of the previous draft NP with the wording beefed up along the lines of-</p> <p>The recently-built housing estate Millford Grange occupies the site of an old sand quarry. At its northern edge is a broad tract of the uncultivated Lower Greensand ridge that was long recognised as ideal for the location of a Country Park, connecting Washington, Heath Common, Warren Hill, Sandgate Park, Sullington Warren and Storrington for walkers and ramblers, avoiding the busy main road and local roads while offering very attractive views of the South Downs.</p> <p>Landscaping, pathways and facilities were approved by Horsham District Council and the Country Park has been established and open to the public since the early part of 2017. In addition to being part of the walking link between Washington and Storrington the Park itself is an excellent area of natural countryside for relaxation, exercise and overall enjoyment.</p> <p>Sandgate Park - Horsham District Council</p>	<p>Please refer to Local Green Spaces Addendum Nov 2017 – site is now included as a proposed LGS</p>
--	--	--

**STORRINGTON & SULLINGTON AND WASHINGTON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN
PUBLIC CONSULTATION RESPONSE SCHEDULE
10TH JULY 2017 – 4TH SEPTEMBER 2017**

	<p>I believe the area upon which the SDNPA carried out its desktop review and have reported is that for which there is the Community Aspiration for the eventual formation of Sandgate Country Park.</p> <p>The area that would comprise Sandgate Country Park would include smaller individual and distinct areas including-</p> <p>*Sandgate Park to the North which is owned and managed by Horsham District Council and properly described as an attractive site on the edge of Storrington covering 30 acres (12 hectares) which consists mainly of woodland, plus some important areas of rare heathland, grassland and ponds and is demonstrably special to the local community. It is not subject to minerals extraction</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fields to the South of Sandgate Park owned by Cemex and imminently to be opened up for public access as part of the conditions to the planning consent given for the development of Millford Grange and known as Water Lane Country Park • Land to the South of Water Lane Country Park and separated by security fencing which is the Sandgate Quarry owned and operated by Cemex. <p>The link below to the HDC web-site gives details of the Local Green Space of Sandgate Park and it will be seen that it is demonstrably special to the local community.</p> <p>https://www.horsham.gov.uk/parksandcountryside/parks-and-countryside/parks-and-countryside-sites/sandgate-park</p> <p>Sandgate Park : Horsham District Council</p> <p>On page 6 of the LGS the SDNPA state-</p> <p>"i. Sandgate Park – This site is currently subject to minerals extraction which is likely to continue beyond</p>	<p>Previous comments apply</p>
--	--	--------------------------------

STORRINGTON & SULLINGTON AND WASHINGTON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN
PUBLIC CONSULTATION RESPONSE SCHEDULE
10TH JULY 2017 – 4TH SEPTEMBER 2017

	<p>2018. The site is allocated in the Horsham District Land Allocations Plan for a country park which will be delivered in stages. Due to current planning permission for this minerals extraction and the extensive nature of the site it does not meet the initial criteria at present."</p> <p>This is incorrect as the minerals extraction is in the separate Sandgate Quarry and not Sandgate Park.</p> <p>On page 9 Appendix 1 the SDNPA state-</p> <p>"The site is currently subject to minerals extraction which is likely to continue beyond 2018 and is sufficiently large (approximately 30 acres) to be considered an extensive tract of land. The site is allocated in the Horsham District Land Allocations Plan for a country park which will be delivered in stages. This future use is also noted in the Sports, Open Space and Recreation assessment commissioned by Horsham District Council. It is therefore the subject of current planning permissions and an allocation which secures its future and it is not felt that it fulfils the LGS criteria."</p> <p>As previously indicated the mineral extraction is from the separate Sandgate Quarry and not Sandgate Park.</p> <p>The SDNPA say they consider the area should be excluded as it is an extensive tract of land although having undertaken considerable searches for the definition of a tract of land I have been unable to find one. However the report also includes the following-</p> <p>3.4 Similarly there is no clear definition of what constitutes an extensive tract of land but it must be local in character and therefore large areas of green space which are of much more than local significance have been carefully considered to make a judgement as to whether they are fulfilling the spirit and purpose of this LGS designation. It is also important to note that many such large areas are often already protected by other designations such as SSSI, SAC or covered by sports and open space policies within Local Plans.</p> <p>There being no definition of an extensive tract of land I consider it inappropriate for Sandgate Park to be excluded merely because the opinion of the SDNPA is that it is one of 30 acres and, no doubt, other bodies would have differing opinions.</p> <p>Sandgate Park is certainly local as it is surrounded by a local community of houses, and has no parking facilities so is accessed overwhelmingly by foot. It is part of the Storrington to Washington Link Footpath and much frequented by the local community of dog walkers and many others.</p>	
--	---	--

