

Slinfold Neighbourhood Plan - Regulation 16 Consultation - Summary of Representations

Stakeholder Reference	Policy No. Paragraph	Summary
Ref #1	<p>Support with modifications</p> <p>Policies 7, 10, 11, 12 and Sustainability Appraisal</p> <p>Paragraphs 5.21 – 5.22</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Policy 7: Housing Mix. SUPPORT SUBJECT TO AMENDMENT Policy 7 needs to be flexibly written so as to be able to appropriately respond to this diversity of sites, avoid uniformity and provide the opportunity to create balanced mixed communities. Acknowledgment there is a demand for smaller houses (1, 2 and 3 bed) there is equally a demand for larger homes (4 and 5 bed), the delivery of which should not be constrained by the Policy. 2. SUGGESTED CHANGE TO POLICY 7: HOUSING MIX: Insert the words “<i>in appropriate locations.</i>” at the end of the first sentence in order to ensure the delivery of viable sustainable¹ developments, it should be recognised that there may be instances where it will be necessary to deliver a reduced quantum of affordable housing in lieu of the significant community infrastructure being provided by the new housing development. 3. SUGGESTED CHANGE TO PARAGRAPH 5.22 -5.23: AFFORDABLE HOUSING: Insert additional sentence at the end of the paragraph, as follows “<i>The Parish notes that there may be circumstances where new housing developments are delivering significant community infrastructure, such that exceptionally a reduced quantum of affordable housing will be considered acceptable.</i>” 4. Policy 10: Crosby Farm: SUPPORT SUBJECT TO AMENDMENT The plan as currently drafted, the requirement to make provision for a scout hut (under point 9), fails to reflect the Parish Council’s Scout Hut Background Paper (May 2017), which forms part of the Neighbourhood Plan’s evidence base, nor does it mention Slinfold Development’s suggested alternative location that was put forward as part of its representations to the Regulation 14 Pre-Submission Neighbourhood Plan in June 2016. 5. SUGGESTED CHANGE TO POLICY 11: WEST OF SPRING LANE: Delete the last bullet point which requires the provision of open space on the southern part of the site 6. SUGGESTED CHANGE TO POLICY 12: COBBLERS: Insert additional requirement to make provision for Scout Hut. 7. SUGGESTED CHANGE TO CROSBY FARM SITE ASSESSMENT: a) The site should score a “no impact or neutral impact” and coloured yellow in relation to both rural character and biodiversity having regard to the above. 8. SUGGESTED CHANGE TO WEST OF SPRING LANE SITE ASSESSMENT:

¹ Every effort has been made to accurately summarise representations as far possible. It should be noted the examiner has received a full copy of each representation received during the consultation periods.

		a) The site should score a “no impact or neutral impact” and coloured yellow in relation to biodiversity having regard to the above.
Ref #2	No Objection	The plan appears to be well constructed and written
Ref #3	Objection & Comment Policy Reference: SPC 2015-2031 Para. LGS3	<p>1. Objection to Llama Field as LGS</p> <p>a) There was no contact, correspondence or discussion with the landowners this proposal was put forward. The land is described to be registered “Traditional Orchard” in the plan but this is disputed</p> <p>b) The plan also identifies the field as a “priority habitat”. This is also disputed.</p> <p>Strongly object to the proposed to designate their land, known as “Llama Field” as an LGS and require this proposed is removed from the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>
Ref #4	Objection Policy Ref. 8 Paragraph No. 5.25, 5.26, 5.27	Objection to Policy 8. The proposal to mirror the existing houses (1-25 Hayes Lane) is inappropriate and would have a negative effect upon biodiversity, the removal of protected trees and is inadequate infrastructure capacity. The road is restrictive in width with no footpath infrastructure. Parking is also inadequate. Previous plans by a developer raised concerns regarding flooding and disruption from construction vehicles. The entire field should be allocated a LGS status and Hayes Lanes is identified as a ‘quiet’ lane. Housing development should be placed closer to the local village services.
Ref #5	Objection Policy 8	<p>1. Objection to proposed inclusion of the Land to the East of Hayes Lane (Policy 8). This inclusion has had no community involvement or approval. It should be deleted as an allocation.</p> <p>2. Planning history of the site indicate the Parish Council originally objected to this site on the grounds of Ecology, Landscape, Visual and design grounds, Loss of local amenity, Negative impact upon the character of the area, Flooding concerns, Drainage concerns, traffic concerns and inadequate parking. The site should therefore be excluded with ribbon development would require the removal of existing trees and mature hedging to allow access to the property frontages. Development at Hayes Lane would be contrary to its “Quiet Lane” status</p> <p>3. A claim for a public footpath across the site has been lodged with West Sussex County Council under the Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 for a path between the Downs Link and the public footpath to the south of the site. This should be taken into consideration when considering the inclusion of this site in the NP.</p>
Ref #6	Objection Flawed assessment methodology	<p>Objection made to the way the draft Neighbourhood Plan has been prepared relating to the methodology and decision making previously underpinning the Neighbourhood Plan’s housing site allocations. It is considered the process is flawed and sites should re-assessed.</p> <p>The Slinfold Neighbourhood Plan does not adequately address housing need that exists in Slinfold. The plan does not</p>

