

COMMENTS POST REG 14 CONSULTATION – EAST STREET

ENVIRONMENTAL POLICIES

| Policy | Summary Explanation | Comments |
|--|---|---|
| EN1 Ecological Sites | Conserve and enhance the natural environment and preserve important ecological sites | Strongly agree |
| EN2 Landscape Character and Open Views | All development must maintain the local character of the landscape and preserve important views | Respect emerging SDNPA Local Plan Map and descriptions are confusing Strongly agree Respect emerging SDNPA Local Plan |
| EN3 Protection of trees and hedgerows | Development that damages or results in the loss of ancient trees or woodland or hedgerows will be resisted | Trees have been here longer than us There should be tree planting along the B2139 to provide a noise screen “will not be supported” |
| EN4 Renewable Energy | Proposals for energy-generating infrastructure using renewable or low carbon energy sources will be supported | As long as it isn't noisy or an eyesore Should not be unsightly Provided not unsightly We need solar panels and other green energy facilities Solar panels should not be visible from the Downs Only if does not affect views Ditto |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| EN5 Conserving and Enhancing the Heritage Environment | New development plans shall respect and preserve the distinctiveness and character of the area | Taking into account HDC guidelines, as in PADS |
| EN 6 'Unlit village' status | Development proposals which detract from the unlit status of the Parish will not be supported; "always-on" lighting will be discouraged | Also Noise Pollution Important to preserve night views Relevant also to car park proposal Always-on lighting should be prohibited, not just discouraged Ditto |
| EN7 Local Green Space (development not permitted) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Millennium Green • Village Pond • Top Field ("The Old Piggery") | We need to keep green spaces Definitely Recommend also Middle Field and Crossgates field for LGS status Do we need to make all these LGS? Ditto Must have equal playing field fro all housing sites, therefore Old Piggery should not be a Local Green Space. Village pond not suitable for development and Mill Green ptoected by MGT |
| EN8 Local Open Space (development not permitted) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recreation Ground & Cricket Field • Football Field • Hurst Cottages Playground | Rec ground already protected Ditto |

FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE POLICIES

| Policy | Summary Explanation | Comments |
|--------|---------------------|----------|
|--------|---------------------|----------|

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| <p>FI 1 Create a car park</p> | <p>Create a car park in the Lower Field ("Harvey's Field")</p> | <p>A car park would attract more cars and never be sufficient. Only if sympathetic. Drainage in winter could be an issue Will be safer for school children Much needed – but should be screened Should be screened Access to school field for off-road drop-off will be good Subject to environmental and lighting considerations; could we consider compulsory purchase of Drewitts Farm land as an alternative? No hard surface, no lighting. Height barrier needed Ditto Yes – but without lighting No lighting</p> |
| <p>FI 2 Build a public toilet</p> | <p>Build a public toilet adjacent to the car park</p> | <p>Problems with monitoring, maintenance and mis-use. No other small villages have public toilets; who will maintain? As long as it is kept safe and clean Who would maintain it? Should be screened Should be unobtrusive No – cleaning, maintenance protection from vandalism too difficult Ditto Too many issues connected with misuse and maintenance Ditto</p> |
| <p>FI 3 Build a joint-use School/Community Hall</p> | <p>Build a joint-use School/Community Hall on Amberley School land, for use by Amberley School (during school hours) and the Community (outside school hours)</p> | <p>This feels like a compromise – both Parish and School need full-time facility. Morning pre-school would encourage school recruitment. Eases use of Church Hall, and useful for the school The school obviously needs a hall for the additional Year 6 – a good opportunity for the village Impact on Church Hall needs to be considered Needs to be a community resource, but just when the school decides; should be bigger than existing Church Hall Needs to be a community resource, but just when the school decides</p> |
| <p>FI 4 Protection of assets of community value</p> | <p>Proposals that enhance the community value of any Asset of Community Value will be supported.</p> | <p>Is the Black Horse and AOCV? – it should be Reinstate BH as AOCV May be resisted by some property owners; Ditto</p> |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| FI 5 Surface Water Management | All new developments must have a surface water management plan | Surface water must not be displaced onto other properties |
| FI 6 Allotments and a community orchard | Land on the Upper and Middle Fields will be allocated for allotments and a community orchard, | Is there sufficient demand for allotments? Allotments can be very untidy “or for other community use” - ie not housing Unsure if sufficient demand; keeping tidy mau be challenging Ditto Wrong place for allotments; too little demand Good idea but only sustainable if sufficient demand |

