

Slaugham Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Representations

Ref#	Cmt#	Respondent	Organisation	Behalf Of	Policy	Page	Para	Map	Type
22005	1	Mr I Barden							Object

Comments

I am very concerned that Slaugham Parish Council (SPC) are not only ignoring the local residents views and concerns by continuing to push forward their unwanted plans; but are further ignoring the actual concerns for the shrinkage of the village centre. I personally created a proposal for the SPC to engage with the National Trust (NT) to further enhance both the village needs and NT attractions, versus the NT now surrounding the village with extended car parks for their own benefit. The proposal would also enhance prosperity to all entities involved and reduce the increasing traffic volumes within the village, who are simply using the village as a bypass both to Horsham and the NT attraction.

Ref#	Cmt#	Respondent	Organisation	Behalf Of	Policy	Page	Para	Map	Type
22005	2	Mr I Barden				11/12			Object

Comments

Generally, I note that there is no requirement for additional building in the Parish and that the Plan recommends helping boost local housing supply over and above what is required.

I do not see the rationale of this as it goes above and beyond MSDC requirements and the housing stock need is more than covered by the “Strategic” 600 house Pease Pottage development as well as the Hyde development and planning permissions already granted in the Plan period.

Indeed, according to the Slaugham Parish website, the current number of households in the Parish is around 1200.

The Plan – including the Pease Pottage, Hyde and existing permissions seeks to increase the housing stock by some 900! Where is the infrastructure to support this and the desirability of transforming this quite rural Parish through such major and rapid growth?

I would like to object, specifically, to the proposed building developments – as referred to in Policies 11 and 12 near St Martin Close because:

- Major impact on the area - effectively DOUBLING the housing stock of the West Park Road and St Martin Close area.
- This will cause significant, additional traffic (potentially 100-150 vehicles) and greater disruption in the narrow West Park Road, St. Martin Close, Frazer Walk, Covert Mead area particularly with local servicing/delivery factions; school trips and general daily usage etc;
- Further the Horsham Road and the already severely congested High Street with its struggling businesses will be impacted due to unnecessarily increased traffic congestion and significant lack of public parking.
- Additionally the major addition of local traffic to the residential area will significantly increase negative air pollution to existing residents.
- It will further create an increased Police and Emergency Response area already suffering from depleted resources, thus potentially making this area much less socially manageable.
- It is at the furthest part of Handcross village – away from the school, the doctor’s surgery and other amenities. A long distance to walk, especially with young children and which involves crossing the hazardous Horsham Road with no safe crossing points.
- Finally for want of furthering community benefits in a positive manner, the farmland depicted for building should also be re-utilised agriculturally; or become donated access for the community for part utilisation as local pet walking area for existing residents (as has been historically) and/or allotments.

I would also like to thank all those involved in preparing the Plan – which has taken a large amount of time, money and voluntary resource to construct.

Ref#	Cmt#	Respondent	Organisation	Behalf Of	Policy	Page	Para	Map	Type
16494	1	Mr and Mrs D and H Barnes				11/12			Object

Comments

We are writing to object to the SNDP (January 19) and in particular with reference to Policies 11 and 12 and the proposed 65 additional homes in the St Martin Close area.

Our reasons for objection to this SNDP are:-

1. Mid-Sussex District Council has stated clearly that there is no requirement for further housing development in Slaugham Parish. However, Slaugham Parish Council has decided, without further consultation with residents to press ahead and boost housing numbers (the 65 new homes in the St Martin Close area (Policy 11 and Policy 12)).
2. These proposals have been modified since the original Neighbourhood Plan was rejected in January 2014. The Examiner queried: the Strategic Environmental Assessment, the rationale for the number of housing units and the consultation process. We would like to be assured that these have been fully addressed.
3. The proposed developments in Policies 11 and 12 would effectively double the housing stock of the West Park Road and St Martin Close area.
4. This would cause significant additional traffic in the West Park, St Martin Close, Frazer Walk, Covert Mead, the Horsham Road and the already severely congested High Street.
5. The Handcross amenities eg Doctors Surgery, Schools and shops are already under extreme stress even before the already approved Pease Pottage and Hyde housing stock are fully up and running.
Where is the infrastructure to support all this?

22024	1	Ms S Barter							Object
-------	---	-------------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--------

Comments

I am writing to express my opposition to the proposed development of 65 houses at St Martin Close and its inclusion in the neighbourhood plan. As you know, Handcross village and the parish as a whole have seen an extremely large number of new homes. These are already impacting on traffic flows and local services before half of them are even finished. Adding further homes to this will worsen traffic flows along the High Street and other neighbouring streets, increase pressure on the village school and surgery, and worsen the situation in which the roads, infrastructure and community facilities no longer match the number of homes.

The neighbourhood plan discussions about the use of the St Martin site began before a lot of this development was known about. We have witnessed not just the large developments on the Hyde land and at Pease Pottage, but also the smaller "infill" developments in the High Street, London Road (sliproad), the Fountain pub, the corner plot opposite the rec, and so on.

In effect, this proposal to build even more homes at St Martin Close has been overtaken by events and by other projects. It is now completely inappropriate to add further homes to the mix in a small village, especially with such limited transport links.

Ref#	Cmt#	Respondent	Organisation	Behalf Of	Policy	Page	Para	Map	Type
16495	1	Mr and Mrs S and G Bedingham				11/12			Object

Comments

A great many houses have already been built in Handcross. A further 600 houses are planned to be built in Pease Pottage. We feel that any further housing in St Martins Close would put too much strain on Handcross Village, the roads, the Doctor's Surgery and Handcross Primary School. We desperately need a new car park in Handcross to ease the congestion - not more housing.

22008	1	Ms Alison Coles							Object
-------	---	-----------------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--------

Comments

Please can you advise how the massive increase in traffic generated from 600 new homes will be accommodated. The Pease Pottage roundabout cannot currently cope at the moment during rush hour, with horrendous queuing to get onto the A23/M23. What will happen with an increase of well over 600 vehicles? I hope the solution is not to further concrete over this once idyllic rural area.

22020	1	Mrs R Cooper				11/12			Object
-------	---	--------------	--	--	--	-------	--	--	--------

Comments

I wish to object to the Slaugham Neighbourhood Development Plan in its current form due to the inclusion of the land in St Martin Close for housing development.

Mid Sussex District Council (MSDC) has stated that, following their review of the draft Neighbourhood Plan, the development of land in St Marins Close is not required because of the burden the Parish has already taken for net new homes due, inter alia, to the development of 600 housing units at Pease Pottage. This number of units, MSDC advise, is much greater, by percentage growth, than any other Parish in Mid Sussex. As a result MSDC does not consider that Slaugham Parish Council is required to include any additional housing units other than those for which planning consent has been granted, which total 235-255.

The Parish Council's insistence, despite local opposition and MSDC's views, to include the St Martin Close land is therefore not justified.

If the St Martin Close land was removed from the Plan I would withdraw my objection.

Ref#	Cmt#	Respondent	Organisation	Behalf Of	Policy	Page	Para	Map	Type
16461	1	Mr S Cooper				11/12			Object
Comments									
I wish to object to the Slaugham Neighbourhood Development Plan in its current form due to the inclusion of the land in St Martin Close for housing development.									
Mid Sussex District Council (MSDC) has stated that, following their review of the draft Neighbourhood Plan, the development of land in St Martins Close is not required because of the burden the Parish has already taken for net new homes due, inter alia, to the development of 600 housing units at Pease Pottage. This number of units, MSDC advise, is much greater, by percentage growth, than any other Parish in Mid Sussex. As a result MSDC does not consider that Slaugham Parish Council is required to include any additional housing units other than those for which planning consent has been granted, which total 235-255.									
The Parish Council's insistence, despite local opposition and MSDC's views, to include the St Martin Close land is therefore not justified.									
If the St Martin Close land was removed from the Plan I would withdraw my objection.									

22019	1	Mr M Gurney							Object
Comments									
Any proposal of building more housing in this village and especially in St Martin Close area is deeply misguided and actively harmful towards this community. Every service and part of local infrastructure is already overwhelmed from traffic, to goods, to schools. We are a traditional tiny English village being used to dump the overflow of modern urban society and it is ruining our way of life. Our pavements are covered in parked cars, our roads are already a death trap for local children, our single local grocery shop is always out of supplies, our children wait an extra year for a school place taken by some commuters child. Theft and incidents are increasing, community cohesion is breaking down and damage to the environment is rampant as people befoul the locale in ever-increasing numbers. Already another several hundred houses have been built, there is zero provision made to cope with the increase in cars and people, building any more homes here would be deeply irresponsible and building the provision itself would constitute even more unwanted green land destroyed. There are foxes and badgers on the site picked for construction, it is also a nature site for many small species of bird and insect, I believe these creatures existence has been concealed and ignored "as much as the human residents" by those keen to profit from this building project.									

22027	1	Ms S Hance							Support
Comments									
I welcome the plan as being a positive plan for the future of the Parish.									

Ref#	Cmt#	Respondent	Organisation	Behalf Of	Policy	Page	Para	Map	Type
22027	2	Ms S Hance			3	12	4.12		Neutral

Comments

In Policy 3, para 4.12 (page 12) dealing with built-up boundaries, there is no mention of the smallest and most rural village, Slaugham. In the MidSussex District Council's Local Plan (which preceded the District Plan) para 38.2 explains why there is no built-up boundary for Slaugham: "Due to the size of this settlement, the Council does not wish to encourage any further development in or around Slaugham. A positive decision has been made not to draw a built-up area boundary around the settlement. This means that the Countryside Area of Development Restraint policies will be applied within, as well as around, the village."

