

COMMENTS POST REG 14 CONSULTATION

ENVIRONMENTAL POLICIES

Policy	Summary Explanation	Comments
EN1 Ecological Sites	Conserve and enhance the natural environment and preserve important ecological sites	<p>Amended to read “where it contributes to the strategic objectives of the SDNP safeguards the natural beauty of the area and does not Detract...”</p> <p>It is important to remember that we must look ahead by planting trees for the future. Trees reach old age + die + there needs to be others coming on</p> <p>I think there should be something about supporting the farming of the land</p>
EN2 Landscape Character and Open Views	All development must maintain the local character of the landscape and preserve important views	<p>2 views South or Rackham Road to the Downs and Amberley Mount; And North from SDW to Amberley village Different views should be Identified separately to afford max protection and Map A altered.</p> <p>Add looking south towards village from the Wey South path</p> <p>View 1 description is confused and is not View 1 on map</p>
EN3 Protection of trees and hedgerows	Development that damages or results in the loss of ancient trees or woodland or hedgerows will be resisted	<p>If there is a loss of habitat area – there should be some compensation planting.</p> <p>It is vital trees affected by development are protected during construction.</p> <p>Final sentence amended by adding after “demonstrate” ...how they will Be protected during construction and how...”</p> <p>Justification Para EN3.1 is slightly inconsistent with policy it seems to Seek to resist ALL loss of trees. Rectify by amending second sentence Of EN3.1 to insert “unnecessary” before “removal”</p> <p>Strongly support efforts to prevent cutting back of scrub and trees on the scarp slop along Rackham Road and Hog Lane</p> <p>Encourage reinstatement of lost hedgerows</p>
EN4 Renewable Energy	Proposals for energy-generating infrastructure using renewable or low carbon energy sources will be supported	<p>Should include reference to not changing Grade I/II listed buildings</p> <p>Providing they do not conflict with other aims of the Plan</p> <p>Only when its visual impact is compatible with EN5</p>

EN5 Conserving and Enhancing the Heritage Environment	New development plans shall respect and preserve the distinctiveness and character of the area	
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	<p>Inconsistency between policy and justification in EN6.2 Policy proposes that security + other outside lighting on private and public premises will be <u>restricted and regulated</u> to be neighbourly in use – whilst in the case of this form of lighting <u>encouragement</u> will be given to ensure a neighbourly approach.</p> <p>Resident believes outdoor lighting is not subject to planning control and add at end "On private residential property security and other outside lighting should be designed to ensure that it has no adverse impact on the amenities of adjacent property.</p> <p>Also remove "considered" from first sentence in EN6.1 – Amberley is Most certainly a rural parish.</p> <p>Will APC assume powers to enforce this</p>
EN7 Local Green Space (development not permitted)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Millenium Green • Village Pond • Top Field ("The Old Pigger y") 	<p>The pond area is incorrectly marked on the map</p> <p>Can part of Harveys Field be added as a green space? This would provide an important green buffer from B2139 esp if a car park is sited there</p> <p>If top field is an LGS why not the Middle and Lower fields. Criteria is not clear and cannot give answer</p> <p>Move Millennium Green to top field a better site. Build housing on MG existing site</p> <p>Do not agree with granting land not owned by the Parish as LGS</p>
EN8 Local Open Space (development not permitted)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recreation Ground & Cricket Field • Football Field • Hurst Cottages Playgroud 	<p>Suggest first bullet point is amended by replacing "any" with "all" to strengthen policy</p> <p>In addition reference to suggested new core objective 9 should be included in the Justification</p> <p>Comment from Geoff C re HC Playground being Windfall Site – but can't read writing!</p> <p>Cricket field should be EN7 as should football field</p>