	Plan failed to meet the housing need (OAN).	meet its OAN. Land West of Clappgate lane (Fladgates Farm) is considered to be sustainable, well connected location to the village and should be reassessed and should be included as a housing allocation in the emerging plan especially in light of a decrease in the number of houses put forward in the previous versions of the plan. Furthermore, the proposal will offer community infrastructure as part of the proposal which will accommodate proposed growth in the village and reflects its position in the settlement hierarchy.
Ref #7	Objection Objectives 3 & 4 are against the plan. Policy 3 Policy 9	Objection to Policy 9: End of West Way (Para 5.28 – 5.31) 1. Objection is made to Policy 9: End of West Way. The historic fields should be preserved as it is against the wishes of the village residents, contrary to the 2007 Slinfold Conservation Area Advice leaflet and the 2006 Slinfold Parish Design Statement. There is inadequate infrastructure capacity to support further growth in Slinfold including local services. 2. The allocation would be in conflict with the emerging Neighbourhood Plan objectives (3&4)
Ref #8	Objection Policy 10	1. Opposition of the proposed development at Crosby Farm for up to 21 houses on the following grounds: a) The view across the cricket pitch from Lyons Road was a designated view and that no housing development would ever be permitted. b) Reference is made to a legal ruling in relation to Health and Safety (Jordans (Bucks.) Cricket Club) and the principle should be applied here.
Ref #9	Objection Policy 9 Paragraphs: • 1.4 • 3.2 • 3.7 • 5.10 • 6.7	1. Objection to Policy 9 The proposal to develop at the end of West Way is unacceptable because it goes against the vote and wishes of residents. Lack of thorough and comprehensive consultation with the local community 2. The proposed development will ruin a valued green space in the centre of the village. Local Green Space LGS1 has been decimated in preparation of the Draft Plan and lack of engagement with the community on this proposal. The consultation should be re-run. 3. Developers are already queuing up to build on the Pub Field; Carter's Fields' Gaskyns; etc. 4. A house was shown in the November 2015 consultation, which blocked an extension to the Pub Field; however, when Millwood Homes submitted its pre-emptive application in 2016, this house had been removed. 5. Presumable to pave the way for future expansion. a) The Draft Plan incorrectly describes the site as "sustainable" when there would be no economic advantages, but great social and environmental harm. b) The Draft Plan is not realistic when it discusses the important of facilities for new residents: (I) There is a single struggling shop (II) One public house