However, the Neighbourhood Plan makes no such reference or provision, meaning that the lack of a built-up boundary could be taken as a green light for development outside the immediate village area. Indeed, in a current Appeal against a refusal of planning permission by MSDC for a development of three houses at Slaugham Garden Nursery, well outside the village (AP/18/0088) the lack of a built-up boundary to the village is cited by the appellant in support of the appeal.

If the Neighbourhood Plan is to provide adequate protection for Slaugham against inappropriate development, wording such as is used by MSDC in their Local Plan to explain the lack of a built-up area boundary would seem essential, and I would ask that it is added in to the Plan.

22027	3	Ms S Hance			5	13	4.17		Neutral
-------	---	------------	--	--	---	----	------	--	---------

Comments

A very minor point, but in Paragraph 4.17 Policy 5 page 13, there is reference to "Mill Pond and Furnace" which makes no sense, it should read Mill Pond and Furnace Pond (the two ponds are geographically separate and there is no furnace).

21999	1	Mr J Haworth							Neutral
-------	---	--------------	--	--	--	--	--	--	---------

Comments

I have read the proposed neighbourhood plan and note acknowledgement of the need for traffic calming measures in some key areas of the parish but not that on the section of Brighton road in handcross - locally referred to as the 'launchpad' - which leads to the A23 southbound.

Excessive speeds on this stretch of road are a daily occurrence. I would urge you please to address this issue in consultation with traffic management teams. The simple introduction of a visible speed camera half way down the road would help enormously while not interfering with the free flow of traffic. At the moment there is nothing, not even a speed limit sign to remind drivers that it is a residential area until they join the motorway.

Ref#	Cmt#	Respondent	Organisation	Behalf Of	Policy	Page	Para	Map	Type
22002	1	Mr and Mrs T F Jones				11/12			Object
Comments									
<p>We would like to register our objection to the building proposal (policy 11 and policy 12 in the plan).</p> <p>We have listed below the major reasons why this current and any future proposal should not go ahead and why we would actively seek compensation if it does.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. West Park Road already has a parking issue. Grass verges are frequently used and the bend in the road where parking occurs is also potentially dangerous. 2. It has been suggested that the planned 35 houses would generate a low number of additional vehicles however even with this reduced number of properties we would still realistically be looking at 60-70 cars as there is no real public transport in Handcross making a car essential. 3. A number of properties in the road have active covenants that do not permit parking on driveways and therefore they have to park in the road. 4. West Park Road is not suitable for increased traffic and the more sensible access to any proposed development should be directly on to Coo's lane. 5. The village is NOT REQUIRED to provide any additional housing at this time so one has to question the motives of the parish council in attempting to do so. Who is going to benefit? Are houses being sited in an attempt to prevent others being sited in another area of the parish? 6. There is already insufficient places at Handcross school, our own daughter had to travel to Balcombe primary. The 586 school bus to Warden Park is already over subscribed and younger cohorts (11yrs) should not be expected to travel on public transport. The plan makes no provision for the greater demand on either and with school budgets being reduced year on year one would assume this will not change anytime soon. 7. Handcross Doctors surgery struggles now to offer appointments and the waiting time would only become longer. 8. Loss of current environment and countryside. Hyde estate now, year on year is closing off access to many areas marking as private. 9. Potential for issues with additional older children having nothing to do especially with no regular transport to access entertainment. 10. Potential loss of value to property due to compounding of already existing major parking issues especially if yellow lines are proposed. Increased traffic onto an unsuitable road that would definitely no longer be child or animal friendly. <p>We do not consider ourselves against ethical and well planned expansion when necessary. This proposal is not necessary and is therefore being pursued for other motivations as mentioned and these need to be clearly understood by all. A parish council should be acting in its residents best interest and proposing this building plan when quota's have already been met is clearly not what is happening.</p>									

Ref#	Cmt#	Respondent	Organisation	Behalf Of	Policy	Page	Para	Map	Type
22009	1	Mr J Large				11/12			Object

Comments

I would like to register my objection to Policy 11 and Policy 12 of the Slaugham Neighbourhood plan as well as to the Slaugham Neighbourhood Plan Consultation Statement document.

Firstly, policies 11&12 of the Slaugham neighbourhood Plan directly contradict the Mid Sussex District Plan Page36 (Note6) which states that “zero” Houses are required for the duration of the plan period due to the strategic Housing allocation of 619 houses at Pease Pottage.

Secondly, there has been NO public consultation or engagement or housing need assessment or exhibition or opportunity to express an opinion about new developments in the Parish undertaken by Slaugham Parish Council “SINCE” the strategic housing allocation at Pease Pottage of 619 houses and the Hyde Estate development. 1985 housing units will be an increase of 75% of the housing stock of this rural Parish. All the PC’s assessments of housing need are out of date, sometimes 3-5 years out of date.

Furthermore, the “consultation statement” is misleading and is not a true reflection of the Parish Councils engagement, regarding the exhibitions held by the Parish Council.

There was in fact a traffic light system used to guide attendees towards the Parish Councils own choice of site which is on land they own, it was the only site promoted vigorously by the Councillors, particularly those councillors who would be affected by development elsewhere. There was “NO” indication that “data” collected would later be used to try and further the PC’s desire to build on their own land, or that any comments received would be considered as evidence of “need”. There was no INDEPENDENT collection of attendee’s comments and no publication of results in any widespread clear and open manner.

Moreover, the consultation statement tries to give the impression that the Parish Council engaged with Handcross Action Group (HAG), a group of concerned local residents. From meetings I attended the comments of local residents at all stages has been ignored. HAG raised more awareness to the local residents via their flyers than any of the Parish Councils publications because they pointed out things relevant to residents in terms of their way of life, such as traffic, school places, danger to children, change to a rural way of life to name a few. There is a historic element to prove this fact as representations made to the previous Examiner Anne Skippers by HAG representatives and parishoners directly led to the first Slaugham Parish NHP being rejected by the examiner because of the lack of consultation amongst the other failings by the Parish Council. There has been “FIVE YEARS” of HAG and local residents being supportive of a Neighbourhood plan, but NOT of any development on land at St Martin’s Close (East & West) but at every stage their views have been ignored and there is the feeling of a lack of democracy happening.

Finally, since the engagement of the consultants by the Parish Council my impression is that their brief seems to have been to do whatever is necessary to exclude any other potential non-windfall development site within the Parish from the NHP at any cost to only leave the St Martins Close (East & West) as a site to be developed. The consultant’s methodology for justifying this site above any other is questionable and their methodology for determining housing need is out of date given the 619 Pease Pottage development which will cater for the housing need many times over. The proposed development of St Martins Close (West) is very odd. This is land owned by a private developer. Why has this site been included?

Ref#	Cmt#	Respondent	Organisation	Behalf Of	Policy	Page	Para	Map	Type
22034	1	Mrs T Large				11/12			Object
Comments									
<p>The proposed site in this policy is on the edge of Handcross and is not near a bus stop, schools or local facilities. To live on the edge of the village happily, each household would need a car, if there are a number of adults in each household then no doubt more than one car would be required. West Park Road is a narrow road and cannot sustain any more road traffic, it would become dangerous as two cars cannot pass each other without one car giving way. Emergency services would struggle to pass.</p> <p>At the exhibition the proposed sites were each given a traffic light but the only site that was given a green traffic light by the Parish Council was the St Martins Close - land that they own, therefore this gave the impression that no other site was considerable suitable by them and there was no point in voting for any other site. This wasn't a choice but a direction. The St Martins Close site should have been given a red traffic light as other sites within the Parish have more going for them, the St Martin's site for example is in an area of outstanding natural beauty and not near amenities there are no school places and it's far away from the Doctors surgery.</p> <p>Now over 600 homes will be built at Pease Pottage the area does not need any more housing and this has not been taken into account when producing this document and no consultation has taken place since the Hyde and Pease Pottage was approved.</p> <p>The land attached to the St Martins site is owned by a private owner and he would gain from developing Policy 11 as he would then be able to sell his land for further development. Why has a private land owner been able to be included in the document?</p>									
16497	1	Mr J Larkins							Object
Comments									
<p>We have always greatly valued the rural nature of our Parish here but feel it is much diminished because of the overall increase in housing already here in the Slaugham Parish area. Furthermore, the proposed overall increase in housing units in Slaugham Parish from 1130 to 1985, an increase of 75%, will fundamentally change the rural quality and nature of this Parish.</p>									
16497	2	Mr J Larkins				11/12			Object
Comments									
<p>Mid Sussex District Council has stated that as a result of the 600 units at Pease Pottage, Slaugham Parish Council is not required to include any additional housing units other than those for which planning consent has been granted, which total 235-255 units. In other words, additional building at St Martin Close is not a requirement within the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>									
16497	3	Mr J Larkins							Object
Comments									
<p>The Horsham Road (B21110) outside our house onto the A23 North to London/Gatwick, and South to Brighton, and Handcross/Balcombe is in my view dangerously unsafe with the traffic volume increase in the last few years, including the massive trucks which should not be on it. The road is narrow and the footpath observably unsafe for pedestrians, a feature which would seem difficult to improve.</p>									

