

## **COMMENTS POST REG 14 CONSULTATION**

### **ENVIRONMENTAL POLICIES**

| <b>Policy</b>                          | <b>Summary Explanation</b>  | <b>Comments</b>  |
|--|---|--|
| EN1 Ecological Sites                   | Conserve and enhance the natural environment and preserve important ecological sites                          | Preserve all ecological sites – not just the important ones.<br>Two lists of views; one in EN1 and one in EN2. Suggest one list.   |
| EN2 Landscape Character and Open Views | All development must maintain the local character of the landscape and preserve important views               | YES BUT IT IS THE DEFINITION AND BY WHOM OF THESE THINGS<br>This is also important as you come into the village from the B2139 to avoid the spraul we see on the roads near Horsham.<br>Not sure of emphasis on “ancient” trees. Suggest “significant. Some trees are not worth saving and vice versa. |
| EN3 Protection of trees and hedgerows  | Development that damages or results in the loss of ancient trees or woodland or hedgerows will be resisted    | Consideration must also be given to fields for their importance to wildlife and absorption of rainwater.   |
| EN4 Renewable Energy                   | Proposals for energy-generating infrastructure using renewable or low carbon energy sources will be supported | Subject to maintaining landscape character and open views.<br>But within the constraints documented.   |

|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
| EN5<br>Conserving and Enhancing the Heritage Environment | New development plans shall respect and preserve the distinctiveness and character of the area   | Whether you live in a Grade 2 Listed building or affordable housing the environmental aspect should be respected.<br>Both heritage and environmental / landscape considerations.<br>Should add archeological sites to list of heritage assets.   |
| 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                  | Can we look forward to Horsham District Council's required removal of bright strip lights at the Riverside Café being enforced?<br>Agreed. Key consideration for any car park needs to be that it is not floodlit – an informal car park. Parish unlit apart from residual light from surrounding buildings. Both station and caravan park have streetlight type lighting.<br>Is discouraged strong enough? Can pressure be put on the new owner of the Riverside tearoom site to turn off the lights along the river and in the caravan site? |
| EN7 Local Green Space (development not permitted)        | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Millennium Green</li> <li>• Village Pond</li> <li>• Top Field ("The Old Piggery")</li> </ul>                    | The Old Piggery should not be included.<br>CANNOT SUPPORT THIS – Millennium Green and Village Pond Yes. The Top Field do not really understand.<br>Unsure why the Old Piggery is listed specifically. This should be widened to include the lower fields except for car park, orchard and allotments.<br>Top field (also called Upper Field in report) has no "significant community and amenity value" so why is it included?   |
| EN8 Local Open Space (development not permitted)         | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recreation Ground &amp; Cricket Field</li> <li>• Football Field</li> <li>• Hurst Cottages Playground</li> </ul> | Football field could really do with a pavilion and some parking perhaps.<br>As above but important to maintain fields. Also suggest creation of wildflower meadow – space to breathe.<br>What does "comprehensive redevelopment of a school" mean?   |