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>Maintenance of car park to be considered + surface porous</p> <p>FI1.4 indicates small part of field but whole field identified on map. Suggest a restriction on size + capacity in policy and the remainder of The important open space is safeguarded from built development. Additional bulletpoint at end of FI 1: "of a restricted size and capacity commensurate with identified local need.</p> <p>3rd bullet point would benefit by including "pedestrian" before route And the 2nd para to FI1.1 would be strengthened by adding "...and "inconvenience to residents" after "...frequent delays"</p> <p>Car park is appealing to relieve parking issues in the village but have concerns how project would be funded. Although the capital costs would be presumably found from elsewhere we would be concerned if a small parish like Amberley was responsible for maintenance and future repairs</p> <p>how wd visitors be persuaded to use car park without yellow lines or parking restrictions. Secondly provision of car park will encourage National Park visitors who used to park elsewhere to use this car park which may generate extra traffic into the village.</p> <p>Agree to car park but not lighting. Lighting conflicts with unlit status + is unnecessary</p> <p>Wd like to see proposals for how to encourage visitors to use car park, monitor and maintain it</p> <p>No illumination</p> <p>Will attract litter and unsocial activity especially after dark. It won't necessarily be used for "Amberley" purposes</p> <p>Concerned about people using it to meet + car share leaving car all day</p> <p>As long as this does not encourage Horsham to develop the rest of the site</p> <p>Support as long as, and only if it is locked at night when lights are switched off</p> <p>Not needed all the time. When there is a function i.e. wedding, football match then arrangements could be made to "hire" field/and or school area</p> <p>No illumination; no overnight parking – especially camper vans</p> <p>No – unless proper car parking and traffic management is introduced</p> <p>Concerned re wrong usage of car park – i.e. travelers, rail parking, for lengthy periods. If we have a car park we need to have restricted parking elsewhere in village as folk will still park anywhere.</p> <p>School needs off street parking – especially when additional classes so create one for school to drop off and share</p> <p>It will detract and destroy the character and feeling in and for the village. Not good.</p>
-----------------------------------	--	--

<p>FI 2 Build a public toilet</p>	<p>Build a public toilet adjacent to the car park</p>	<p>Although a good idea in principle we would have concerns if the Parish was responsible for daily cleaning and maintenance</p> <p>Wd like to see proposals for maintenance of public toilet</p> <p>We do not want to turn the village into a mini motorway service station</p> <p>Use the toilet in Surgery instead</p> <p>Wdn't be necessary if pub were reopened</p> <p>Would support if locked at night along with car park</p> <p>I would only support if there was restricted opening times and it was known who held responsibilities. I consider it would be better to locate by railway station</p> <p>No - unless incorporated in Community Hall</p> <p>Toilet facilities could be in Community Hall</p> <p>No – who will service this</p> <p>A ludicrous idea. Storrington doesn't have one why should Amberley?</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>If Church Hall becomes redundant – consideration for conversion to 2 x 1bed accommodation.</p> <p>Church hall is inadequate but don't think sharing a school hall, evenings only, is the solution</p> <p>How will this work during the day – village lunch, yoga, pilates?</p> <p>This will entail closure of church hall – which loses money anyway. The proposal seems to contradict EN5 and FI4</p> <p>Impact on Church Hall needs to be considered</p> <p>Would need tightly controlled access</p> <p>Could the Community Hall be used at times during school hours for activities such as yoga, pilates, art classes?</p> <p>We agree with this as long as the hall is <u>only</u> on Amberley School land and doesn't require a new/any car park</p> <p>Expanding the facilities for the School is supported</p> <p>If this allows school to develop</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>Suggest amendment to final sentence: insert “robust” before “marketed” delete “no sale or let has been achieved” and replace with “there is no realistic prospect of a sale or let being concluded”</p> <p>Not necessary to register Shop + PO as it is already in community ownership – Amberley Parish Trust</p> <p>Particularly Church Hall</p>

FI 5 Surface Water Manage ment	All new developments must have a surface water management plan	
FI 6 Allotme nts and a commun ity orchard	Land on the Upper and Middle Fields will be allocated for allotments and a community orchard,	<p>Also a community/historic planting of old fruit tree species that used to Grow in Amberley along the North Escarpment.</p> <p>There must be full provision for funding maintenance before implementation</p> <p>Providing there is a demand and a commitment to maintain</p> <p>Wd like to see proposals for establishing and running these</p> <p>This is a good idea if there is demand for allotments/orchard though difficulties can arise if allotments in particular are left untended. (I had an allotment in London and this was often a problem)</p> <p>As extension of Millennium Green</p> <p>It is already a miniature reserve + it would be a shame to disturb the old turf and spoil the habitat of several threatened species</p> <p>I question whether there is a demand and therefore would be take up</p> <p>I intend to take an allotment as soon as they are available and to support a community orchard (Tim Ashby)</p> <p>Strongly support – Orchard could offer opportunities for school involvement and activities as in Slindon</p> <p>Ideally I would wish to see Top, Middle and Lower fields maintained as grazing/agricultural land and <u>most certainly not</u> for housing development. Unsure of degree of take up for allotments – access issues for middle field is upper field developed differently.</p> <p>Needs to be monitored to keep prettiness of village. Allotments have sheds, glasshouses and fencing</p>