Ref#	Cmt#	Respondent	Organisation	Behalf Of	Policy	Page	Para	Map	Type
22004	1	Ms J Lowe							Object
Comments									
<p>I and many other residents of the Parish previously submitted our objections to Slaugham Parish Council January 19th 2018. Please see annexe (1) In that document, we stated that we had no objections to the proposed overall plan, but had deep concerns about the proposal to develop the land in the vicinity of St Martin close. Since we submitted our objections we have tried to engage with the SPC Planning Committee with a view reaching a compromise position as we are aware that a rejection of this development at the examination stage could jeopardise the entire plan and this is something which we are not seeking.</p> <p>It is regret that I have to record, contrary to the spirit of the November 2017 consultation request, that the Planning Committee has made no effort to reach any form of compromise or even to engage with residents on this matter. They have ignored all contact and have proceeded with their own proposal ignoring all local concerns. Furthermore, whilst ignoring local concerns they have failed to give any reasonable justification for their actions. This is further compounded by the fact that Mid Sussex County Council in their own review of the draft Neighbourhood Plan concluded that the development of land around St Marin Close was not required.</p>									

22004	2	Ms J Lowe				11/12			Object
Comments									
Annexe 1									
<p>We should like to make it clear that we fully support the need for a SNHP and all the proposals set out in the “2014-2031 Pre-Submission Plan” with the exception of the inclusion of 65 housing units (Policy11 and 12) in St Martins Close to which we strongly object. These units are totally unnecessary for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Paragraph 6.12 of the SNHP states “The supply of completions and commitments indicates this housing need will be met without further allocations in the Neighbourhood Plan”, i.e. these are the housing units for which planning consent has been granted and housing units completed since the inception of the Plan. These total 235-255, depending on which Hyde Estate plan is implemented. 2. SNHP’s consultants, at the meeting, confirmed that as the Parish has had to accept the development of 600 housing units at Pease Pottage, MSDC would not be seeking any additional units within the SNHP. 3. The inclusion of the St Martins Close units would cause severe infrastructure problems to the surrounding area which have not been addressed in the document. 									

22003	1	Mr R Lowe							Object
Comments									
<p>I and many other residents of the Parish previously submitted our objections to Slaugham Parish Council January 19th 2018. Please see annexe (1) In that document, we stated that we had no objections to the proposed overall plan, but had deep concerns about the proposal to develop the land in the vicinity of St Martin close. Since we submitted our objections we have tried to engage with the SPC Planning Committee with a view reaching a compromise position as we are aware that a rejection of this development at the examination stage could jeopardise the entire plan and this is something which we are not seeking.</p> <p>It is regret that I have to record, contrary to the spirit of the November 2017 consultation request, that the Planning Committee has made no effort to reach any form of compromise or even to engage with residents on this matter. They have ignored all contact and have proceeded with their own proposal ignoring all local concerns. Furthermore, whilst ignoring local concerns they have failed to give any reasonable justification for their actions. This is further compounded by the fact that Mid Sussex District Council in their own review of the draft Neighbourhood Plan concluded that the development of land around St Martin Close was not required.</p>									

Ref#	Cmt#	Respondent	Organisation	Behalf Of	Policy	Page	Para	Map	Type
22003	2	Mr R Lowe				11/12			Object

Comments

Annexe 1

We should like to make it clear that we fully support the need for a SNHP and all the proposals set out in the “2014-2031 Pre-Submission Plan” with the exception of the inclusion of 65 housing units (Policy11 and 12) in St Martins Close to which we strongly object. These units are totally unnecessary for the following reasons:

1. Paragraph 6.12 of the SNHP states “The supply of completions and commitments indicates this housing need will be met without further allocations in the Neighbourhood Plan”, i.e. these are the housing units for which planning consent has been granted and housing units completed since the inception of the Plan. These total 235-255, depending on which Hyde Estate plan is implemented.
2. SNHP’s consultants, at the meeting, confirmed that as the Parish has had to accept the development of 600 housing units at Pease Pottage, MSDC would not be seeking any additional units within the SNHP.
3. The inclusion of the St Martins Close units would cause severe infrastructure problems to the surrounding area which have not been addressed in the document

22032	1	Mr G Main							Neutral
-------	---	-----------	--	--	--	--	--	--	---------

Comments

Item 6 on p9 speaks rightly about access to high quality primary and secondary education being important.

However 5.4 on p16 only refers to primary. Surely this should be extended to the secondary half of the parish population as well?

22017	1	Ms V May							Object
-------	---	----------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--------

Comments

I and many other residents of the Parish previously submitted our objections to Slaugham Parish Council January 19th 2018. Please see annexe (1)
 In that document, we stated that we had no objections to the proposed overall plan, but had deep concerns about the proposal to develop the land in the vicinity of St Martin close. Since we submitted our objections we have tried to engage with the SPC Planning Committee with a view reaching a compromise position as we are aware that a rejection of this development at the examination stage could jeopardise the entire plan and this is something which we are not seeking. It is regret that I have to record, contrary to the spirit of the November 2017 consultation request, that the Planning Committee has made no effort to reach any form of compromise or even to engage with residents on this matter. They have ignored all contact and have proceeded with their own proposal ignoring all local concerns. Furthermore, whilst ignoring local concerns they have failed to give any reasonable justification for their actions. This is further compounded by the fact that Mid Sussex District Council in their own review of the draft Neighbourhood Plan concluded that the development of land around St Martin Close was not required. The objections made in January 2018 stand.

Ref#	Cmt#	Respondent	Organisation	Behalf Of	Policy	Page	Para	Map	Type
22017	2	Ms V May			11/12				Object
Comments									
Annexe 1									
<p>We should like to make it clear that we fully support the need for a SNHP and all the proposals set out in the “2014-2031 Pre-Submission Plan” with the exception of the inclusion of 65 housing units (Policy11 and 12) in St Martins Close to which we strongly object. These units are totally unnecessary for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Paragraph 6.12 of the SNHP states “The supply of completions and commitments indicates this housing need will be met without further allocations in the Neighbourhood Plan”, i.e. these are the housing units for which planning consent has been granted and housing units completed since the inception of the Plan. These total 235-255, depending on which Hyde Estate plan is implemented. 2. SNHP’s consultants, at the meeting, confirmed that as the Parish has had to accept the development of 600 housing units at Pease Pottage, MSDC would not be seeking any additional units within the SNHP. 3. The inclusion of the St Martins Close units would cause severe infrastructure problems to the surrounding area which have not been addressed in the document 									
22018	1	Mr CA Merritt			11/12				Object
Comments									
The Housing proposed for St Martins Close East and West does not include additional vehicle access to the site from Coos Lane despite it eventually being adjacent to Coos Lane. This will put additional vehicle movement pressure on the existing road in Covert Mead accessing the Horsham Road and the existing road accessing into Coos Lane.									
22018	2	Mr CA Merritt					6.25		Object
Comments									
The comment in Paragraph 6.25 that no access is required into Coos Lane from the proposed St Martins Close East or West housing ignores the fact that there is already the existing access into Coos Lane from Covert Mead ! .									
22018	3	Mr CA Merritt							Object
Comments									
Currently in Covert Mead and West Park area there can be on average 2 or more cars per household putting a premium on parking space and narrowing the existing roads. This was made worse in 2008 to 2009 when the existing garages in Covert Mead were demolished and additional houses put in there space with minimal increased parking. The proposed increased housing will make vehicle access and egress more difficult.									
22018	4	Mr CA Merritt							Object
Comments									
The additional housing proposed will put an additonal load on the existing School and Doctors Surgery .									

Ref#	Cmt#	Respondent	Organisation	Behalf Of	Policy	Page	Para	Map	Type
22018	5	Mr CA Merritt							Object

Comments

The Mid Sussex District Council (MSDC) has as a result of the 600 houses proposed for Pease Pottage said Slaugham Parish Council is not required to include any additional houses other than those for which planning consent is given .

22015	1	Mr P Moore							Object
-------	---	------------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--------

Comments

Given the lack of improvements to community services, roads and parking in and around the villages of Pease Pottage and Handcross to cope with existing and pending housing developments in Pease Pottage and Handcross it is inappropriate to include any further housing developments in the Neighbourhood Plan until substantial improvements, not just aspirations, have been put in place for community services, roads and parking in these villages.

16490	1	Mr A Pickering				11/12			Object
-------	---	----------------	--	--	--	-------	--	--	--------

Comments

I am writing to object to the SNDP which has been submitted by Slaugham Parish Council with particular reference to Policies 11 and 12 (65 additional homes in St Martin Close area) as detailed below.

Specifically, I wish to raise new concerns, as follows:

- 1.The overall increase in Slaugham Parish in housing units is set to increase from 1130 to some 1985. This represents an increase of 75% and will fundamentally change the rural quality and nature of the Parish.
- 2.Permission for the 600+ new houses at Pease Pottage has been granted (work now started) and MSDC, in the District Plan, has stated clearly, that there is no requirement for further housing development in Slaugham Parish. However, Slaugham Parish Council has decided, without further consultation with residents, to press ahead and boost housing numbers. More specifically, I refer to the 65 new homes in the St Martin Close area (Policy 11 and Policy 12).
- 3.There has been and still is a lack of transparency for residents as regards the housing development selection process. It is not clear how and why Policy 11 and Policy 12 are linked and what has changed since the first plan was submitted in 2013. I understand that Policy 11 land is owned by the Council and Policy 12 land is owned by a private landowner.
- 4.The Policy 11 and 12 proposals have been modified since the original Neighbourhood Plan was rejected in January 2014 where the Examiner queried; the Strategic Environmental Assessment, the rationale for the number of housing units and the consultation process. I would like to be reassured that these have been fully addressed.