STORRINGTON & SULLINGTON AND WASHINGTON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN
PUBLIC CONSULTATION RESPONSE SCHEDULE
10TH JULY 2017 – 4TH SEPTEMBER 2017

	<p>Even though a site may already be protected by other designations I do not believe that protecting a site by more than one designation is not permitted and given the aggressive nature of developers I consider it essential to protect our community by whatever legitimate means possible.</p> <p>To further support my representations I would add that I understand that within the West Chiltington NP, Monkmead Wood is included as a LGS and is referred to as follows-</p> <p>"Monkmead Wood is owned and managed as a public open space by Horsham District Council. It is located along the valley of the River Chilt, a tributary of the river Arun. This wooded area lies partly within the Hurston Warren SSSI. It contains an area of wet heathland where cross leaved heather and insectivorous plants thrive and is home to a number of important fungi and invertebrates and the animals and birds which feed upon them. It also has an area of dry heathland containing heathers and gorse, grasses, heathland plants and trees along with bare ground which provides perfect habitat for wood ants, butterflies and basking reptiles. In the UK there is now only approximately 16% of such habitat remaining."</p> <p>The similarities with the description of Sandgate Park are quite noticeable as are the sizes of the areas with Monkmead Wood covering approximately 28 acres. In my opinion a 2 acre difference between Sandgate Park and Monkmead Wood does not justify the exclusion of the former and inclusion of the latter in the respective NPs.</p> <p>The Report also includes the statements-</p> <p>2.3 Paragraph 77 of the NPPF recognises that the LGS designation would not be appropriate for most green areas. It sets out the following criteria for designation of LGS sites:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves • Demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty, historic significance, recreational value (including as a playing field), tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and 	<p>Sandgate Park (the land owned by HDC) is now included in the list of proposed LGS (Local Green Spaces Addendum Nov 2017)</p>
--	--	---

**STORRINGTON & SULLINGTON AND WASHINGTON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN
PUBLIC CONSULTATION RESPONSE SCHEDULE
10TH JULY 2017 – 4TH SEPTEMBER 2017**

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local in character and is not an extensive tract of land. <p>3.5 Paragraph 77 of the NPPF sets out a further test; namely that the green area is demonstrably special to the local community. This criteria requires a more detailed analysis which is undertaken through stage 2 of this evaluation.</p> <p>I suggest that the area meets the criteria of 2.3 and the test of 3.5 and that both will be confirmed by reference to the HDC web-site using the link already provided.</p> <p>Finally I would draw attention to the reference to Warren Hill which was donated to the National Trust to protect it from the threat of building and quarrying.</p> <p>A description of Warren hill records that much of this 250 acre area is farmed. However, 70 acres are open to the public and a further area has limited public access.</p> <p>Warren Hill used to be part of the heathland that stretched from Sullington Warren and further west. It is the most easterly of the remaining Wealden Greensand heaths in West Sussex.</p> <p>Mixed woodland covers much of Warren Hill. Some areas were planted with dense conifer plantations which are inhospitable to wild life. The dense woodland is being gradually selectively cleared to give a more natural wooded heathland which is much richer in wild life."</p> <p>On page 12 of Appendix 1 of the LGS you will note the answer answer NO to the assessment criteria "Extensive Tract of Land". I consider it incorrect to assess Sandgate Park at 30 acres as an Extensive Tract of Land but record that the 70 acres of Warren Hill is not deemed to be so.</p> <p>I request the inclusion of Sandgate Park as a Local Green Space and reinstatement of pages 3 & 4 of the attached June 2016 LGS report of the previous draft NP.</p> <p>Warren Hill</p>	<p>The assessment of Warren Hill as a LGS was reviewed and it was concluded that it does not meet the criteria (Local Green Spaces Addendum Nov 2017) However it is noted that the area benefits from protection by the National Trust.</p>
--	---	---

**STORRINGTON & SULLINGTON AND WASHINGTON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN
PUBLIC CONSULTATION RESPONSE SCHEDULE
10TH JULY 2017 – 4TH SEPTEMBER 2017**

