

Dear Tim

Sorry not to have replied to you sooner

I have consulted with our officer who deals with settlement boundaries, and he advises that the proposed new settlement boundary includes an undeveloped area just west of Newland Gardens, which could therefore be seen as being suitable for development.

If it is the community's wish to include this area as a housing allocation site then we would recommend proceeding with the proposed new boundary; however if the community do not wish to see development on this site we recommend re-drawing the settlement boundary more tightly around the proposed housing site to the east of Newland Gardens and the existing development.

Do let us know if you need any further advice before the meeting on 14 July

Kind regards

Stella New  
Neighbourhood Planning Assistant  
South Downs National Park Authority

Tel: 01730 819249 | Reception: 01730 814810  
South Downs Centre, North Street, Midhurst, West  
Sussex, GU29 9DH  
[www.southdowns.gov.uk](http://www.southdowns.gov.uk) | [facebook](#) | [SDNPA twitter](#) |  
[Ranger twitter](#) | [youtube](#)

**From:** Tim Simpson [<mailto:mail@tim-simpson.com>]  
**Sent:** 29 June 2016 09:35  
**To:** Sarah Nelson <[Sarah.Nelson@southdowns.gov.uk](mailto:Sarah.Nelson@southdowns.gov.uk)>  
**Cc:** Stella New <[Stella.New@southdowns.gov.uk](mailto:Stella.New@southdowns.gov.uk)>

**Subject: Re: Amberley Settlement Boundary**

Hi Sarah,

We have reviewed this issue of Amberley's settlement boundary in our NP Steering Group, and agree that the proposal below is our preferred option. If you recall, we are now proposing in our NP to extend the settlement boundary to include both the existing houses in Newland Gardens, and more importantly, the proposed new site for housing in Amberley.

We are due to confirm this formally at a Parish Council meeting on 14 July. In advance of this it would greatly help if you could send us an email confirming your support for this proposal - i.e. to extend Amberley's settlement boundary in this way.

Many thanks

Tim

T +44 (0)1798 831234

M +44 (0)7803 288178

**From:** Tim Simpson <[mail@tim-simpson.com](mailto:mail@tim-simpson.com)>

**Date:** Wednesday, 15 June 2016 13:00

**To:** "[Sarah.Nelson@southdowns.gov.uk](mailto:Sarah.Nelson@southdowns.gov.uk)"

<[Sarah.Nelson@southdowns.gov.uk](mailto:Sarah.Nelson@southdowns.gov.uk)>

**Cc:** "[Stella.New@southdowns.gov.uk](mailto:Stella.New@southdowns.gov.uk)"

<[Stella.New@southdowns.gov.uk](mailto:Stella.New@southdowns.gov.uk)>,

<[Chris.paterson@southdowns.gov.uk](mailto:Chris.paterson@southdowns.gov.uk)>

**Subject:** Re: Amberley Settlement Boundary

Dear Sarah,

Thank you for calling back. This is the email I was about to send you. It sounds as though you and Chris both agree that this is the way to handle the issue.

Many thanks for your help on this.

Tim

T +44 (0)1798 831234

M +44 (0)7803 288178

"Have just had another conversation with Chris about this. The issue is that our proposed housing site is outside our existing settlement boundary. I have attached the Horsham 2007 map of

Amberley's current SB, and also Amy's map showing our proposed housing site adjacent to Newland Gardens.

Chris' solution to the issue is that in our NP we should propose extending our Settlement Boundary to include the proposed site

This would then be contiguous with the existing SB, and would include both Newland Gardens and the proposed site.

This redrawing would also take in our Millennium Green, but this is held in trust by a village trust, and we intend to designate it as a Local Green Space, so it should be protected from any development.

The third map attached shows this - in Black the existing settlement boundary, in Red the proposed extension, and in Green the Millennium Green.

Would appreciate your views. Will this change to the SB overcome the issue on the proposed housing site?; and will it protect the Millennium Green from development?"

**From:** Tim Simpson <[mail@tim-simpson.com](mailto:mail@tim-simpson.com)>

**Date:** Wednesday, 15 June 2016 08:56

**To:** "[Sarah.Nelson@southdowns.gov.uk](mailto:Sarah.Nelson@southdowns.gov.uk)"

<[Sarah.Nelson@southdowns.gov.uk](mailto:Sarah.Nelson@southdowns.gov.uk)>

**Cc:** Stella New <[Stella.New@southdowns.gov.uk](mailto:Stella.New@southdowns.gov.uk)>

**Subject:** Re: Amberley Settlement Boundary

Hi Sarah,

I would like to have a phone call today about this. Would sometime later this morning work for you?