Ref#	Cmt#	Respondent	Organisation	Behalf Of	Policy	Page	Para	Map	Type
22006	1	Ms K Pickering				11/12			Object
Comments									
<p>I am writing to object to the SNDP which has been submitted by Slaugham Parish Council with particular reference to Policies 11 and 12 (65 additional homes in St Martin Close area) as detailed below.</p> <p>Specifically, I wish to raise new concerns, as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.The overall increase in Slaugham Parish in housing units is set to increase from 1130 to some 1985. This represents an increase of 75% and will fundamentally change the rural quality and nature of the Parish. 2.Permission for the 600+ new houses at Pease Pottage has been granted (see photo attached, work now started) and MSDC, in the District Plan, has stated clearly, that there is no requirement for further housing development in Slaugham Parish. However, Slaugham Parish Council has decided, without further consultation with residents, to press ahead and boost housing numbers. More specifically, I refer to the 65 new homes in the St Martin Close area (Policy 11 and Policy 12). 3.There has been and still is a lack of transparency for residents as regards the housing development selection process. It is not clear how and why Policy 11 and Policy 12 are linked and what has changed since the first plan was submitted in 2013. I understand that Policy 11 land is owned by the Council and Policy 12 land is owned by a private landowner. 4.The Policy 11 and 12 proposals have been modified since the original Neighbourhood Plan was rejected in January 2014 where the Examiner queried; the Strategic Environmental Assessment, the rationale for the number of housing units and the consultation process. I would like to be reassured that these have been fully addressed. 									
16496	1	Mr G Reid							Object
Comments									
<p>I was dismayed to find that still more house-building is being proposed by Slaugham parish Council in St. Martin's Close in Handcross.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1)As the parish's quota of new housebuilding has already been FAR exceeded, I fail to understand why this development has even been thought of. 2)20 years ago I chose to live in this village within the High Weald special conservation area, - not in what is fast becoming a suburb of Crawley. 3)As our greatly expanded village is currently hobbling along with a rickety village hall, congested and potted roads and services bursting at the seams (like the village school, traffic density, and the doctor's surgery), I wish to register my strong disapproval of the Parish Council's proposed plans to build yet more houses on this greenfield site. 									
22022	1	Mrs A Sadler				11/12			Object
Comments									
<p>I am writing to share my concerns over the proposed building of additional housing at St Martins Close, Handcross. The building of 65 housing units will increase the traffic on the surrounding roads significantly creating many safety issues and putting the welfare of existing residents at risk.</p> <p>I fail to understand the need for this development when no additional housing is required in the Parish councils Neighbourhood plan other than those already granted with planning consent. This venture is highly unnecessary with the already 255 housing units being constructed in the village and 600 units at Pease pottage.</p> <p>Please consider the safety of residents and the future shape of the village of Handcross.</p>									

Ref#	Cmt#	Respondent	Organisation	Behalf Of	Policy	Page	Para	Map	Type
16491	1	Mr C Sadler				11/12			Object

Comments

I write to you to voice my concerns over the proposed building of additional housing units at St Martins Close, Handcross.

I am highly concerned that the building of 65 housing units in the immediate area will significantly increase the traffic on access roads into the location and create obvious safety risks to residents of the area currently residing and new alike.

I further fail to understand the need for this development as the NHP plan has already reached its goal of 235-255 homes in the Parish and this would be in addition to this and totally unnecessary. Add to this the fact that Pease Pottage is in close proximity and is the sight of a 600 home development, I cannot see the need for further development at the St Martins site.

Therefore I strongly object to this proposal and urge local planning and councillors to think about the impact and pressure that this will add to an already busy village hub in the centre of some of our most beautiful countryside.

22013	1	Mr P Seamer				11/12			Object
-------	---	-------------	--	--	--	-------	--	--	--------

Comments

I and many other residents of the Parish previously submitted our objections to Slaugham Parish Council January 19th 2018.

In that document, we stated that we had no objections to the proposed overall plan, but had deep concerns about the proposal to develop the land in the vicinity of St Martin Close. Since we submitted our objections we have tried to engage with the SPC Planning Committee with a view reaching a compromise position as we are aware that a rejection of this development at the examination stage could jeopardise the entire plan and this is something which we are not seeking.

It is with regret that I have to record, contrary to the spirit of the November 2017 consultation request, that the Planning Committee has made no effort to reach any form of compromise or even to engage with residents on this matter. They have ignored all contact and have proceeded with their own proposal ignoring all local concerns. Furthermore, whilst ignoring local concerns they have failed to give any reasonable justification for their actions. This is further compounded by the fact that Mid Sussex District Council in their own review of the draft Neighbourhood Plan concluded that the development of land around St Marin Close was not required. The objections I made in January 2018 stand.

Ref#	Cmt#	Respondent	Organisation	Behalf Of	Policy	Page	Para	Map	Type
16483	1	Mr L Shanks				36/3			Object
						7			

Comments

As has been stated within this plan due to additional 600 housing units at Pease Pottage, Slaugham Parish council is not required to include any additional housing units. Why is Slaugham Parish Council still trying to push through the building of unwelcome and unneeded housing in St Martins Close, Handcross. The Parish Council is clearly not listening to the residents, who, including myself have objected to the building in the area. I would like to stress yet again this is village and should not be extended further.

Immediate neighbours are also unhappy about the proposals being pushed by the Parish Council but have been unable to represent themselves due to issues with technology/age.

22001	1	Mr C Smith							Object
-------	---	------------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--------

Comments

I and many other residents of the Parish previously submitted our objections to Slaugham Parish Council January 19th 2018. Please see annexe (1)

In that document, we stated that we had no objections to the proposed overall plan, but had deep concerns about the proposal to develop the land in the vicinity of St Martin close. Since we submitted our objections we have tried to engage with the SPC Planning Committee with a view reaching a compromise position as we are aware that a rejection of this development at the examination stage could jeopardise the entire plan and this is something which we are not seeking.

It is regret that I have to record, contrary to the spirit of the November 2017 consultation request, that the Planning Committee has made no effort to reach any form of compromise or even to engage with residents on this matter. They have ignored all contact and have proceeded with their own proposal ignoring all local concerns. Furthermore, whilst ignoring local concerns they have failed to give any reasonable justification for their actions. This is further compounded by the fact that Mid Sussex District Council in their own review of the draft Neighbourhood Plan concluded that the development of land around St Martin Close was not required.

Ref#	Cmt#	Respondent	Organisation	Behalf Of	Policy	Page	Para	Map	Type
22001	2	Mr C Smith				11/12			Object

Comments

Annexe 1

We should like to make it clear that we fully support the need for a SNHP and all the proposals set out in the “2014-2031 Pre-Submission Plan” with the exception of the inclusion of 65 housing units (Policy11 and 12) in St Martins Close to which we strongly object. These units are totally unnecessary for the following reasons:

1. Paragraph 6.12 of the SNHP states “The supply of completions and commitments indicates this housing need will be met without further allocations in the Neighbourhood Plan”, i.e. these are the housing units for which planning consent has been granted and housing units completed since the inception of the Plan. These total 235-255, depending on which Hyde Estate plan is implemented.
2. SNHP’s consultants, at the meeting, confirmed that as the Parish has had to accept the development of 600 housing units at Pease Pottage, MSDC would not be seeking any additional units within the SNHP.
3. The inclusion of the St Martins Close units would cause severe infrastructure problems to the surrounding area which have not been addressed in the document.

Despite the consultants statement (item 2 above), HAG do not object to the provision of 235-255 units even though they, together with the Pease Pottage development, will increase the number of housing units in the Parish from 1130 to 1985, an increase of 75% which will fundamentally change the rural quality and nature of the Parish.

In the light of the above and significant local objections to the proposal we urge you to remove the St Martins Close proposals from the Plan. If these proposals remain they will be strongly contested at the examination. Importantly, if these remain and are subsequently approved by the examiner there is a significant risk, given the local concern, that the Plan will be turned down at a referendum, a result that HAG does not want and which will have resulted in significant abortive costs in terms of consultants fees and several years of effort by the SNHP Committee.

22021	1	Ms R Smith							Object
-------	---	------------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--------

Comments

I and many other residents of the Parish previously submitted our objections to Slaugham Parish Council January 19th 2018. Please see annexe (1) In that document, we stated that we had no objections to the proposed overall plan, but had deep concerns about the proposal to develop the land in the vicinity of St Martin Close. Since we submitted our objections we have tried to engage with the SPC Planning Committee with a view reaching a compromise position as we are aware that a rejection of this development at the examination stage could jeopardise the entire plan and this is something which we are not seeking. It is with regret that I have to record, contrary to the spirit of the November 2017 consultation request, that the Planning Committee has made no effort to reach any form of compromise or even to engage with residents on this matter. They have ignored all contact and have proceeded with their own proposal ignoring all local concerns. Furthermore, whilst ignoring local concerns they have failed to give any reasonable justification for their actions. This is further compounded by the fact that Mid Sussex District Council in their own review of the draft Neighbourhood Plan concluded that the development of land around St Martin Close was not required. The objections I made in January 2018 stand.

Ref#	Cmt#	Respondent	Organisation	Behalf Of	Policy	Page	Para	Map	Type
22021	2	Ms R Smith				11/12			Object

Comments

Annexe 1

We should like to make it clear that we fully support the need for a SNHP and all the proposals set out in the “2014-2031 Pre-Submission Plan” with the exception of the inclusion of 65 housing units (Policy11 and 12) in St Martins Close to which we strongly object. These units are totally unnecessary for the following reasons:

1. Paragraph 6.12 of the SNHP states “The supply of completions and commitments indicates this housing need will be met without further allocations in the Neighbourhood Plan”, i.e. these are the housing units for which planning consent has been granted and housing units completed since the inception of the Plan. These total 235-255, depending on which Hyde Estate plan is implemented.
2. SNHP’s consultants, at the meeting, confirmed that as the Parish has had to accept the development of 600 housing units at Pease Pottage, MSDC would not be seeking any additional units within the SNHP.
3. The inclusion of the St Martins Close units would cause severe infrastructure problems to the surrounding area which have not been addressed in the document.