		<p>(III) An empty church (IV) Empty buses (V) An overflowing school</p> <p>c) There are no site plans showing how the proposed houses would be laid out.</p> <p>6. The Draft Plan is not in “general conformity” with the District’s adopted Development Plan Document, which indicated the Horsham District Planning Framework (HDPF). The emerging plan does not take into consideration historic build rates and recent completions in the village.</p> <p>7. Since November 2015, when nine members of the group resigned – until participating in the April 2017 Annual Parish Meeting. The background papers reveal there has been much contact between the Working Group and HDC (and even with Developers). The background papers reveal the contraction of LGS1 was encouraged by HDC; the Southern part of LGS1 was eliminated at the direction of HDC. It was de-listed as a Green Space or Open Space at the direction of HDC. The next step would be for a review of the Draft Plan by an Examiner. The site at the End of West Way should never been included. (Attachment forward onto the Examiner).</p> <p>8. A number of residents felt the Draft Plan did not make sufficient use of Brownfield Sites and could not understand why it was acceptable to build out-of-town sites like Wickhurst Green, but <u>not</u> acceptable to build at Nowhurst or Bridge Farm. The Central Fields LGS1 was modified. There is substantial contradiction in reducing the scope of LGS1 (on the grounds of NPPF paragraphs 76 & 77), whilst meanwhile protecting the extensive tract of land between Slinfold and Broadbridge Heath as “unassailable”.</p> <p>9. The Central Fields are of historic interest and Common land.</p> <p>10. The Draft Plan (Reg. 16) dismisses Slinfold’s Conservation Area Leaflet which stresses the need to “retain conservation views” across the Central Fields. The Draft Plan dismisses Slinfold’s Parish Design Statement which stresses in several places the importance of retaining the space in the Central Fields. Slinfold Parish Council are proposing to re-write this Design Statement, which could possibly white-wash references to the importance of retaining the Central Fields.</p> <p>11. The Draft Plan dismisses Slinfold’s May 2015 “Proposed Open Spaces and Local Green Spaces” document where the Central Fields are proposed as LGS1.</p> <p>12. Site (SA061) is rejected by HDC’s SHELAA as “Not Currently Developable”. The capacity is not required. HDC has identified a supply of sites covering 114% of the requirement. More than 30 sites as Schenectady (Cherry Tree Farm?); Nibblets Yard; Brackley Burn; and several individual properties have been excluded from the Slinfold count. The site is considered to be within the countryside, as it lies outside of the BUAB. It should only be considered for development if the site is essential to the community.</p> <p>13. The Draft Plan dismisses Horsham District Council’s Landscape Assessment, which rates the overall capacity of the Central Fields (SF1) as “Low/No”. The Draft Plan contradicts HDC’s LDF Policy 4 and Paragraph 9.14 (to conserve and enhance the character of the district) Paragraph 9.5 (preserving rural unspoilt qualities) Building on the Central Fields would have the opposite effect.</p> <p>14. The site effectively adjoins Slinfold’s Conservation Area. The Draft Plan dismisses HDC’s Development Control Policy, which says; “Development will not be permitted unless it retains historical significant boundaries, does not harm important views in and out of the village, or detracts from the Conservation Area’s</p>
--	--	--

		<p>character”.</p> <p>15. A “Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Appraisal of Potential Housing Sites at Slinfold” by consultants David Huskisson Associates commissioned by Slinfold Parish Council assessed the site as having a “Negligible/Low” capacity for housing. This report also said of the Central Fields: “The rural character of this area together with its important contribution to the setting of Slinfold, and the moderate – high visual sensitivity are key factors that result in a low/no capacity for small scale housing development”.</p> <p>16. Access by new residents to the site would introduce hazardous traffic conditions to the already congested West Way and Hayes Lane.</p> <p>17. Extra pressure on drains will exacerbate the existing drainage problem.</p> <p>18. The site would have a devastating effect on existing residents by destroying their views, peace and quiet.</p> <p>19. The site greatly invades privacy for existing residents of West Way and Tannery Close. Wildlife on the site would be devastated including Deer, Grass snakes, Slow worms, Great crested newts</p> <p>20. An attractive site at “Gaskyns” (at the end of Six Acres) was not followed up because:</p> <p>a) The land had a Section 106 covenant that would need to be released by five bodies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (I) HDC (II) WSCC (III) George Wimpey (IV) Southern Counties Ltd. (V) Alfred McAlpine Homes <p>b) It could set a precedent putting other green/open spaces at risk. See minutes of Slinfold Parish Council Feb & March 2016.</p> <p>21. There is a conflict of interest: A Councillor whose property backs onto the Pub Field held a number of meetings with the developer of Land at the End of West Way.</p> <p>22. There was an error in the Pre-Draft Plan (Reg. 14) which was not corrected. On 10th May 2016, the Clerk of Slinfold Parish Council was advised there was a significant error in the Pre-Submission Consultation (Reg 14) document that incorrectly showed a link between the Northern and Southern proposed sections of the Central Fields. This link was purchased by the residents in 2001. Therefore parishioners were being falsely consulted as they would not be aware of this separation of the Central Fields into two remote disconnected sections – and the consequent likelihood of expansion. No correction was circulated by the Parish Council. A reminder was sent to the Clerk on 2nd June. Yet again no action was taken – so the misleading description was allowed to remain in public domain. At the Parish Council meeting on 30th June 2016 it was resolved that members of the public must leave the room so that a confidential matter relating to a Neighbourhood Plan consultation response could be considered.</p> <p>23. In November 2016, Millwood Homes made a pre-emptive application to build 18 homes at Niblets Farm at the End of West Way. All Slinfold Councillors were urged via e-mail to object to this application on the grounds that it was pre-Neighbourhood Plan (as per Hayes Lane, Taylor Wimpey DC/15/0591); would set an expansion precedent; and contradicted residents wishes. The Parish Council declined making an objection to Millwood</p>
--	--	---