	<p>I also consider the exclusion of Warren Hill on the grounds that it is not close to a settlement to be inappropriate as it is not only adjacent to long standing surrounding roads and housing, including Washington Village, it is very close to the extensive new Millford Grange development.</p> <p>In the report the SDNPA state-</p> <p>3.3 There are no clear specifications in the NPPF or in the PPG on precisely what constitutes 'close proximity to the community'. As noted above, the PPG, in general terms advises that where public access is a key factor, then the site would normally be in easy walking distance of the community served. The Horsham Sports, Open Space and Recreation Assessment uses a range of distances to define what is accessible. These were used in the desktop evaluation, along with additional practical considerations of access such as busy roads, pavements and streetlights.</p> <p>Apart from the fact that "close proximity" is not defined I cannot understand on what the SDNPA has formed its opinion that the area is not in close proximity when it is within very easy close walking distance of the surrounding community and a section of the Storrington to Washington Link Footpath and various other paths and roadways.</p> <p>I request the reinstatement of Warren Hill as a Local Green Space.</p> <p>Angells Pit</p> <p>I consider the addition of this site for housing development to be totally unacceptable and request its removal from the Plan. I understand the original planning conditions to have required the pit to be restored to its original condition as heathland after working ceased and that this was completed although due to lack of enforcement the land was not taken over by the NT as had been anticipated at one stage.</p> <p>Although the land is not now heathland of the best quality, given the work undertaken in The Warren and Sandgate Park to restore and manage their heathlands I'm sure restoration work would be achievable.</p> <p>Access to the development is indicated as being off Heather Way and being very familiar with the area as a result of magazine deliveries I must say that I consider the proposal as being totally unacceptable as it would result in significant increase in traffic levels and the need to make major changes to the existing narrow</p>	<p>Please see previous comments WSCC have confirmed that the site had been fully restored in accordance with the approved plans and that it entered the 5 year period of aftercare. Accordingly, in 2015 the permission was 'completed' and is therefore no longer a county site. The site was never transferred to the National Trust.</p>
--	---	---

STORRINGTON & SULLINGTON AND WASHINGTON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN
PUBLIC CONSULTATION RESPONSE SCHEDULE
10TH JULY 2017 – 4TH SEPTEMBER 2017

	<p>single track which would spoil and majorly change the area.</p> <p>The land having been identified as a phase for the future establishment of Sandgate Country Park but now being proposed for development emphasises the danger of not ensuring that other phases of the Country Park, including Millford Grange Country Park, Sandgate Park and Water Lane Country Park are given the maximum levels of protection possible from development by whatever means available.</p> <p>I restate my request that Angell Pit be removed from the NP.</p> <p>Water Lane Country Park</p> <p>As will be seen from the attached document relating to the proposals for the Country Parks which were required to be established as a condition of the planning approval given for the Millford Grange housing development, both country parks form parts of the same planning approval and proposal.</p> <p>Being attached to Millford Grange its Country Park began to be established early on and, as indicated already, had been sufficiently established for the SDNPA to comment that it could be considered for inclusion in the previous draft of the NP. At the time of the previous draft there was no sign of any activity in connection with the establishment of the Water Lane Country Park and as no information could be obtained from Barratts, Cemex or HDC, the area was not at a stage for consideration of its designation as a LGS.</p> <p>However following various representations made to HDC since the last draft they took enforcement action and the situation changed significantly with the developer being forced to produce a plan of action for the establishment of Water Lane Country Park in addition to the existing Management Plan.</p> <p>As a result matters progressed very quickly to the extent that HDC Parks Department has confirmed it is now in the final stages of agreeing the landscaping for the establishment of the Park with the developer. The Park is described in the attached plan and is the self contained area between the South of Sandgate Park and North of Sandgate Quarry as shown on the map in the report.</p> <p>The plan will also show the relationship between Millford Grange and Water Lane Country Parks both of which are parts of Phase 1 of Sandgate Country Park and subject to a specific requirement of a condition applicable to the planning consent for the Millford Grange housing development and it would be a breach of the condition for one or both not to meet the requirements for designation as a Local Green Space.</p>	
--	--	--

STORRINGTON & SULLINGTON AND WASHINGTON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN
PUBLIC CONSULTATION RESPONSE SCHEDULE
10TH JULY 2017 – 4TH SEPTEMBER 2017