## 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>Do you intend to use all the field? Please maintain the natural setting – trees, hedgerows etc. Subject to funding (by whom?), upkeep (by whom), damage responsibility etc. Why spoil this field? Parking can be provided elsewhere if required. But limit size and do not tarmac. Important to create surface that is suitable for surroundings but still practical. Concern about access from School Road and B2139. Whereas we understand the motivation behind these proposals we believe there are likely to be unintended consequences. Sites like these inevitably attract litter and antisocial behaviour that will harm the village environment and use by individuals for which neither facility was intend (e.g. not visitors to Amberley but through traffic and a rendezvous point. This will not solve the real parking problem – Church Street and Hog Lane. Cars are getting bigger. Spaces must reflect this. Not true to say there is a stretch of restricted parking in School Road. This is only during school hours and is voluntary. I don't think a car park is needed on a day-to-day basis. The current practice of using Harvey's Field as a temporary car park for events seems to work well. How would a car park be maintained and funded? If charges are applied, people would park in the streets to avoid charges. The only way of avoiding this would be to introduce yellow / double lines which I would object to. I would not be in favour of a car park if I have to contribute financially to its maintenance. With regard to the school, I work in a school with ample parking and it makes no difference at drop off / pick up time. We still have people stopping in the street outside. I think in general parking is not a problem on a day to day basis.</p> |
| <p>FI 2 Build a public toilet</p> | <p>Build a public toilet adjacent to the car park</p>          | <p>Will incur vandalism. Will not be financially viable, needs continual upkeep. Who would be responsible for cleaning and maintenance? With reservations. How will it be kept clean and free from vandalism? Not required at this location. We consider this is not necessary. (There is not even a public toilet in Storrington) It will bring other issues to the village. Who would be responsible for cleaning and maintenance? Whereas we understand the motivation behind these proposals we believe there are likely to be unintended consequences. Sites like these inevitably attract litter and antisocial behaviour that will harm the village environment and use by individuals for which neither facility was intended (e.g. not visitors to Amberley but through traffic and a rendezvous point. It should be possible to include the w.c. in the community hall keeping access separate. What about cleaning it? Not sure yet. But there is a definite need for mobile toilet blocks during events like open gardens. These are not expensive. A toilet on the station would be more useful than in the village.</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>Agree if school has need but community has the church hall, which is underutilized. Must be cost to school. The church hall is underused. Who would own and be responsible for this building?<br/>         Black Horse could be used.<br/>         Plenty of places for a community hall. Surely the black horse site is obvious. Why does the school need more space?<br/>         Not sure why this is necessary. We already have a church hall.<br/>         Village has the Church Hall.<br/>         Can Amberley support two halls? The plan needs to address the future of the Church Hall.<br/>         I don't see a need for this. We have a village hall. If the school needs more space this is a separate issue and should be funded by the LEA.</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>The 12-month marketing condition is not sufficient. Disingenuous developers can too easily abuse this. Parish councilors should be directly involved in the process, alongside any community interest groups, to ensure that every effort is made to retain assets of community value.<br/>         More details needed.<br/>         Well yes but again depends on the definition and by whom of what is an asset of community value.<br/>         Not clear how the 12 month policy applies to an asset of community value such as the Black Horse which has been on the market and empty far in excess of this.<br/>         List of ACVs should include Castle, All the pubs, the Tea Room and the River Cafe</p>   |
| <p>FI 5 Surface Water Management</p>                 | <p>All new developments must have a surface water management plan</p>  | <p>Also waste-water management, traffic management and ensure utilities are in place.<br/>         No mention of river flooding.</p>   |
| <p>FI 6 Allotments and a community orchard</p>       | <p>Land on the Upper and Middle Fields will be allocated for allotments and a community orchard,</p>   | <p>Allotments are not a necessity in the village.<br/>         In theory – if sufficient members want it. Personally, at 80, I have too much land to deal with.<br/>         Sounds good but will allotments be used enough? How will Parish residents get there and park – in the new car park? – surely not!<br/>         Suggest consider lower field too – ease of access through new car park. Also soften the impact. Consider meadow very important for bees.<br/>         “Allotments contribute to wildlife habitat” – really? Once gardeners get going with herbicides, insecticides and pesticides nothing lives.<br/>         I don't think there is a need for allotments. I don't know anyone in Amberley without a garden. However, if this prevents development of the land I would be in favour – I would rather look t allotments than houses.</p> |