HOUSING AND DESIGN POLICIES

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

<p>HD 1 Presumption in favour of development</p>	<p>Planning applications which accord with the policies of the Neighbourhood Plan will be approved.</p>	<p>APC is not LPA and it is therefore inappropriate and premature to indicate that planning applications will be “granted” or “approved” policy should be amended by substituting “supported” for “approved” First sentence of HD1.1 shd also be amended by inserting “... unless material considerations indicate otherwise” after “...will be approved” to ensure consistency with statutory requirements Do <u>not</u> support a general presumption</p>
<p>HD 2 Quality of design</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>Reference to safe crossings across B2139 to Amberley Station and the SDW is only tenuously related to the quality of design or need for new housing to be well connected to surrounding area. Better placed in Getting Around Needs to be visually appropriate for the village and policy EN2 (not just “integrated” as that could be interpreted as just being with the next door building) In principle yes, but to date most of the houses built have been unimaginative, lacking architectural merit. There are of course several exceptions! Modern architecture should not be ruled out</p>
<p>HD 3 Housing mix</p>	<p>New housing proposals must meet the housing needs of current and future households within the Parish of Amberley</p>	<p>This wd be better strengthened by recognizing the potential value of initiatives such as Community Land Trusts in the delivery of local housing and suggest the inclusion of the following at the end of HD3.1 “ Community Land Trusts or other similar organisations created to develop and manage housing that genuinely meets local needs will be welcomed” This is key</p>
<p>HD 4 Housing Density</p>	<p>The density of any new development shall be appropriate to its location.</p>	<p>And include car parking spaces for its residents and visitors And the context of the village as a whole This is very much open to interpretation</p>

<p>HD 5 Housing site 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>Premature for the policy to indicate permission will be granted in the absence of specific development proposals. Policy shd be amended to read: "Proposals for a minimum of six new homes will be supported if they meet all the relevant policies of this Plan"</p> <p>Should read maximum of six</p> <p>Subject to appropriate design and scale. Concerned at reference to "minimum" with no limit on "maximum"</p> <p>Depends what sort/size of housing I'm sorry but I do not understand why it should be said that permission <u>will</u> be granted for new houses at Newland Gardens. (? Can't read word: Averil) references to me need to show housing needs. Is this implicit?</p>
<p>HD 6 Windfall 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>A/B inappropriate for NP to indicate "planning permission will be granted..." Policy shd be reworded to read "Proposals for residential developmentswill be supported, subject to the following conditions being met"</p> <p>Note that the draft Plan does not include a map showing the recognised settlement boundary or proposals to revise the boundary set out in Horsham LP. I consider this to be a serious omission making it impossible to apply the policy consistently; it shd be rectified and a map showing the settlement boundary shd be included in the final draft Plan to the LPA</p> <p>This is too sweeping. All policies need to be adhered to to provide permission. I don't think that isolated buildings should be included here e.g. barns which seem to be covered.</p> <p>Where are these sites!</p>
<p>HD 7 Outdoor space</p>	<p>Housing development proposals should include good quality outdoor amenity space</p>	<p>Need to treat on an individual basis. Flats for example do not really fit in here</p> <p>Not necessarily</p> <p>Needs to be on a case by case</p>

<p>HD 8 Attention to detail</p>	<p>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>	<p>Solar panels restricted</p> <p>Presumption in favour of PV and similar “green” energy</p> <p>Default position seems to be to discourage photo-voltaic panels. Suggest these should be the norm on new developments of modern design. They are not ugly or obtrusive – some are now coming as faux tiles</p> <p>Depends what they are</p> <p>Solar panels should have frames the same colour as the panels so that they are less conspicuous</p> <p>Do we need any more restriction which may become dated?</p>	
<p>HD 9 Local Connection</p>	<p>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>	<p>Wd like to see policy strengthened to ensure these requirements are applied robustly – amend penultimate para to read “If there is still no potential purchaser or renter, and subject to satisfactory evidence of robust marketing having been undertaken to fulfil the above requirements the property may thereafter...”</p> <p>Should always be for people with Amberley connection not just first. (this is a get out clause for council)</p> <p>Not just first occupants, this should apply to subsequent occupants as well</p> <p>This policy must be enforced. We understand that forecast local demand for Newland Gardens did not materialize</p> <p>Limited effect in long term</p>	