Despite the consultants statement (item 2 above), Handcross Action Group do not object to the provision of 235-255 units even though they, together with the Pease Pottage development, will increase the number of housing units in the Parish from 1130 to 1985, an increase of 75% which will fundamentally change the rural quality and nature of the Parish.

16493	1	Mrs L Sugrue							Object
-------	---	--------------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--------

Comments

I am writing to advise my objection to the planned development in St Martin Close and adjacent plot. Slaugham Parish has had a huge increase in new housing over the last few years. I understand that Slaugham parish has fulfilled its new housing requirements and feel that any further unnecessary building, especially on greenfield site, will be of detriment to the area by overloading our already busy and inadequate roads, and changing the quality of our Parish.

22007	1	Mr M Sugrue				11/12			Object
-------	---	-------------	--	--	--	-------	--	--	--------

Comments

I would like to raise an objection. The overall plan I am in general support of, but the PC’s insistence of additional housing on the only plot of land they own (St Martin close), is short term and unnecessary, other than gaining revenues to the PC. With the enormous growth of housing already in the parish, these additional houses are not justified, in fact your own Mid Sussex District Council review of the draft Neighborhood Plan concluded that the development of land around St Martin Close was not required because of the burden the Parish has already taken for net new homes, much greater by percentage growth of any other Parish in Mid Sussex!

I have raised my objections with the PC directly, but they seem insistent on building on St Martin’s, if only for the revenue in may bring them.

Ref#	Cmt#	Respondent	Organisation	Behalf Of	Policy	Page	Para	Map	Type
22031	1	Ms P Sugrue				11/12			Object
Comments									
I would like to register my objection to the proposed housing development at St Martins Close/Coos Lane, Slaugham.									
I am very concerned about the threat to our wildlife by building yet more houses on our green fields. I understand that Slaugham Parish has fulfilled it's new housing quota, so any need for further developments seem unnecessary and detrimental to the village.									

22000	1	Ms H Richardson	Batcheller Monkhouse	The Trustees of Ashfold Estate		13			Support
Comments									
My clients own a parcel of land at Coos Lane and believe their land is suitable for allocation for residential development within the Slaugham Neighbourhood Plan.									
We are supportive of the policies identified in the Neighbourhood Plan but believe that the land at Coos Lane should also be allocated for development of up to 12 units to ensure short term housing delivery within a sustainable location.									
We are particularly supportive of Policy 13: Residential Development within and adjoining Settlement Boundaries.									
It is considered that my clients' land meets the requirements of Policy 13 and therefore development of up to 9 units on the site is likely to be acceptable. The land at Coos Lane has been found suitable for development in the former SHLAA, is both deliverable and developable in accordance with NPPF requirements, and offers a realistic prospect of providing housing within the short term. Access and landscaping can be sufficiently mitigated and the full development could be delivered within 1-5 years, unlike the other developments identified in the Neighbourhood Plan. It is therefore considered that the site should be allocated for housing within the Neighbourhood Plan.									

Ref#	Cmt#	Respondent	Organisation	Behalf Of	Policy	Page	Para	Map	Type
22000	2	Ms H Richardson	Batcheller Monkhouse	The Trustees of Ashfold Estate	11/12				Neutral

Comments

My clients' site is contiguous with an existing built up area and therefore, assuming an appropriate scheme were put forward comprising 9 dwellings, it would comply with this policy and therefore be likely to be approved. We are of the view however that the site could easily accommodate 12 dwellings whilst still retaining adequate landscape buffers. Notwithstanding the threshold set out in the policy, we continue to promote the site for allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan and the Mid Sussex Site Allocations DPD.

The sustainability appraisal considered the development at Coos Lane to be largely neutral or positive when assessed against the criteria identified in the methodology. The assessment did however consider that the development would have a significant negative impact on the conservation of the rural character and a negative impact on the biodiversity of the site. This is considered to be a particularly harsh assessment against the criteria in light of the small scale nature of the proposal and the assessment text which concludes that the much of the landscape buffer would be retained and that there are no biodiversity designations covering the site.

The Land at St Martin Close is currently owned by Slaugham Parish Council. The site at Coos Lane is privately owned within single ownership by the Trust who have continuously promoted their land through the emerging Local Plan and Neighbourhood Plan. There are therefore no barriers to delivery in relation to the site ownership.

The land at Coos Lane is sited in a better location in terms of access to services and facilities than St Martin Close East and West and would therefore constitute a more sustainable location for development.

The St Martin Close development would also require archaeological and historical assessment prior to undertaking any development whereas the land at Coos Lane is not restricted by any known archaeological issues and would therefore be more suitable in this regard.

The site is currently extensively screened by established trees along its southern, eastern and western boundary and would therefore create no unacceptable visual intrusion or harm the setting of Handcross or the natural character of the AONB.

The Parish Council, in their assessment of the land at Coos Lane, state that the provision of adequate access and visibility splays may require the removal of mature trees and hedgerows, which they believe would be likely to have a harmful effect on the character of the site and its setting. This could however be mitigated with an appropriate arboricultural strategy. Regardless of whether the St Martin Close site comes forward, it is likely that as the Site Allocations Plan develops, there will be increased housing pressures on sustainable settlements such as Handcross. In addition, there are concerns regarding the time lag before many of the proposed sites are likely to come forward, meaning there is a risk of housing delivery shortfall in the interim.

Ref#	Cmt#	Respondent	Organisation	Behalf Of	Policy	Page	Para	Map	Type
20529	1	Ms L Da Silva	DMH Stallard	Millwood Designer Homes		12			Support

Comments

We understand that the Housing Need section of the Neighbourhood Plan notes that the Mid Sussex District Plan advises that due to the allocation and subsequent permission at Pease Pottage for 600 homes, the other settlements within Slaugham will not be required to identify further growth through the plan process, although they may wish to do so to boost supply. We note that the Parish have chosen to do this and resolved to make housing allocations within their plan with the provision for further, modest housing growth in the Parish over the plan period. We wholeheartedly agree with the approach taken by the Parish in this regard, and commend them for this.

In order to provide this further modest housing growth the Plan allocates two sites for residential development of up to 65 dwellings in total. These sites are land at St Martin Close (east) and land at St Martin Close (west). Broadly speaking we fully support the continued allocation of the St. Martin Close (west) site within the Neighbourhood Plan. However, we would like to draw the Examiner's attention to the following points, and the points made in our previous representations on the Neighbourhood Plan.

20529	2	Ms L Da Silva	DMH Stallard	Millwood Designer Homes		12			Neutral
-------	---	---------------	--------------	-------------------------	--	----	--	--	---------

Comments

The supporting text states that the allocation of St Martin Close (west) is as a reserve site with the intention that it be developed in the second part of the Plan period following the delivery of St. Martin Close (east), 'if required'. However, it should be noted that the existing permission for 600 dwellings in the Parish relates to a large-scale strategic site, and by its very nature it is likely to come forward and provide housing in the later stage of the plan period, and even beyond. As such, it is thought that it would be more helpful for housing to come forward in the earlier part of the Plan period in order to address the immediate need for housing in the Parish in the short and medium term.

It is important to note that our client's site is eminently suitable for residential development and is available now. Therefore, it is not considered necessary or appropriate to delay the potential development of the site until the adjoining site has been commenced or until the second half of the Plan period. Furthermore, the reference to 'if required' is considered to be unclear, especially given that the Neighbourhood Plan does not set out how it will be established if the site is required, and therefore we consider that this point is unnecessarily restrictive and confusing.

On this point, we consider that there are some inconsistencies with the policy and supporting text. The wording of policy 12 states that development on site will be supported following the commencement of St. Martin Close (east), but the supporting text at 6.24 is even more restrictive by stating that the site is to come forward in the second part of the Plan period following the delivery of the site to the east, and if required. For clarity, consistency and for the reasons set out above, it is considered that the reference to the site coming forward in the second part of the Plan period should be removed, and the reference to if required also be removed.

We have concerns that the wording of the policy means that the 'fate' of the St. Martin Close (west) site is effectively tied to St. Martin Close (east). This would mean that should the St. Martin Close (east) site not come forward for any reason it would effectively mean that development on the St. Martin Close (west) site could not come forward. With this in mind, we ask that consideration be given to amend the wording to allow flexibility with a mechanism which would allow for development on the site to come forward even if the neighbouring site does not.

Ref#	Cmt#	Respondent	Organisation	Behalf Of	Policy	Page	Para	Map	Type
22011	1	Ms A Rabone	Environment Agency						Support
Comments									
We are pleased to see that the proposed allocations have been directed to the areas at the lowest probability of flooding and that they are all located within Flood Zone 1.									
22011	2	Ms A Rabone	Environment Agency				8.5		Neutral
Comments									
We note that Section 8.5 is not quite complete as the final part of the paragraph reads “...and where possible encourage additional”									
22029	1	Mr J Farrelly	Genesis Town Planning	Wates Developments					Support
Comments									
The company has an interest in approximately 5 hectares (12.5 acres) of land to the west of Park Road, Handcross.									
Overall the Neighbourhood Plan is considered to be in general conformity with strategic policies of the Mid Sussex District Plan. Wates Developments supports the decision of the Parish Council to allocate new housing land within the Plan despite the existing amount of committed development within the Plan area.									
Wates also supports the provision of additional housing development at Handcross which is the most sustainable settlement in the Plan area.									
22029	2	Mr J Farrelly	Genesis Town Planning	Wates Developments					Object
Comments									
Following consideration of Appendix 2 – Housing Sites Options Appraisal of the SA there is doubt as to whether a thorough assessment of alternative housing sites has been carried out particularly with regard to the proximity of potential sites to the existing services/facilities at Handcross. Although the land was not promoted for development in previous ‘Call for Sites’ consultations it is available, developable and deliverable for the development described above. Given its ability to deliver sustainable development it should be considered for a potential mixed use development in the Neighbourhood Plan.									
My clients land West of Park Road, Handcross has locational advantages and provides a more viable and a more sustainable option for between 65 to 80 dwellings (including affordable), significant areas of public open space with enclosed defensible boundaries, play spaces as well as the potential for other community benefits in accordance with the Slaugham Neighbourhood Plan policy requirements.									
Wates Developments would consider the inclusion of this site to offer a more comprehensive development to meet local need in line with the requirement of the recently adopted District Plan as and when identified. Wates look forward to engaging locally and with the Neighbourhood Plan Group throughout the promotion of this site.									