## HOUSING AND DESIGN POLICIES

| Policy   | Summary Explanation   | Comments  |
|--|---|---|
| HD 1<br>Presumption<br>in favour of<br>development | Planning applications which accord with the policies of the Neighbourhood Plan will be approved.  | I feel this should be changed to read: "Will not be opposed without good reason." (Too sweeping). Not sure I agree with how planning applications are permitted or not based on proposals in this plan. Still need to be considered individually as without doubt, there will be elements that have not been considered and new implications over time.<br>"Previous local need housing developments for the parish of Amberley, although well intentioned, have largely failed to deliver the intended benefits for those with a local connection." – I dispute this, but if it is true, it is due to a failure by HDC to manage allocation of local housing needs and by Amberley PC to monitor the allocations. This must be addressed for the future. |
| HD 2 Quality<br>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 | Ensure housing maintains the current village style. NO modern executive houses.<br>PADS need a plan for ongoing review and updates.   |
| HD 3<br>Housing mix                                | New housing proposals must meet the housing needs of current and future households within the Parish of Amberley  | Yes, this would be nice.  |

|   |   |  |
|---|---|--|
| <p>HD 4<br/>Housing<br/>Density</p>         | <p>The density of any new development shall be appropriate to its location.</p>   | <p>Avoid density that is too close because financial gain is uppermost for developers!! Watch closely!! At Drewitts Farm the closeness to Rilands fence was devious. (rest illegible)<br/>         Yes, but a developer will only build what is profitable.<br/>         This is very important otherwise Amberley will look like one of the many densely paved estates.<br/>         “The density of new developments shall be appropriate to this location” – meaningless!<br/>         There is no HD4 in my copy of the neighbourhood plan.</p>  |
| <p>HD 5<br/>Housing site<br/>allocation</p> | <p>Permission will be granted for a minimum of six new homes on the land adjoining, and to the east of, Newland Gardens</p>   | <p>If really necessary but a peaceful area close to existing homes would be destroyed.<br/>         This statement is incorrect and very misleading.<br/>         What’s this “Permission will be”? I do not think due process has been followed in respect of consideration for all sites.<br/>         This is a good location – easy access through current road management from B2139. Also tree masked position does not impact the rural feel of the village.<br/>         No problem with Newlands Gardens but Parham land at Cross Gates should not be discounted.<br/>         In the past few years the vicarage has been turned into housing. We have also had the development of Newlands Gardens and Drewitts Farm. For such a small village surely we have had enough recent development! I would not be in favour of more.<br/>         I think the space between Hurst Cottages and Cross Gates would be a more suitable site.</p> |
| <p>HD 6 Windfall<br/>sites</p>              | <p>Permission will be granted for residential developments on infill and redevelopment sites within the recognised settlement boundary, subject to a set of specific conditions</p> | <p>Yes, providing control is always evident.<br/>         Why? There is no need.<br/>         But must consider environmental impact plus laso access from amin roads. Safe turning particularly from B2139.<br/>         Whole Parish is within the SDNP so superfluous point.</p>  |
| <p>HD 7 Outdoor<br/>space</p>               | <p>Housing development proposals should include good quality outdoor amenity space</p>  | <p>Why hasn’t this been followed at Drewitts Farm for instance?<br/>         Whole set of meaningless conditions – “good quality”, “commensurate”, appropriate”!</p>   |

|                          |  |  |
|--------------------------|--|--|
| 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) | <p>Plus also car parking / garages.</p> <p>We feel this is too restrictive in respect of photovoltaic panels, which only work when facing the sun. We should be encouraging renewable energy, not putting obstacles in its way. We support other requirements. "PV panels should not be visible from roads, paths or views." Such panels do not need planning permission unless in a conservation area or on a listed building. A short walk round the parish shows several installations visible from roads etc. Perhaps the word intrusive might add some perspective. "Compliment" should be "complement"</p>   |
| 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                                       | <p>I think existing residents should have first priority and also they should not be allowed to vacate for a longer period than other developments in the past have.</p> <p>Define "Amberley connection" in this context.</p> <p>But I do not understand the need for more housing in the Parish when significant housing is unoccupied.</p> <p>Agree the sentiment but think the "Amberley connection" criteria drawn too broadly – e.g. it would give priority to someone who lived here to age 5, then elsewhere for the rest of their life and wanted to return in old age. This would seem a very loose "connection" to the parish.</p> <p>This must be effectively monitored. The concept of "neighbouring parishes" is complicated by different district councils who manage housing allocation.</p> <p>Should also include those who work in the parish.</p> <p>I do not approve of this discrimination. I have no objection to 'outsiders'. I commented on this extensively on this in the survey. There is affordable housing in Storrington and Pulborough.</p> |