GETTING AROUND POLICIES

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

<p>GA1 Footpaths, cycleways and bridleways</p>	<p>Support will be given to proposals that improve and extend existing footpaths, cycleways and bridleways</p>	<p>Does APC have a role in encouraging initiation of proposals to achieve this?</p> <p>Experience in London suggests cycleways create a lot of concrete infrastructure which is unsightly and unnecessary. See no need for these around Amberley</p> <p>Wd not be in favour of a footpath along East Street to Crossgates. Enjoy this walk which is in essence a country lane. Pedestrians can walk in the road with as much right to it as car drivers, cyclists.</p> <p>Remember we are a country village not a suburb</p> <p>A new route linking No 2 Bostal with the Wey South Path would be supported – map is currently missing</p>
<p>GA2 Pedestrian footways</p>	<p>Support will be given to proposals which lead to the creation of public footways.</p>	<p>More appropriate to include safer crossing points over B2139..suggest policy is retitled “Pedestrian footways and safety” and policy is extended by adding “...and also safe pedestrian crossings over the B23139 at Amberley Station/Amberley Museum and the South Downs Way”</p> <p>Ensuring obstructions are avoided would help i.e. cutting back overgrown hedges + preventing cars parking on path at the garage on B2139</p> <p>Does APC have a role in encouraging initiation of proposals to achieve this?</p> <p>Cannot support this as a general proposition! Insufficient detail provided and lack of suitable caveats.</p> <p>Yes to footpaths along the main roads but not country lanes</p> <p>But not pavements in the old village which would make some roads too narrow and make resident parking a nightmare for those off-road space, as well as reducing its current “old-worldd” rural character which is much appreciated by visitors</p>
<p>GA 3 Car parking</p>	<p>Development proposals will be supported only if they include the maximum level of off-street parking consistent with current standards.</p>	<p>Policy wd benefit from inclusion of a commitment that APC works with the Highways Authority to bring forward measures to address parking hot spots around the Parish as part of a wider package of traffic management proposals</p> <p>Yes if it's a new area development – not if its infill or conversion</p>

<p>GA 4 Quiet Lanes</p>	<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>We would like the High Street and The Square included in this proposal as this road has substantial problems with speeding vehicles</p> <p>If East Street and Rackham Road are included why not School Rd?</p> <p>Provided it does not involved extra signs, lighting, markings or other intrusions which will diminish the essential rurality of the roads</p> <p>Not sure if traffic burden in East Street and Rackham Road makes this feasible</p> <p>How about the B2139</p> <p>I am in favour of Quiet Lanes for rural areas, but less certain whether it is equally appropriate for builtup roads such as Church Street, Hog Lane, East Street for the following reason:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A sign would be necessary and I wd prefer to avoid signage 2. As the quiet lanes cannot be enforced, other than by self-enforcing + public awareness – it may lead to monitoring +I am not convinced this is helpful 3, I have not been aware of problems in the village + have always found that car owners are patient/polite with walkers, horse riders etc. <p>How would it be enforced? Speeding is habitual + I wd add School Road</p> <p>Sounds good but how would it be implemented/policed?</p> <p>I cannot support this unless some thought is given to the High Street particularly where it enters the Square</p> <p>High Street needs to be on this list</p> <p>I strongly support the intention, but am very concerned that the only effect will be yet more signs which will produce no results.</p> <p>High Street should be included as a quiet lane too; cars and cyclists come far too fast around the blind corer at the Black Horse and are a considerable hazard when children come out of school.</p> <p>This sounds a lovely idea – BUT current behavior suggests that without enforcement little notice will be taken of any signs which would merely detract from the current street scene and add an unwelcome air of urbanization.</p> <p>Pedestrians in Amberley (especially young children returning from school and the elderly) are more in need of protection from groups of cyclists, which unlike cars can seldom be heard approaching unless they are especially noisy. This is a particular hazard on the blind corner by the Black Horse where groups in convoy charge/ sweep round at speed and take pleasure in swooping down the unexpected slope of the High Street. This needs to be taken seriously it is an accident waiting to happen</p> <p>Add High Street and School Road</p> <p>Add School Road, The Square and High Street</p> <p>We agree the road should be shared but we do not want signage, road markings etc</p>
---------------------------------	---	--