Just to inform you, we telephoned yesterday and spoke to Chris Paterson to get his view on Amberley's settlement boundary. SDNPA have not mentioned Amberley Parish in their review of settlement boundaries in their emerging Local Plan - Chris explained that SDNPA expects those parishes which are currently doing NPs to review their settlement boundaries as part of the NP process. We

then looked at the current settlement boundary, which has not been updated since the 2007 Horsham Local Plan ([http://www.horshamdistrictldf.info/Files/LP\\_Amberley\\_2007\\_CONS.pdf](http://www.horshamdistrictldf.info/Files/LP_Amberley_2007_CONS.pdf)). This seemed to Maureen and me to be sufficient for our purpose in the NP. By saying in our policy HD6 that development on Windfall Sites outside the SB would not be supported, we are effectively excluding the three HDC fields and the Crossgates field. So we don't appear to need to change our Settlement Boundary.

Chris also sent us a document describing the SDNPA methodology for reviewing SBs - (<https://www.southdowns.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2015/09/Settlement-Boundaries-Methodology-and-Appendix-1.pdf>) and requested that we indicate that we had used this methodology to review Amberley's SB. We did a quick read-through, and it looks as though there is nothing in there which would require us to change our SB. We should therefore add a sentence to HD6 saying "*the Settlement Boundary has been reviewed in line with the emerging SDNP local Plan methodology, and is unchanged*"

Hope to speak later,  
Regards  
Tim

T +44 (0)1798 831234  
M +44 (0)7803 288178

**From:** Stella New <[Stella.New@southdowns.gov.uk](mailto:Stella.New@southdowns.gov.uk)>  
**Date:** Tuesday, 14 June 2016 09:31  
**To:** Tim Simpson <[mail@tim-simpson.com](mailto:mail@tim-simpson.com)>  
**Cc:** "[Sarah.Nelson@southdowns.gov.uk](mailto:Sarah.Nelson@southdowns.gov.uk)" <[Sarah.Nelson@southdowns.gov.uk](mailto:Sarah.Nelson@southdowns.gov.uk)>  
**Subject:** RE: Amberley Settlement Boundary

Dear Tim

Thank you for your email - I've spoken with Sarah and this matter may be easily resolved by moving the recognised settlement boundary to include the proposed site.

We've also received some further comments from our Landscape Officer, regarding the alignment of the car park. The group may have already considered this in depth as part of the planning process, and reached the conclusion that an east/west alignment is the best solution, however the Landscape Officer has offered the view that a north/south alignment along School Road could perform better from views to the south, including Amberley Mount, and in landscape terms for the following reasons:

1. The car park would be viewed in the context of/closer to the existing road in views from higher ground to the south;
2. The car park would not run parallel to the B2139 -thereby reducing its exposure;
3. The car park would not extend along the boundary of the school field & intrude into the adjacent field to such a large degree;
4. The proportions of Bottom Field would be less affected & it's depth would be conserved in views along B2139.
5. Structure planting would be for the length of the north south boundary along School Lane and would complement the existing hedgerow

She has also suggested that any design should refer to rural materials and have an informal layout - wooden sleeper edges, post and rail fencing, limestone chippings (type 1) surfacing for parking bays, raised edges with meadow grass, native hedging and trees i.e. a native, low maintenance planting scheme. Vehicular access could be tarmac with suitable kerbing. Drainage should be through SUDS if possible. There are quite a few examples of rural car parks in

the National Park that you may like to have a look at, including an application for an extension to the car park in the centre of Selborne which relies on native and semi natural woodland species for the planting scheme.

This is obviously for the group to consider and decide upon; we are just offering it as helpful information at this stage.

If you would like to talk through the settlement boundary or car park matters please call myself or Sarah – neither of us are in the office today but Sarah will be in tomorrow, or if not next week.

Kind regards

Stella New  
Neighbourhood Planning Assistant  
South Downs National Park Authority

Tel: 01730 819249 | Reception: 01730 814810  
South Downs Centre, North Street, Midhurst, West  
Sussex, GU29 9DH  
[www.southdowns.gov.uk](http://www.southdowns.gov.uk) | [facebook](#) | [SDNPA twitter](#) |  
[Ranger twitter](#) | [youtube](#)

**From:** Tim Simpson [<mailto:mail@tim-simpson.com>]  
**Sent:** 09 June 2016 10:46  
**To:** Stella New <[Stella.New@southdowns.gov.uk](mailto:Stella.New@southdowns.gov.uk)>  
**Cc:** Sarah Nelson <[Sarah.Nelson@southdowns.gov.uk](mailto:Sarah.Nelson@southdowns.gov.uk)>  
**Subject:** Amberley Settlement Boundary

Dear Stella,

Thanks a lot for your very useful reply on LGS and our proposed car park. Both give us considerable encouragement to press ahead with these.

In our SG meeting last evening, we identified a possible issue with our housing policies, concerned with Amberley's settlement boundary. We may have a conflict between two of our Housing policies, and if so, we would appreciate your advice as to how to resolve it.