**POSSIBLE HOUSING SITES OFFERED BY LAND OWNERS**

| SITE | Location and Current Status | Support Development on this Site | Comments |
|------|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|----------|
|------|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|----------|

|                                      |   |   |   |
|--------------------------------------|---|---|---|
| Parham Site 1                        | Along Rackham Road, West of Crossgates, on land currently leased from Parham Estates for horse grazing  | Y | <p>It would fill in the ugly gap between the isolated house and Crossgates. It would also complement development on the north side.</p> <p>Good position infill in this road would join the village together.</p> <p>Although I don't see the need for any development, this would be the most suitable site in my opinion.</p> <p>A beautiful site. If development was well spaced, in keeping with cottage style housing I would love to live there.</p> <p>This ribbon development would spoil views into and out of the village, contrary to policy EN2.</p> <p>Would spoil the view to the Downs.</p> <p>If roadside development – similar to the housing style at Crossgates, i.e. maintaining the fields in spaces between the houses and B2139.</p> |
|                                      |   | Y |   |
|                                      |   | Y |   |
|                                      |   | Y |   |
|                                      |   | N |   |
|                                      |   | N |   |
|                                      |   | Y |   |
| HDC Site, Top Field, The Old Piggery | Land to the South side of the conservation area behind properties in High Street and East Street. Hurst Close is to the East of this site. This is agricultural land currently used as grazing. | N | <p>Access is the problem.</p> <p>This would be my first choice as infill would be better and access easier and safer than other sites.</p> <p>Many residents are against this infill development. Also contrary to EN2 and EN7.</p> <p>I see no reason why the Old Piggery can't be allocated for development. I strongly object to the wording above which clearly leads residents towards Hilda Newlands paddock, and NOT FAIR!</p> <p>Development did commence here. Hence infrastructure is in place. View from the Downs is not compromised. Traffic for 6 properties is insignificant. Hence Hurst Cottages road access is satisfactory.</p>  |
|                                      |   | Y |   |
|                                      |   | N |   |
|                                      |   | Y |   |
|                                      |   | Y |   |
| HDC Site, Middle Field               | Fiend between Newlands Gardens and School Road. This is agricultural land currently used as grazing.  | N | <p>This would also spoil views, contrary to EN2 and use would be contrary to policy F16.</p> <p>No problem with development here but nice to just leave it to sheep.</p> <p>Possibly better site as access from Hurst Cottages but still feel these fields are important to look and feel of the village.</p>   |
|                                      |   | N |   |
|                                      |   | N |   |

|                           |   |   |   |
|---------------------------|---|---|---|
| HDC Site,<br>Bottom Field | Field along B2139, from junction of School Road and south of HDC Middle Field. This is agricultural land currently used as grazing. | N | Would spoil views contrary to EN2. Would be a stand out development not linked to anywhere. Same comment as middle field.<br>This would ruin the rural style of the village and also access would be difficult without creating dangerous turning on B2139.   |
|                           |   | N |   |
| Hilda Newland Site        | Site adjoining and to the east of Newland Gardens   | Y | The only problem might be concentrating all affordable housing in one area.<br>Complies with policy HD5 and next to recent development considered an asset.<br>Access for residents onto Turnpike Road (especially ours) must be part of a road safety audit. Surprised this was not included in the "Independent Housing Survey"!<br>More development here would further spoil the view from Amberley Mount. Consideration required to access as well as difficulties getting onto / off B2139. Residents on Turnpike Road compromised.<br>This is the best site for all the reasons given previously. |
|                           |   | Y |   |
|                           |   | N |   |
|                           |   | N |   |
|                           |   | Y |   |

Key issue is price of purchase to allow for affordable housing.