EMPLOYMENT AND TOURISM POLICIES

Policy	Summary Explanation	Comments
ET1: Develop ment of new and existing business es	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 ...	<p>As FI 4 – suggest final sentence is amended to insert word “robust” before “marketed”</p> <p>Delete “no sale or let has been achieved” and replace with “there is no realistic prospect of a sale or let being concluded”</p> <p>Should the reverse be welcomed?</p> <p>Need to ensure that a development proposal fitting all the policies is approved at the time of change of use otherwise attracts speculators on change of use</p> <p>Be careful – details required</p> <p>No horrible looking masts</p>
ET 2 Telecom municatio ns	Proposals to improve mobile phone services will be supported	<p>Does PC have a role in encouraging telephone companies to submit proposals for siting of mobile phone masts</p> <p>No masts. Ariels</p> <p>But no more masts on the Downs</p> <p>It depends on mast locations</p>
ET 3 Tourism	Subject to appropriate conditions, development of facilities connected with tourism will be supported	<p>Policy shd be amended to read “Proposals for facilities ... homes and pubs will be supported, subject to...”</p> <p>We do not have enough facilities in Amberley for more tourism. If we increased the facilities we are likely to take away from Amberley all the things that the visitors like e.g. tranquility and hearing the birds sing</p> <p>I think we should say that mobile businesses e.g. food vans will not be supported.</p> <p>Enough already</p> <p>It is for individual businesses to promote themselves and to put a business case forward. There should not be over-tourism as this will spoil the peace and quiet of this rural location</p> <p>Provided they do not impact the village</p> <p>Need to wake up South Downs National Park on this</p>

NOTES + COMMENTS:

The authors + all are to be congratulated in bringing forward a well researched document. I am sure those preparing new planning applications will find it helpful

We are less clear what the role of the PC is in bringing forward developments such as the car park, Community hall, allotments, orchard, public toilet, mobile phone reception, new footpaths etc. What are the cost implications of establishing + maintaining these schemes for example. We are also less clear as to what powers the PC has to enforce agreed restrictions on planning applications e.g. obtrusive lighting – the Castleview instance is a case in point. We would like to see the PC encouraging proposals to establish public access defibrillators at Crossgates + Hurst Cottages.

* * * * *

Farmers ought to consider a deer farming project – rather than them being considered a pest – turn into an asset

* * * * *

This Pre Submission version of the ANP is an excellent document which in my view accurately captures the aspirations and concerns of the local community. It sets out a package of well-considered and realistic policies and proposals that will guide the future social, economic and physical development of the parish. Any suggested changes are intended to strengthen or clarify the plan and should not be taken as showing a lack of support.

Para 4.2 Core Objectives (P20 Full Version) The Core objectives should be strengthened to recognise the contribution of important open spaces to the character of the Parish, by including the following additional objective:

“9: Safeguard important local open spaces from inappropriate development”

Map A – Protected Local Views – map is inaccurate in that the views from Rackham Road point in an easterly direction and not south as indicated in the text

* * * * *

FI 3.5 P29: We disagree that a new school hall would meet the needs of the village. It's by no means clear that there is an unmet demand for evening club space (The Mens Club and Youth Club both folded years ago) and when children move on to Rydon, Steyning etc they partake in activities in those centres. For the village, any hall must allow access during the day. The Church Hall is inadequate but I don't think sharing a school hall, evenings only, is the solution.

5.7 Employment + Tourism P38: Breakfast/after school club – I'm unclear how the Parish could help with this. Is it a suggestion that a) the Parish makes available premises and funding for such a club or b) encourages a private provider to run such a club?

“75% would support care services for the elderly” – a laudable statement, but what exactly does it mean:- that there is support for a new business to provide care services to the elderly in Amberley? Could it be clarified more precisely?

The draft Plan has obviously taken a lot of time and commitment to produce – to those of you who have worked on it, thank you, even if we disagree with some proposals.