Ref#	Cmt#	Respondent	Organisation	Behalf Of	Policy	Page	Para	Map	Type
22029	3	Mr J Farrelly	Genesis Town Planning	Wates Developments	13				Support

Comments

Whilst it is acknowledged Neighbourhood Plan Policy 13 is derived from Policy DP6: Settlement Hierarchy of the adopted Mid Sussex District Plan, Wates Developments questions the merits of limiting the amount of development on sites outside of the built up areas of Handcross, Pease Pottage and Warninglid to fewer than 10 dwellings. This approach rules out potential development of larger more comprehensive sites that would provide much needed affordable housing and other potential community facilities which would not otherwise be secured by developments of less than 10 dwellings.

22025	1	Mr J Fleming	Gladman Developments						Object
-------	---	--------------	----------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--------

Comments

As currently proposed, Gladman believe that a number of the SNP's policies require further modification/amendment, before they can be considered consistent with the Neighbourhood Plan Basic Conditions.

In principle, Gladman support many of the principles listed in the vision and objectives. However, Gladman consider that the vision does not go far enough to ensure housing needs are met in full over the duration of the plan period as it seeks to 'significantly reduce' local housing need which suggests that the amount of housing required will not be delivered in full. It is recommended that the Plan's vision is modified so that it seeks to meet housing needs in full and is consistent with Objective 8 which provides a more positive approach to development needs as it seeks 'To ensure a supply of homes consistent with identified local housing need...'

22025	2	Mr J Fleming	Gladman Developments		2				Object
-------	---	--------------	----------------------	--	---	--	--	--	--------

Comments

It does not appear that this policy is supported by evidence and the policy itself seeks to protect areas of countryside outside the AONB and is more akin to previous national planning policy which sought to protect the countryside for its own sake. In this regard, for areas considered to be valued, means that a view would need to have some form of physical attribute that will allow a decision maker to come to the view as to whether these particular locations contain physical attributes that would 'take it out of the ordinary' rather than seeking to protect all areas of open countryside outside the AONB.

Furthermore, it is also considered that the 'exceptional circumstances' test is inappropriate as the exceptional circumstances is only featured in nationally protected designations and should not applied to areas of open countryside and should be deleted.

Ref#	Cmt#	Respondent	Organisation	Behalf Of	Policy	Page	Para	Map	Type
22025	3	Mr J Fleming	Gladman Developments		3				Object
Comments									
Further to the concerns raised in response to Policy 2, Gladman is opposed to the above policy as it seeks to protect the open countryside for its own sake and is not supported by any robust evidence. The Framework is clear that development which is sustainable should go ahead without delay. The use of the above policy will stifle the ability of sustainable development opportunities coming forward and would not accord with the positive approach to growth required by the Framework which sets out a presumption in favour of sustainable development.									
Gladman recommend that the above policy is deleted in its entirety as it is in conflict with basic conditions (a) and (d).									
22025	4	Mr J Fleming	Gladman Developments		13				Object
Comments									
The above policy is considered unnecessary as it merely duplicates the requirements set out in the recently adopted Local Plan. Whilst the Plan will not be tested against the Revised Framework paragraph 16 makes clear that policies should “serve a clear purpose, avoiding unnecessary duplication of policies that apply to a particular area (including policies in this Framework, where relevant). Gladman recommend that Policy 13 is therefore deleted.									
21938	1	Mr C Reynolds	Hallam Land Management						Support
Comments									
HLM has an interest in ‘Warren Cottage Fields, Handcross’ (plan attached) which we are promoting for a 125 dwellings along with a new community hall.									
We support the approach taken by the Parish Council who have sought to positively prepare a Neighbourhood Plan which will contribute to the overall housing delivery in the District over the Plan period.									
21938	2	Mr C Reynolds	Hallam Land Management		11/12				Object
Comments									
However, we believe that there are still some specific issues in respect of the site selection process, namely the lack of justification for the allocations at St Martins Close (Policy 11 and 12). We believe that this Publication Plan has failed to apply National Policy and has not properly assessed reasonable alternatives in a consistent manner to demonstrate that the most sustainable, logical and deliverable site has been chosen. We remain of the view that this Neighbourhood Plan fails to meet the ‘Basic Conditions’ for Neighbourhood Planning.									

Ref#	Cmt#	Respondent	Organisation	Behalf Of	Policy	Page	Para	Map	Type
21938	3	Mr C Reynolds	Hallam Land Management			8			Neutral
Comments									
<p>HLM welcomes the addition of this policy into the NP, particularly as the existing community hall is in the same ownership as our Site, as the Parish is aware. The supporting text at Paragraph 5.8 is supported given that WCF is the only site available within close proximity to Handcross centre which has the potential to deliver a new and enhanced community hall, which as highlighted in paragraph 5.7, is supported by the local residents.</p> <p>The existing community hall is in a poor condition with very limited opportunities to expand to cater for the growing population, on a site surrounded by housing. This is an issue, especially as National Policy states that planning policies needs to allow for established facilities to develop and modernise in a sustainable way, whilst ensuring an integrated approach between community facilities and location of housing, economic uses and services. We do not feel that this Plan sufficiently explores how sites, particularly alternative sites, can unlock the potential to provide new community facilities that will serve the immediate population of Handcross.</p> <p>HLM are committed to the comprehensive planning and development of Warren Cottage Fields and the community hall, which can be seen in our previous reps and vision for the site.</p>									

116	1	Ms C Tester	High Weald AONB Unit			11/12			Object
Comments									
<p>The High Weald AONB Unit responded to the Regulation 14 consultation on the Slaugham Neighbourhood Plan on 15th December 2017. In this response it raised concerns about policies 11 and 12, which propose to allocate two sites in Handcross for additional housing – amounting to 65 dwellings. It is understood that these allocations are not necessary in order to meet housing need because of the high number of existing planning permissions and the strategic allocation at Pease Pottage. It is therefore questionable as to whether these proposed allocations meet the tests in NPPF paragraphs 115 and 116 (now paragraph 172 of the new NPPF). The NPPF requires that great weight be given to conserving landscape and scenic beauty in Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, which have the highest status of protection, and that major development be refused in designated areas such as AONBs “except in exceptional circumstances and where it can be demonstrated they are in the public interest”. To meet these exceptional circumstances, the decision-maker must make an assessment of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “the need for the development, including in terms of any national considerations, and the impact of permitting it, or refusing it, upon the local economy; - the cost of, and scope for, developing elsewhere outside the designated area, or meeting the need for it in some other way; - any detrimental effect on the environment, the landscape and recreational opportunities, and the extent to which that could be moderated”. <p>The High Weald AONB Unit therefore advised that, if Slaugham Parish Council wished to retain these allocations, further justification should be included within or alongside the submission plan to demonstrate how these proposals meet these tests. Unfortunately this recommendation does not appear to have been addressed in the Consultation Statement and there does not appear to be any justification for such major development in an AONB within the Plan itself or the supporting material.</p> <p>Reluctantly therefore I must formally object to the allocations in Policies 11 and 12 of the submitted Slaugham Neighbourhood Plan as representing unjustified major development in an AONB contrary to the NPPF paragraph 172. These proposals are therefore contrary to the Basic Condition which requires neighbourhood plans to have regard to national planning policy.</p>									

Ref#	Cmt#	Respondent	Organisation	Behalf Of	Policy	Page	Para	Map	Type
21947	1	Mr R Franklin	Highways England			11/12			Neutral
Comments									
We note that:									
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the Mid Sussex District Plan 2014-2031 (March 2018) outlines that due to the 600 homes to be delivered at Pease Pottage within Slaugham Parish, “other settlements within Slaugham Parish (Handcross, Slaugham and Warninglid) will not be required to identify further growth through the Plan process on top of windfall growth although may wish to do so to boost supply”. the Slaugham Neighbourhood Development Plan Regulation 16 Consultation identifies 2 further sites for development as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - St. Martins Close (east): 30 dwellings - St. Martins Close (west): 35 dwellings 									
As these sites are remote from the M23 Junction 11 junction at Pease Pottage, within the broader operation, they are unlikely to have a significant impact on the Strategic Road Network. As such, we do not have any objection at present to the Slaugham Neighbourhood Plan - Regulation 16 Consultation with regard to the safe and efficient operation of the SRN. It should however be noted that further sites with a higher number of dwellings are likely to have an impact on the M23 Junction 11 junction at Pease Pottage as modelling shows that at the end of the Local Plan in 2031 with highway mitigation in place, there is no spare capacity in the junction to accommodate any more traffic. Accordingly, if any further intensification of the junction comes forward on top of that already allocated, it is likely that substantially more significant mitigation would be required.									
21948	1	Mr A Byrne	Historic England						Neutral
Comments									
We have no additional comments to make regarding the plan further to our letter dated 18 January 2018 to the Parish Clerk.									
22028	1	Ms A Coombs	Natural England			1			Support
Comments									
Natural England supports the inclusion of a policy which aims to conserve and enhance the natural beauty of the High Weald AONB. All development should have regard for the High Weald AONB Management Plan with reference to the AONB’s key characteristics.									
22028	2	Ms A Coombs	Natural England			5			Support
Comments									
Natural England supports the inclusion of a policy on green infrastructure.									