#### GETTING AROUND POLICIES

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

|   |   |  |
|---|---|--|
| GA1<br>Footpaths,<br>cycleways<br>and<br>bridleways | Support will be given to proposals that improve and extend existing footpaths, cycleways and bridleways   | The old footpath from No 2 Bostal also leads to Ham Piece.<br>This must include future planning for maintenance to ensure these remain passable (already an issue mid to late summer).   |
| GA2<br>Pedestrian<br>footways                       | Support will be given to proposals which lead to the creation of public footways.   | I agree with footways but they need better maintaining than other paths in the past.<br>There are currently adequate footpaths in Amberley and surrounds.<br>It would be appreciate if one could cross the road safely at Mill Lane – especially for walkers and tourists.<br>As above   |
| GA 3<br>Car parking                                 | Development proposals will be supported only if they include the maximum level of off-street parking consistent with current standards.   | More detail is required in respect of a car park. Viz. finance, security, upkeep, responsibility.<br>More info needed.<br>I do not understand what this means.   |
| GA 4 Quiet<br>Lanes                                 | It is proposed that the following are considered for designation as Quiet Lanes <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mill Lane</li> <li>• High Titten</li> <li>• Church Street</li> <li>• Hog Lane</li> <li>• East Street</li> <li>• Rackham Road</li> <li>• North Stoke Road</li> </ul> Please indicate your view (Y/N) for each | Fantastic! Presumably reduction of speed limits from “National Speed Limit” to a more suitable limit would follow (ref Mill Lane, High Titten, North Stoke Road).<br>I’ve put no to East street and Rackham Road as people would not pay any attention to these roads which then makes it more dangerous for pedestrians.<br>Also High street and School Lane. Traffic here is LOCAL and fast. This is dangerous to everyone but especially the children and elderly.<br>Quiet lanes should affect all, i.e. Hurst Cottages and Newlands Gardens.<br>To be honest, these are really quiet already. If something were done about the B2139 then the overall would look after itself, but we know it never will be.<br>Also agree with full submission regarding the B2139. Any proposals must not worsen the situation on the B2139. Certainly Newlands Gardens did when road widening without consultation (to allow safe turning space) made existing Turnpike Housing more dangerous.<br>We would dearly love to see traffic calming along the B2139 between Houghton and Amberley in the form of <u>large raised humps</u> – only with the danger of damage to their vehicles will drivers slow down! The whole area will then become a quieter, safer and more pleasant place for walkers and cyclists and allow motorists to turn out onto the main road in safety.<br>This list includes all roads in the parish except B2139 and Hust Cottages. Why is Hurst Cottages excluded?<br>Is it possible to make the whole parish a “quiet parish”? Nationwide experience shows quietness without traffic calming measure are a waste of time. |

## EMPLOYMENT AND TOURISM POLICIES

| Policy   | Summary Explanation  | Comments  |
|--|--|---|
| ET1:<br>Development of new and existing businesses | 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. | See comments for policy F14. The same applies here.<br>More info needed.<br>Do not understand why this is here – is this related to the Black Horse? My view is there is no requirement for a pub.<br>Not clear how the 12-month policy applies to an asset of community value such as the Black Horse which has been on-the-market and empty far in excess of this.  |
| ET 2<br>Telecommunications                         | Proposals to improve mobile phone services will be supported   | So we'll have a mast somewhere?<br>Also landline provision must be resolved including broadband. This is a known issue for BT requiring significant investment. There are currently no spare lines for existing households so new housing would have to take this into consideration.<br>As long as masts are well hidden.  |
| ET 3 Tourism                                       | Subject to appropriate conditions, development of facilities connected with tourism will be supported  | People come to view the historic village (Church Street) – no requirement for anything further.<br>But not provision of toilets for the reasons described previously.<br>What are “appropriate conditions”? Another meaningless phrase!<br>I don't object to tourism, neither do I benefit from it so I would not like to see the council putting too much emphasis on this. It is for businesses to market themselves. |

### ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:

The consultation produced strong community resistance to the establishment of new caravan parks in the parish. Can it be stipulated within the plan that they will not be supported?