	<p>At a stage when the SDNPA believed Millford Grange Country Park not to provide public access it commented in the LGS Report that "that the site will have a future role for the community for recreation purposes once the country park is completed and open, and the community may consider this role as being particularly important". I consider the same now applies to Water Lane Country Park.</p> <p>In fact Water Lane Country Park is probably now more established than when the SDNPA made its comment as it is in a far better state for public access than was Millford Grange and it is appropriate and the correct course of action to provide protection by including it within the NP.</p> <p>Millford Grange Country Park and the aspiration of Sandgate Country Park both passed the previous consultation, there being no objections of any relevance and as Water Lane Country Park is part of the published plan for the Millford Grange housing development and within the Sandgate Country Park aspiration, I would suggest that the inclusion of Water Lane as a LGS is fully justified and without the need for any further consultation.</p> <p>Although it would for part of the Community Aspiration for Sandgate Country Park, as stated in the NP I do not believe this can be relied upon to protect the area particularly in the light of Angell Pit having been included as a site for development.</p> <p>I would make the point that the area is separate from and does not form part of either Sandgate Park (as owned by HDC) or Millford Grange Country Park and must not be lost to the community as seems a possibility with Angells Pit which is within a few yards of Water Lane Country Park so one that developers and builders will have an eye on, particularly those already involved in the area.</p> <p>I request its designation as a Local Green Space.</p> <p>Land adjacent to and between Sullington Lane and Chantry Quarry</p> <p>Protection was afforded to the area in an earlier draft NP but was later omitted following the removal of related Policies. However I believe the threat of a road across the field from Sullington Lane to Chantry Quarry to still exist on more than one front and request that, at the very least, the area be afforded as much</p>	
--	---	--

STORRINGTON & SULLINGTON AND WASHINGTON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN
PUBLIC CONSULTATION RESPONSE SCHEDULE
10TH JULY 2017 – 4TH SEPTEMBER 2017

		<p>protection as possible by Policy 8. and Policy 15.</p> <p>In conclusion I would emphasise that I consider it essential for and incumbent upon the Parish Council to ensure that the NP also affords maximum protection to each and all of these areas and takes every possible opportunity to ensure that none slip through the net and are potentially exposed as has happened with Angells Pit.</p>	
104	4/9/17	<p>I fully support the principle of Neighbourhood Plans and complement the Steering Group of the Storrington, Sullington and Washington Neighbourhood Plan in their efficient production of the Pre-Submission Plan. I have considered all the proposals of the Pre-Submission Plan and write with my comments. I hope my comments will be useful in formulating our neighbourhood plan. I wholeheartedly support change that is seen to be positive by the effected community.</p> <p>Re: Land at Chantry Lane Industrial Estate, Storrington</p> <p>The pre-submission plan has been altered to exclude this development proposal and there is no longer any ‘tourism development’ included in the plan. I find it disappointing that there is no ‘tourism development’ for a settlement located as Sullington, Storrington and Washington are close to the centre point of the South Downs National Park and well positioned within West Sussex for easy access to all parts of the county including the Downs, the coast, Chichester and the popular neighbouring, Brighton.</p> <p>As the site under the previous ‘tourism development’ was outside the existing built up area boundary and would, therefore, have extended the built up area of Storrington thus compromising the broad location of the green gap between Storrington and Sullington and the neighbouring parish of Washington, I can understand why it has been removed from the plan. Our plan should resist development of the broad location of green gaps between Storrington and Sullington and all other neighbouring parishes as this policy has been supported by residents.</p> <p>Within the previous plan was a sentence designed to protect the character and setting of the SDNP adjacent to the previously proposed development. Development of the sizeable areas designated</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>The site was subjected to a robust site assessment process and it was considered that all of the constraints could not be mitigated. (Site Assessment Report and Appendix 2)</p> <p>There is a policy on tourism and for the protection of green gaps.</p>

STORRINGTON & SULLINGTON AND WASHINGTON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN
PUBLIC CONSULTATION RESPONSE SCHEDULE
10TH JULY 2017 – 4TH SEPTEMBER 2017

	<p>for 'tourism development' will not sit comfortably within the landscape. Although the road access area that was previously highlighted in order to show road development is no longer highlighted, the plan no longer protect the National Park from future road access to the development of the sandpit and access to the Chantry Lane industrial site development outside the Neighbourhood plan.</p> <p>I find this lack of protection for one of the most compelling views within the area of the plan to be disappointing. I believe that the community support for the protection of these fields was made clear in the last public consultation and it is against the wishes of the community to remove that protection.</p> <p>Horsham District Council's 2007 core strategy – explained in the pre-submission plan – is to protect, conserve and enhance landscape and townscape character and biodiversity. Development within the South Downs National Park should make minimal impact of the biodiversity of the park, on views of the park and views within the park. The stated aim of the South Downs National Park Authority is to Development within the recognised asset represented by the National Park should be specifically for the enhancement of enjoyment of the park or fulfilling a clear demand. As the neighbourhood is aware of the intention to develop the areas within and around Chantry Industrial Estate the plan is beholden to protect the countryside around it. Applications for development in these areas go back at least 10 years, such development would negatively impact on the biodiversity of the SSSI, the existing views of the agricultural site from the, elevated, South Downs and a new road will be alien to the existing landscape and views.</p> <p>A stated objective of the pre-submission plan is to 'To work with the SDNP to protect and enhance the National Park', this proposal for significant change/development and any development in this area including a new road within the National Park will be detrimental to the existing park landscape.</p> <p>Horsham District policy Framework, as described in the pre-submission plan, aims to manage</p>	
--	--	--