- In our policy HD5 we nominate a site for housing, which has provisionally been approved a while ago by Amy T-J. (see attachment).
- In our policy HD6 on Windfall sites, we say that "*Permission will be granted for residential developments on infill and redevelopment sites within the recognised settlement boundary, subject to the following conditions being met:...*"

The possible issue is that the site we have nominated for housing lies outside the current settlement boundary (shown on the second attachment). Is this a real problem, or can we simply say something like "*the proposed site, while outside the existing settlement boundary, will be treated as an exceptional site*"?

Would very much appreciate your advice on this

Thanks

Tim

T +44 (0)1798 831234

M +44 (0)7803 288178

**From:** Stella New <[Stella.New@southdowns.gov.uk](mailto:Stella.New@southdowns.gov.uk)>

**Date:** Wednesday, 8 June 2016 15:15

**To:** Tim Simpson <[mail@tim-simpson.com](mailto:mail@tim-simpson.com)>, "[vhspiers@hotmail.com](mailto:vhspiers@hotmail.com)" <[vhspiers@hotmail.com](mailto:vhspiers@hotmail.com)>

**Cc:** "Sarah.Nelson@southdowns.gov.uk" <[Sarah.Nelson@southdowns.gov.uk](mailto:Sarah.Nelson@southdowns.gov.uk)>

**Subject: RE: Amberley NDP: Proposed LGS sites and Carpark**

Dear Tim and Vicky

Thank you for your respective emails regarding the proposed Local Green Space sites and the carpark for the Amberley Neighbourhood Development Plan (ANDP).

### **Proposed Local Green Space sites**

From the SDNPA's perspective we do not see any issue with the Parish's aspiration to designate either site as Local Green Space, and would support the identification of Local Green Spaces for protection within the ANDP. It is an area where local knowledge and a Neighbourhood Development Plan can really add to what a Planning Authority might do. It is likely that designation of either/both sites would be in line with NPPF paragraph 77, but if there is any uncertainty, this can be tested through the examination.

The Piggeries site is adjacent to the Conservation Area and forms part of its setting. With regard to the Crossgates site, our Landscape Officer has provided the following comments which you may find useful:

- It is highly visible from the scarp slope and from the B2139, so any development would have visual impacts through increasing the length of development along Rackham Road. This would have a degree of impact on northward facing views from Amberley Mount a notable viewpoint in the SDNPA Viewshed Study (Viewshed panorama no 32). Development would be visible in views from Amberley Mount to the west of existing properties; the east/west alignment of the site would maximise this exposure in views.
- Views towards the scarp slope from Rackham Lane would be truncated in the location of the site.

- The open and highly visible nature of the site would make development more apparent at the settlement edge.
- There is existing gappy hedgerow along Rackham Lane which would be affected/removed by development through the need to gain access to the site which would be detrimental to landscape character.

We would suggest that given the background to both sites, that the Parish consider whether they are satisfied that they would not wish any development to take place either now or in the future on the sites before seeking Local Green Space designation. If this is the case, we would recommend that you seek to demonstrate in the supporting text why the sites are special to the community (e.g. beauty, historic significance, recreational value etc. - see NPPF Para 77).

An example of this is the [Hamsey NDP](#) (pages 23-29) which passed referendum on 2 June, where the supporting text provides helpful justification for the designation of Local Green Space and makes good use of community feedback and local wildlife data to demonstrate their local value in line with NPPF para. 77. Another example that may be worth looking at would be the [Lavant NDP](#) (pages 28-31) which is at pre-submission stage, and their [Review of Open Spaces](#) which goes into some detail regarding their definition methodology of different types of designation including Local Gaps and Local Community Spaces.

### **Proposed Car Park**

Our DM officers have advised that Landscape impact would be the priority consideration if an application for a car park was to come forward on this site. If this is deemed acceptable, the following matters would need to be considered, in addition to the lighting, charging and opening hours as already outlined:

- Frontage/street view
- Visibility and access
- Is the layout workable
- Impact on the conservation area/nearby listed buildings
- Sustainable drainage and the use of permeable surfacing
- Adequate space for vegetation within and/or around the car park (6m is the minimum gap between rows of car park spaces, and the proposed gap of 10m offers scope to consider soft landscaping options)
- Who would be using the car park (residents/tourists/local businesses)
- Proven benefits in terms of the National Park Purposes e.g. tourism

If more detailed planning advice is required the Parish Council is recommended to submit a pre-application

I hope this provides the information you need, but please let us know if there is anything further you need from us at this stage.

Kind regards

Stella New  
Neighbourhood Planning Assistant  
South Downs National Park Authority

Tel: 01730 819249 | Reception: 01730 814810  
South Downs Centre, North Street, Midhurst, West  
Sussex, GU29 9DH  
[www.southdowns.gov.uk](http://www.southdowns.gov.uk) | [facebook](#) | [SDNPA twitter](#) |  
[Ranger twitter](#) | [youtube](#)