It is always advisable to monitor programmes. Never assume anything is being done to agreed plans!

Sewage: The Amberley sewage system needs urgent attention! Maybe renewing! I do not know current plans but we have a serious problem of a foul smell – a surge – outside property. The water company are aware and come to fix the problem in the street when requested, but that should not be happening. Extra building will need a new system!!!

The proposals make no mention of funding. Viz, Whi will fund the capital outlay for, (for instance) the car park or public lavatory and perhaps more maintenance the ongoing maintenance and daily security, cleaning etc. I am particularly against the introduction of a public lavatory which in my experience causes many problems nad are usually closed within a three year time scale. Viz. Storrington and I believe Amberley in the past.

As far as the community hall is concerned that must be up to the school if it is required for the children's education but not for the community as the church hall has been adequate for their use over many years and is cureently not fully utilised.

Policy GA4, Traffic management. Page 9 of abbreviated ANP. I support anything that would help to decrease the traffic fumes, noise and speed. We need a safe way to cross the B2139, particularly for the elderly and infirm. For one resident in particular, in their late eighties, it is extremely dangerous to cross to get to shop or tea room.

I have recently seen a faded notice pinned to a gate post at the top of High Titten. I thought it gave notice that the Arun River Authority (I forget its correct name) were no longer going to deal with the accumulation of silt in the river or with bank repairs. I have returned to check the contents of the notice but it ahs disappeared (30.04.16). I am wondering how less river maintenance will affect land surrounding Amberley in times of high rainfall.

I cannot support one NP in full. An independent body should have been recruited, NOT members of the PC who will benefit directly from the green space. I do not understand why an expert was brought in to advise re housing sites. It is the Parish residents that must make this decision as a whole and they must make their decision without recourse to reading someone else's view. I think it would have been more appropriate to have more independent residents running this plan (that is my opinion) - persons not serving on the Parish Council. It is for this reason that I cannot support this plan.

I think we need to understand how many houses are needed and not over up too much without reason. The village already suffers from poor electricity, poor waste-water management, flooding, dreadful landline and broadband coverage (we are at capacity and BT confirmed that huge is required in Amberley – “a known problem area. This is combined with the B2139 speeding risks, schools and local GP services at breaking point and train disruption. What Amberley has is its heritage, its landscape and its wonderful community, which I know you are doing your best to protect. Please ensure, as we try to compromise, that these issues are resolved before commitment to development is given.

We get the feeling that much of the wording has been lifted from the plans for larger communities than Amberley.

Para 3.4. Flooding and drainage: Should say some of the houses and businesses at Houghton Bridge are at risk of flooding.

Other than traffic calming measures as part of any new development, there is nothing even aspirational in the plan to curb what is identified as a threat / issue of major concern to residents; namely the weight / speed /volume / noise of traffic on the B2139. We feel thst this is a missed opportunity to highlight and explore the ways that this might be tackled, in particular the current lack of enforcement of the speed limits – the 40 mph at Amberley and the 30mph at Houghton Bridge, which we see flouted daily.

**Thank you everyone responsible for this!**

Amberley is a beautiful place to live and I am very proud to be a resident, but I know that places must evolve and although I am not currently in favour of development (because I believe we have had enough in recent years), any development should add to the 'story' of the village. By this I mean that I don't believe any development should be a copy of what we already have. It should tell something of the time we live in now. I think that the council's primary focus should be in maintaining a SAFE, peaceful and beautiful village for those lucky enough to live here.

Consideration must be given to the fact that the Environment Agency will not continue to maintain flood defences. A plan should be agreed between the Parish and the landowners to maintain the defences. It simply won't work to have each household defend themselves. It needs to be a coordinated effort. If this is not happen many houses in the village will suffer the devastating consequences.