Ref#	Cmt#	Respondent	Organisation	Behalf Of	Policy	Page	Para	Map	Type
22028	3	Ms A Coombs	Natural England			11/12			Object
Comments									
<p>- The Mid Sussex District Plan 2014 – 2031, states that Slaugham Parish (Handcross, Slaugham and Waringlid) will not be required to identify further growth through the plan process on top of windfall growth. This is due to the over-provision and strategic allocation of 600 homes at Pease Pottage. Therefore polices 11 and 12 of the Slaugham Neighbourhood Plan are not in accordance with the Mid Sussex District Plan.</p> <p>- The NPPF (paragraph 172) indicates that ‘Great weight should be given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty in National Parks, the Broads and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty’ and that ‘Planning permission should be refused for major development other than in exceptional circumstances’. We advise that clarity is sought from MSDC as to whether these allocations constitute major development. If so, then they will need to be assessed against paragraph 172 of the NPPF, i.e. are there exceptional circumstances for this development, is development in the public interest and does the development satisfy the three tests for major development.</p> <p>- Natural England finds Policies 11 and 12 to be incompatible with Objective 1 of the sustainability appraisal. We have concerns that the sustainability appraisal has not fully accounted for the High Weald AONB in its assessment of the plans policies. Whilst Objective assesses policies impact on the countryside, Natural England advises that, in order to recognise the importance of the nationally designated landscape, an objective should be included that assesses all polices against the objectives of the High Weald AONB. Furthermore, Policies 11 and 12, will have a negative impact on Policy 1: Protecting the AONB.</p> <p>- We also advise that any advice provided by the High Weald AONB Unit is given full consideration. Their knowledge of the site and its wider landscape setting, together with the aims and objectives of the AONB’s statutory management plan, will be a valuable contribution to the planning decision.</p>									

22028	4	Ms A Coombs	Natural England			13			Neutral
Comments									
Any future development within the parish must be in accordance with relevant policy and legislation, the MSDC local plan and have regard for the High Weald AONB management plan.									

22030	1	Ms S Coffey	Rural Solutions	Adrian and Amber Baillie of the Freechase and Lydhurt Estates					Neutral
Comments									
Our clients generally support both the initiative to bring forward a Neighbourhood Development Plan, the approach taken, and contents included within the Publication Draft Slaugham Neighbourhood Plan. They do however have some specific concerns relating to the current draft plan which are set out in detail in this letter .									

22030	2	Ms S Coffey	Rural Solutions	Adrian and Amber Baillie of the Freechase and Lydhurt Estates					Object
Comments									
As currently drafted, the Plan makes no reference to the presumption in favour of sustainable development which is a fundamental tenant of national planning policy. It should do so. A useful reference as to the basis of an appropriate statement can be found in the Main Modifications to Paragraph 2.13 of the Mid Sussex District Plan (reference MM01).									

Ref#	Cmt#	Respondent	Organisation	Behalf Of	Policy	Page	Para	Map	Type
22030	3	Ms S Coffey	Rural Solutions	Adrian and Amber Baillie of the Freechase and Lydhurt Estates					Object

Comments

No reference is made to sustainable economic growth or economic well - being. This omission is inconsistent with national policy (NPPF Paragraphs 7, 9, 17, 18, 19 and 28) with the objectives and policies of the Mid Sussex District Plan (DP2, DP12, DP14 and DP17) and with Strategic Objectives 10 and 11 of the pre- submission draft Neighbourhood Plan. This omission should be addressed.

22030	4	Ms S Coffey	Rural Solutions	Adrian and Amber Baillie of the Freechase and Lydhurt Estates					Object
-------	---	-------------	-----------------	---	--	--	--	--	--------

Comments

The language of SO1 needs to be changed. The phrase 'preserve, protect and enhance the countryside' is inconsistent with national (Paragraphs 170 and 171) and local policy (DP12 & DP16). The wording should be changed so that it is consistent with the spirits, objectives and wording of these policies .

The language of SO3 needs to be changed to be consistent with national (NPPF Section 16) and local plan policy (DP35); it should read 'conserve and enhance' the architectural heritage of Conservation Areas rather than 'conserve and protect'.

22030	5	Ms S Coffey	Rural Solutions	Adrian and Amber Baillie of the Freechase and Lydhurt Estates	1				Support
-------	---	-------------	-----------------	---	---	--	--	--	---------

Comments

Our clients are pleased to support this policy. They note its consistency with Policy DP16 in the Mid Sussex District Plan.

22030	6	Ms S Coffey	Rural Solutions	Adrian and Amber Baillie of the Freechase and Lydhurt Estates	2				Object
-------	---	-------------	-----------------	---	---	--	--	--	--------

Comments

The objectives and wording of draft Policy 2 are demonstrably inconsistent with national policy (NPPF Paragraphs 170 and 171) and local policy (DP12, DP16 and DP17) .

We suggest the policy should be made consistent with Policy DP12 of the Mid Sussex District Plan and mirror the approach set out to a) recognise the intrinsic character and beauty of countryside but b) to permit development within it provided that it maintains or where possible enhances the rural and landscape character of the district and is supported by an explicit policy reference elsewhere in the Local Plan (i.e. policies DP14 and DP19).

Ref#	Cmt#	Respondent	Organisation	Behalf Of	Policy	Page	Para	Map	Type
22030	7	Ms S Coffey	Rural Solutions	Adrian and Amber Baillie of the Freechase and Lydhurt Estates		3			Object

Comments

This policy as currently drafted is demonstrably inconsistent with national (NPPF Paragraphs 8, 83, and 78) and local policy (MSDP Policy DP 12, DP14, DP16 and DP19), despite the view expressed in the Consultation Statement (Table 2) that the policy (then Policy 4) is in line with the strategic policies of the district plan.

We note that Mid District Council recommended in their response on the Submission Draft (Consultation Statement Appendix 10) that 'the policy is updated to clearly align with DP12: Protection and Enhancement of the Countryside'. The superficial updating to change reference from 'outside of settlement boundaries' to 'in the open countryside' does not address the fundamental conflicts between the policies.

Policy DP12 is significantly more enabling than neighbourhood policy 3.

22030	8	Ms S Coffey	Rural Solutions	Adrian and Amber Baillie of the Freechase and Lydhurt Estates		6			Object
-------	---	-------------	-----------------	---	--	---	--	--	--------

Comments

A very similar policy previously included in the Submission version of the Mid Sussex District Plan was deleted as part of the Main Modifications put forward by the Inspector as necessary to make the plan sound (MM28).

In our view, this policy is likely to be challenged on the same grounds and so should be deleted from the plan for the same reasons as cited in the Main Modifications report.

22030	9	Ms S Coffey	Rural Solutions	Adrian and Amber Baillie of the Freechase and Lydhurt Estates		8			Neutral
-------	---	-------------	-----------------	---	--	---	--	--	---------

Comments

We are pleased to note the support for community facilities and open space set out in strategic objectives for example in SO4, SO5 and SO7.

We recommend however that the position in Policy 8 in support of such facilities is extended beyond a position of protection and retention of existing facilities, and also offers support for the provision of appropriate new facilities, in line with the requirements of NPPF Paragraph 83 and policy DP25 in the Mid Sussex District Plan.

As noted in our comments in the introduction, the original comments by the SPCNHP and PC recommended that this policy was updated to include support for new community facilities in line with our comments, a recommendation reversed in the Regulation 16 Consultation Statement, with no explanation.

Ref#	Cmt#	Respondent	Organisation	Behalf Of	Policy	Page	Para	Map	Type
22030	10	Ms S Coffey	Rural Solutions	Adrian and Amber Baillie of the Freechase and Lydhurt Estates		15			Neutral

Comments

We are pleased to note that our recommendation for the inclusion of a specific policy which supports the development of new businesses within the parish is addressed in the creation of new Policy 15.

We support the policy as drafter with the exception of recommending that the reference to 'businesses use' is amended to read either 'business' or 'employment uses', to ensure that this policy can fulfil its objectives to support economic growth and job creation within the area by not limiting suppoer to B1/2/8 uses, which is how the current wording could be interpreted.

16481	1	Mr D Wilson	Savills	Thames Water Utilities					Neutral
-------	---	-------------	---------	------------------------	--	--	--	--	---------

Comments

Thames Water have confirmed that Slaugham lies just outside their operational area. Therefore we have no additional comments on the Neighbourhood Plan.

22012	1	Ms C Mayall	Southern Water						Support
-------	---	-------------	----------------	--	--	--	--	--	---------

Comments

We are pleased to note our comments on the Pre-Submission plan have been taken into consideration, and as such, confirm that we have no further comments to make.

21998	1	Planning Admin Team	Sport England						Neutral
-------	---	---------------------	---------------	--	--	--	--	--	---------

Comments

It is also important to be aware of Sport England's statutory consultee role in protecting playing fields and the presumption against the loss of playing field land.

Sport England provides guidance on developing planning policy for sport.

Sport England works with local authorities to ensure their Local Plan is underpinned by robust and up to date evidence. In line with Par 97 of the NPPF, this takes the form of assessments of need and strategies for indoor and outdoor sports facilities.

If new or improved sports facilities are proposed Sport England recommend you ensure they are fit for purpose and designed in accordance with our design guidance notes.