STORRINGTON & SULLINGTON AND WASHINGTON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN
PUBLIC CONSULTATION RESPONSE SCHEDULE
10TH JULY 2017 – 4TH SEPTEMBER 2017

	<p>Protected Landscapes, the setting of the South Downs National Park is a Protected Landscape. In addition, the Framework aims to protect the rural character of the countryside beyond defined settlement boundaries. The plan should not only positively address development potential that is acceptable to residents but also protects those areas and buildings which residents do not want to see changed. Any development sited within the National Park boundary contradicts these stated aims and should be protected against by the Neighbourhood plan; there was a clear mandate for protection of these fields in the previous consultation and there is no reason to assume that the wish of residents has altered.</p> <p>The Horsham District Framework also seeks to protect heritage assets like Conservation Areas and Listed Buildings this entire proposed development is likely to compromise the adjacent Grade II listed Chantry Mill, and the view from the A283 of the only Grade I building in the parish of Storrington and Sullington, St Mary’s church, Sullington. In addition, a road across those fields will impact the view of the Downs from the A283: a view which has not changed in hundreds of years. The landscape from the A283 just west of Sullington Lane includes the ancient buildings, on the rise to the south of the fields in question, of the ancient manorial centre of Sullington. Now represented by Sullington Conservation Area and including Sullington Manor Farm and St Mary’s church, the oldest of these buildings dates from Saxon times but together they have visible construction features for every century from the 11th – 21st. In addition development on these fields will compromise the former medieval manorial fish ponds and designated ancient woodland south of the eastern field. The South Downs National Park exists to protect the special qualities and character of the South Downs and the Neighbourhood plan should do likewise as it is a stated objective of our plan ‘to work with the SDNP to protect and enhance the National Park and its setting in the wider landscape’.</p> <p>Conclusion: In a previous version of the plan there was an assumption for a road across these fields to serve development in the neighbouring Chantry Sandpit and in Chantry Industrial estate. The protection was included to avoid any such assumption. At present the plan includes no development for the two areas stated but any future application will no doubt make the same assumption for access as</p>	
--	--	--

STORRINGTON & SULLINGTON AND WASHINGTON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN
PUBLIC CONSULTATION RESPONSE SCHEDULE
10TH JULY 2017 – 4TH SEPTEMBER 2017

		<p>before, therefore the reason for including the protection has not changed.</p> <p>It has been suggested that the protection would now be ‘arbitrary’ because the adjacent development is no longer included in the plan. It would not be arbitrary; it is clearly desired by a good number of the local residents and the Neighbourhood plan is meant to reflect the aspirations of the local people. If this leads to other requests for similar protection then they should be judged on their merits.</p> <p>I would like to see a paragraph included in the plan, along the lines of: <i>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’. 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 spoil the natural beauty, wildlife, and cultural heritage of the South Downs National Park.</i> I shall be unable to support the Neighbourhood Plan in the form of the current pre-submission plan. In particular, I would like to see the agricultural fields to the west of Sullington Lane protected within the plan.</p>	<p>The Quarry site was removed from the Plan at an early stage and therefore there is no way to make a policy to protect potential access to a site that is not in the Plan. The Quarry is in the SDNP and would be afforded protection as considered necessary by the SDNPA.</p> <p>However the Plan does have a policy to protect views and the wording of this policy will include reference to this area</p>
105	4/9/17	<p>Ravenscroft Allotments</p> <p>If we move to a new site I feel the following should be considered</p> <p>Security of the site should be increased</p> <p>It seems a number of people take on a plot then just leave it because it is too big or they just have not had enough spare time – why not provide some smaller plots</p> <p>If somebody leaves a plot untended for more than 2 months issue a notice if not response clear the plot and cover it as recently I had the same problem with plot xx</p>	<p>These comments from an existing plotholder have been noted and will be raised with any potential developer.</p>

**STORRINGTON & SULLINGTON AND WASHINGTON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN
PUBLIC CONSULTATION RESPONSE SCHEDULE
10TH JULY 2017 – 4TH SEPTEMBER 2017**

		Arrange for rubbish to be collated every 3 months plus from the site	
--	--	--	--