* * * * *

Development on any of the “possible housing sites” should expressly be made subject to the type of criteria expressed elsewhere in this document plus proposals (such as screening by trees and hedgerows) to reduce the visual impact from the roads (in particular the B2139) and from the Downs. Generally as far as possible, conditions should be imposed to minimise disruption and adverse visual impact (particularly over extended periods of time) such as has been experienced at Drewitts Farm. Protection of trees, hedgerows and woodland should be subject to proper management too maintain health of the vegetation, views and access. There should not be any presumption in favour of unchecked growth and/or additional planting which may adversely affect issues like this (as has been evident around the village green and pond for example)

As a general observation and to permit better and more accurate statistical analysis a third option e.g. “don't know” or “undecided” would have been useful in addition to “Yes” or “No”. It is also important to understand how comments and caveats are to be interpreted. For example in this document, responses marked with asterisk and accompanied by comments are a YES subject to those comments; otherwise they would have been a NO or (if the option had been available possibly “Don't Know” or “Undecided) Query therefore to what extent it is appropriate for statistical and other purposes, to record such responses as a YES. Many thanks for organising this consultation.

* * * * *

In overall terms it is a good document but

1. It is really not obvious why Amberley needs more housing
2. The car park and hall proposals are a bad idea and will have undesired consequences

* * * * *

Keep Amberley different, keep it rural, not suburban!

* * * * *

F1:3 (Page 3) Build a joint use School/Community Hall
Although the merits of this proposal are clear, the village would benefit from a community hall
Available at all times (excepting the middle of the night)

Its possible that the hall, only being available in out of school hours would prevent activities taking place. Bury as a positive example: plays, ballroom, regular fund raising coffee mornings. Grants available for halls. The village of Privett in Hampshire raised many pounds, but the majority of funds came thru grants. The shop could benefit from a stronger location. Wd the village look at the possibilities of a Community Hall that also housed the shop with parking? I visualise an attractive timber framed construction!

* * * * *

Good job! Well done all! I have no comments of substance to make except those at HD3 and HD5

* * * * *

Excellent survey!

* * * * *

Page 3 Vision 2nd Para – why is the date 2025-30. Why not just use the plan dates
2nd sentence “Whilst allowing for sustainable development ...” Those businesses might not be
The ones that are appropriate or needed/wanted in the future. The Parish should evolve as wanted
by a changing community. I think it is better to say “businesses wanted by and appropriate to the
needs of the Parish Community.
3rd Para – I’m not clear what is meant by “neighbours”. Why not just say “The Parish will be
connected throughout by a network of footpaths and cycleways which includes access to the South
Downs.
I think the shop can only continue if it is viable as a business and enough people in the Parish want
To use it. I don’t think it should be “protected” any more so than any other business

Core Objectives

1. I don’t consider there is a need for more new residential development
3. Appropriate Infrastructure – I consider it unrealistic to expect all that is listed to be within the Parish. It is not unreasonable when living in a rural village to expect to go to a town for some Amenities/facilities.
4. I’m unclear what is meant by “immediate neighbours” In the objectives I would have liked there to be something about supporting the continuation of local farming of the land.

* * * * *

Additional bad aspects of living in Amberley: Noise from garden machinery; power tools should be Discouraged. Too many weekenders

Views shown on Map A in full document do not correspond to text descriptions. The map information is more complete but needs correct text descriptions

Text description 1 is confusing and seems to describe two very different views in opposite directions south and north. Most parts of the village can see at least one of these views they are not just from Rackham Road

Map A View 1 – is from Amberley Mount and the South Downs Way looking north over Amberley Village and The Wildbrooks and far beyond, looking west over the Arun Valley, Bury and along

The South Downs and looking south over the South Downs with hidden valleys This is possibly the Best view in the Parish but is not mentioned in the text list, The upper Field, Middle Field and Lower Field are prominent assets in this view

Map A View 2 is south from Rackham Road across the fields and also from Amberley village to the Downs, Aberley Mount and the South Downs Way and High Titten. This view is also prominent from the Wey South Path across The Wildbrooks

Map A View 3 is from North Stoke and the lane up to the Downs looking north towards Houghton Bridge and looking west and south to the Arun Valley

* * * * *

Thank you for giving us a chance to comment. The process has been very thorough.

* * * * *

Public Car Park and Toilet (abbreviated version)

The provision of a public toilet within a public car park usually proves to be a magnet for groups of People who engage in inappropriate and unacceptable behaviour. If there is to be a public toilet, a preferred option would be to incorporate it within the proposed new school/community hall, whereby, hopefully there would be an extension of the caretaker provision to control, maintain and clean.

Quiet Lanes

Notice designating quiet lanes are a good idea but I suspect will have little effect in reducing the speed which drivers already drive through the village when the roads are free of parked cars

Amberley is a unique village, hence the title The Pearl of Sussex. I think it wd be so sad to urbanise "The Pearl"

* * * * *