Any new housing developments will generate additional demand for sport. If existing sports facilities do not have the capacity to absorb the additional demand, then planning policies should look to ensure that new sports facilities, or improvements to existing sports facilities, are secured and delivered.

In line with the Government's NPPF (including Section 8) and its Planning Practice Guidance (Health and wellbeing section), consideration should also be given to how any new development, especially for new housing, will provide opportunities for people to lead healthy lifestyles and create healthy communities.

Ref#	Cmt#	Respondent	Organisation	Behalf Of	Policy	Page	Para	Map	Type
22016	1	Mr D Barnes	Star Planning	Welbeck Strategic Land		2			Object

Comments

Welbeck Strategic Land object to the wording of Policy 2. As drafted, this policy refers to development only being allowed in 'exceptional circumstances'. Such a high threshold is not applicable outside, for example, Green Belt or Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Even in 'valued landscape' there is no threshold which requires development to only be allowed in 'exceptional circumstances'. Accordingly, there is no support for the wording of Policy 2 in the National Planning Policy Framework and the Planning Practice Guidance.

There is a requirement for Policy 2 to be redrafted to remove reference to the demonstration of 'exceptional circumstances'.

22016	2	Mr D Barnes	Star Planning	Welbeck Strategic Land		11/12			Object
-------	---	-------------	---------------	------------------------	--	-------	--	--	--------

Comments

Welbeck Strategic Land is supportive of the Neighbourhood Plan in seeking to allocate land for residential development to meet an acknowledged housing need within Slaugham Parish. However, Welbeck Strategic Land object to the allocation of land at St Martin Close (east) for housing development.

The Slaugham Neighbourhood Sustainability Appraisal which seeks to underpin the housing allocations cannot be relied upon to demonstrate that the proposed allocation at St Martins Close (east) is the most appropriate and sustainable option at Handcross.

Based upon this critique of the Appraisal which underpins the choice of the proposed allocation at St Martin Close (east), it can be concluded that this site is not the most sustainable and appropriate location for housing development at Handcross. If land is to be developed for housing in the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty then it should be in a location which has the least detrimental effect on the environment.

The Slaugham Neighbourhood Sustainability Appraisal which seeks to underpin the housing allocations cannot be relied upon to demonstrate that the proposed allocation at St Martins Close (west) is the most appropriate and sustainable option within Handcross.

Ref#	Cmt#	Respondent	Organisation	Behalf Of	Policy	Page	Para	Map	Type
22016	3	Mr D Barnes	Star Planning	Welbeck Strategic Land					Object

Comments

There is a more appropriate, sustainable and environmentally less harmful option to the west of London Road, Handcross (SL17) which is available and deliverable. Solely for reference purposes for the Examiner, a document is attached which identifies Welbeck Strategic Land’s proposals for the land west of London Road, Handcross, including why it is a better site than at St Martin Close (east).

Welbeck Strategic Land’s interest extends in about 3-hectares (some 7.41 acres) of land contained by London Road, A23, the access road to the Hyde Estate. The land is currently used for grazing but is isolated from the wider countryside of the High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) by the roads and existing residential development of Handcross to the south.

The land west of London Road is physically and visually related to the settle-ment of Handcross. The site has the capacity to accommodate housing de-velopment without detriment to the scenic beauty, character or appearance of the wider landscape of the AONB. There is ample scope to augment ex-isting planting within and adjacent to the site to create an effective transition between the countryside and the extended settlement of Handcross.

The site is well located relative to the facilities and services within Hand-cross. Future residents would be able to safely walk and cycle to the exist-ing facilities and services within Handcross, including the schools, shops, recreation ground, Post Office, public house, village hall, churches, healthcare centre and bus stops.

22014	1	Mr D Sullivan	Thakeham Homes						Object
-------	---	---------------	----------------	--	--	--	--	--	--------

Comments

Thakeham Homes Ltd are submitting representations to the draft Slaugham Neighbourhood Plan (‘the SNP’) as local stakeholders and with an important land interest in the designated area. This land interest is Land to the West of Old Brighton Road in South Pease Pottage (‘the Site’).

Whilst we encourage Neighbourhood Plan preparation in order to help meet the community’s needs, we strongly object to the draft Slaugham Neighbourhood Plan as it does not meet the requirements of Basic Conditions (a) and (e) as set out in Paragraph 8(2) of Schedule 4B of the Localism Act 2011.

We therefore make representations on the basis that the SNP has not been drafted in line with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2018) in order to deliver sufficient planned housing, thereby failing Basic Condition (a). The proposed approach to housing allocations in the SNP is insufficient in site number and scale in order to be compatible with the recently adopted Mid Sussex Local Plan (MSLP) (2018). This is in respect to the strategic approach and settlement hierarchy for housing distribution in the MSLP, thereby failing Basic Condition (e).

Ref#	Cmt#	Respondent	Organisation	Behalf Of	Policy	Page	Para	Map	Type
22014	2	Mr D Sullivan	Thakeham Homes						Object

Comments

We consider that further and/or 'reserve' housing allocation sites should be incorporated into the draft SNP in order to create a more robust approach, especially should the St Martin Close housing allocation falter in its delivery. It would also help future-proof the SNP, especially given the planned review of MSLP in 2021 and the increase in stepped housing trajectories of 876dpa until 2023/2024 and 1090dpa thereafter. This is important given that the SNP will cover the period up to 2031 and is in the interests of long term housing need.

We believe that there should be more cohesion between the parish and the district regarding housing numbers, especially given that the site has progressed to the second round of Mid Sussex District's 'Site Allocations Development Plan Document' currently under consideration. It means that the draft SNP is out of step with the District's own assessment of the site and forms a further reason for our Objection.

We consider that Land to the west of Old Brighton Road South is achievable and deliverable in order to meet this housing need. There needs to be greater recognition within the SNP of increasing housing demand in the District and the wider Housing Market Area including unmet need from Crawley and beyond.

22014	3	Mr D Sullivan	Thakeham Homes						Object
-------	---	---------------	----------------	--	--	--	--	--	--------

Comments

Thakeham Homes Ltd are actively promoting the Site for the delivery of circa 150 dwellings. We consider that the Site has the ability to be delivered within the first five years, and on the basis the site will make a significant contribution to the District's ongoing land supply trajectory.

The demise of the land parcel has been adjusted and reduced in size particularly at its western extent at Regulation 14 stage and is consistent with that contemplated by MSDC as part of their Call for Sites consultation in October 2017 and current Site Allocations Development Plan Document.

We strongly disagree with the site assessment undertaken by the Parish Council at Regulation 14 stage who overstated the significance of its rural qualities, both in the PHLAA and the Sustainability Appraisal.

Ref#	Cmt#	Respondent	Organisation	Behalf Of	Policy	Page	Para	Map	Type
22026	1	Mr P Davis	Turley	A2Dominion Group					Object

Comments

As background to these representations, we note that A2Dominion has an interest in an area of land to the north of Horsham Road and west of Old Brighton Road North, Pease Pottage ('the Site'). A2Dominion is promoting this land for residential development and considers that it is suitable and sustainably located to accommodate future housing requirements.

A2Dominion note that the draft Neighbourhood Plan seeks to identify (as an 'Aim' and via the Proposals Map) a 'Gap' between Pease Pottage and Crawley. A2Dominion consider that this approach is flawed for a number of reasons as explained in these representations. In short, A2Dominion's concerns arise as this 'Aim' and proposals map designation fails to have regard to the character of this area, the relationship between Pease Pottage and Crawley and the presence of existing and permitted development that already exists within the proposed area.

These representations highlight that coalescence between Pease Pottage and Crawley will not be possible to the presence of the Little Trees Cemetery and the significant wooded area between the two settlements. In any event, it has been shown that it is unnecessary to designate or define a Gap in this area since there is no perceptual connection Pease Pottage and Crawley. Development can be accommodated without significantly reducing the degree of separation and without leading to the actual or perceived coalescence of the settlements in a physical or visual sense.

We note that despite the wording of Policy DP13, no up-to-date evidence has been prepared in support of the Neighbourhood Plan to support the Pease Pottage Gap.

In addition, it has been demonstrated that there are existing policies in place which are capable of controlling development in the area of the proposed Gap and the resulting impact on the AONB, the landscape, the separation of settlements and the distinct identities of settlements.

Aim 1 (and the identification of the Pease Pottage Gap on the Proposals Map) is therefore unnecessary and has not been justified. The requirements of Policy DP13 of the MSDP have not been met.

22023	1	Ms E Short	West Sussex County Council						Neutral
-------	---	------------	----------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	---------

Comments

Given that the submitted Slaugham Neighbourhood Plan (SNP) includes the proposed allocation of small-scale housing, it should be noted that this will be subject to the resolution of any highway safety and access issues at the planning application stage or as part of a consultation on a Community Right to Build Order.

22023	2	Ms E Short	West Sussex County Council		5	14	2		Neutral
-------	---	------------	----------------------------	--	---	----	---	--	---------

Comments

Seems to be missing the end of the second sentence. We would suggest '...will be supported.'

Ref#	Cmt#	Respondent	Organisation	Behalf Of	Policy	Page	Para	Map	Type
22023	3	Ms E Short	West Sussex County Council			16			Neutral
Comments									
Strategic Objective 4 should be updated here to reflect the new wording on page 9 for Strategic Objective 6 to include reference to secondary pupils; 'Support the provision of high quality education facilities throughout the Parish for pre-school, primary and secondary aged pupils.'									
22023	4	Ms E Short	West Sussex County Council			29	8.5		Neutral
Comments									
Missing wording at the end of the paragraph. We would suggest '...additional opportunities to enhance the network'.									