HOUSING AND DESIGN POLICIES

| Policy | Summary Explanation | Comments |
|---|--|---|
| HD 1 Presumption in favour of development | Planning applications which accord with the policies of the Neighbourhood Plan will be approved. | Better wording – “will be looked at favourably” Too strong – should not apply to sites rejected by residents “supported”, not “approved” Ditto Up to a point – would hate Amberley to expand too much |

| | | |
|------------------------------|---|---|
| HD 2 Quality of design | Proposals for new development and extensions will be assessed against the standards laid down in the Parish Of Amberley Design Statement. New housing must be well connected to the surrounding area, and visually integrated | No dumpy red-brick modern houses Not like those at Drewitts Farm Use PADS, suitably updated – but not too restrictively Ditto |
| HD 3 Housing mix | New housing proposals must meet the housing needs of current and future households within the Parish of Amberley | Reasonable cost housing for young families - £300-400K We should indicate preference for smaller units Emphasise affordable housing and local connection |
| HD 4 Housing Density | The density of any new development shall be appropriate to its location. | Not too crammed together - and appropriate to the size of the property |
| HD 5 Housing site allocation | Permission will be granted for a minimum of six new homes on the land adjoining, and to the east of, Newland Gardens | Need to consider the scall and size of any new housing Emphasise affordable housing and local connection Best site available in the Parish Provides direct access for cars from B2139 an safe footpath access to shop and school Strongly supported – best available site |
| HD 6 Windfall sites | Permission will be granted for residential developments on infill and redevelopment sites within the recognised settlement boundary, subject to a set of specific conditions | Infill yes, strip development no ?May be granted? Small scale & low cost With strict enforceable controls Settlement boundary needs careful definition Ditto |

| | | |
|--------------------------|--|--|
| HD 7 Outdoor space | Housing development proposals should include good quality outdoor amenity space | Especially car parking We should consider more smaller units with less space “will” not “should” – landscaping is essential Ditto |
| HD 8 Attention to detail | In addition to conforming to the Parish of Amberley Design Statement (PADS), new developments should meet a further set of detailed requirements (eg bin stores, outside lighting, photo-voltaic panels) | Plus adequate parking Yes, but realistic Appropriate drainage PADS should be updated to reflect this |
| HD 9 Local Connection | Affordable housing delivered as part of policies HD5 and HD6 will require the first occupants to be existing residents of Amberley, or with an Amberley connection | Is there enough demand for this in the village? Useful for first time buyers and younger villagers Good for local young people Local Connection should be more precisely defined And for at least 10 years Needs to be time limited – eg 10 years |

HOUSING SITES

| SITE | COMMENTS |
|------|----------|
| | |

| | |
|--|---|
| Parham Site 1 | <p>No – ribbon development Yes – will connect two parts of the Parish ? - risks ribbon development Should be explored Risks ribbon development Ditto Loss of views; harm to landscape Car park appealing, but not at the expense of housing Second choice – but would create additional traffic through the village</p> |
| HDC Site, “Top Field”, The Old Piggery | <p>No – impacts on existing residents; access only through Hurst Close; opens other sites to development A possible – services already there Unacceptable in-fill Would harm views Loss of views; harm to landscape No – would lose an important green space</p> |
| HDC Site “Middle Field” | <p>No – ditto No – ditto No - ditto No – ditto</p> |
| HDC Site “Bottom Field” | <p>No – but if community hall/car park sited here then preferable to other sites Site for car park/?school hall? No – would cause undesirable in-fill Better to use for a car park and school/community hall Better used for car park Ditto</p> |

| | |
|--------------------|---|
| Hilda Newland site | <p>Yes – best suggestion - opportunity to sort out drainage for N/L Gdns. Services already in place</p> <p>Yes – provided access is from the B2139 and not from Rackham Road</p> <p>Yes – most appropriate site by a long way</p> <p>Ditto</p> <p>As long as flood risk is addressed</p> <p>Best option</p> |
|--------------------|---|

GETTING AROUND POLICIES

| Policy | Summary Explanation | Comments |
|---|---|---|
| GA1 Footpaths, cycleways and bridleways | Support will be given to proposals that improve and extend existing footpaths, cycleways and bridleways | Plus separate cycle tracks |
| GA2 Pedestrian footways | Support will be given to proposals which lead to the creation of public footways. | <p>Depends on location</p> <p>Not if this means pavements in the village where none exist</p> <p>Do not want pavements in Amberley village</p> <p>Ditto</p> |
| GA 3 Car parking | Development proposals will be supported only if they include the maximum level of off-street parking consistent with current standards. | Should be “minimum” not “maximum” |

| | | |
|------------------|---|--|
| GA 4 Quiet Lanes | <p>It is proposed that the following are considered for designation as Quiet Lanes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mill Lane • High Titten • Church Street • Hog Lane • East Street • Rackham Road • North Stoke Road <p>Please indicate your view (Y/N) for each</p> | <p>All Yes – legs not wheels – some cyclists are a menace Rackham Road will not remain quiet if more houses are built by the Sportsman Much needed to improve road safety – speed limits below 30mph 20mph speed limit much needed on these roads Quiet Lane designation superfluous – will lead to signage clutter Ditto No to all – would increase signage clutter Not possible to enforce Unenforceable – would attract more groups of dangerous cyclists Road signs should be kept to a minimum</p> |
|------------------|---|--|

EMPLOYMENT AND TOURISM POLICIES

| Policy | Summary Explanation | Comments |
|---|---|--|
| ET1: Development of new and existing businesses | <p>Proposals for the redevelopment or change of use of land or buildings in employment or service trade use to non-employment uses will not be permitted, unless the existing use can be shown to be no longer economically viable.</p> | <p>Villagers need to support all aspects of village life</p> |
| ET 2 Telecommunications | <p>Proposals to improve mobile phone services will be supported</p> | <p>Some providers have rubbish coverage Only if masts are unobtrusive and not in conservation area Ditto But no more mobile masts</p> |

| | | |
|--------------|---|--|
| ET 3 Tourism | Subject to appropriate conditions, development of facilities connected with tourism will be supported | Positive for jobs Can better use be made of the Old Surgery? ?May be supported? Should include slipway for boat launching Accommodation YES, caravan parks NO Ditto Within limits – one of the joys of Amberley is minimal tourism |
|--------------|---|--|

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

1. Addition to Vision statement – in 2025-30, Amberley will continue to be a WELCOMING AND INCLUSIVE place
2. We need some kind of central meeting place – it's an important dimension of village life
3. Can the plan include active creation of new business units
4. Important to support renewable energy developments – eg a Parish wind turbine
5. Our community needs to be INCLUSIVE – transport links, affordable homes, starter homes. This will support sustainability in the Plan
6. No mention of public transport in the Plan. Our train service to London is a key benefit
7. Bus services are minimal – can they be improved
8. No mention of Rubbish collection – could this be improved?
9. No mention of the existing voluntary social networks
10. No mention of existing charity work
11. Listserve is excellent – should be mentioned
12. Could Amberley ever have a gas main?