		<p>Homes' application DC/16/2556 – even though it was blatantly pre-Plan. It is not understood why Slinfold Parish Council did not object, while HDC had no hesitation in refusing the application.</p> <p>24. Dowsett Mayhew's Consultancy Statement should contain 21 appendices, which are missing and therefore cannot be commented on. Descriptions of public engagement "at every stage" are not correct. Paragraphs 1.4, 3.2, 3.7, 5.10, and 6.7) Paragraph 3.8 shows that public consultations petered out after November 2015. Paragraph 3.9 incorrectly states the website was regularly updated and was used to publicise events. Paragraph 3.13 incorrectly says agendas and key reports were published regularly on the Slinfold Parish Council website. Paragraph 3.10 says there was "separate stakeholder engagement". Yet there as none with affected residents. Paragraph 4.75 refers to the David Huskisson Landscape Assessment in September 2015. However, it does not report that the findings of that report were not distributed to parishioners. It does not mention the report did not support building in the Central Fields. It also does not report that nine members of the Working Group subsequently resigned. Paragraph 4.96 says the land availability assessment was updated to incorporate, amongst others, the Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Appraisal. However, this appraisal recommended no building on the Central Fields. Paragraph 4.97 says final agreements on housing land availability were "agreed" prior to Pre-Plan Consultation (Reg 14). Paragraph 5.8 mentions the importance of Strategic Views. This is contradicted by paragraph 5.11 which includes Policy 9 End of West Way. Section 6 describes the Pre-Plan submission (reg 14) but does not explain how each site was assessed by the Working Group. Section 7 contains Table 1 with a list of the 70 responses obtained from the Pre-Plan consultation (Reg 14). Almost every response contained an objection or suggested changes. Only those in favour of developers were altered. In Table 1, Stakeholder 8 wanted to remove restrictions to expansion beyond the End of West Way site.</p> <p>25. Horsham District Council should veto this site and should review the scope of the "unassailable" land between Slinfold and Broadbridge Heath.</p> <p>26. The owners should donate part of the community. If this were done, then the land could once again be opened up as Common Land.</p>
<p>Ref #10</p>	<p>Objection with modifications</p> <p>Policy 11/13</p> <p>Paragraphs: 5.36 to 5.39</p>	<p>1. Objection to Policy 13, West of Spring Lane.</p> <p>2. The Draft Plan in section 5.38 is clearly incorrect in suggesting that 10 houses in the field will not impact on Spring Lane.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) The plan recognises Spring Lane as a one track road and proposes to designate Spring Lane as a Quiet Lane. b) Spring Lane is an essential part of the village and provides a rural walkway for: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (I) Residents (II) Visitors (III) Cyclists (IV) Horse riders c) It provides an important access to the Downs Link. d) Policy 13 is in direct conflict with the plans own stated aims of a designated Quiet Lane. e) Spring Lane is single track and it is abundantly clear that it would be inappropriate to then propose to build 10 new homes next to with access from Spring Lane with the extra vehicular activity along this

		<p>single track road.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. The Parish dropped plans for development of East of Spring Lane as inappropriate to the Neighbourhood Plan. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) The plan is inconsistent as it does not treat the field to the West of Spring Lane in a consistent manner. b) The lane is essential as a rural walkway and this would undoubtedly be marred by building houses on either side of the lane. c) Although the plan mentions buffers, new buildings would still have a large detrimental effect on the lane. 4. Policy 13 was annexed to the Draft Plan. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) It formed no part of the original set of proposals which the village residents had an opportunity to comment and vote on when all the options were laid out formally in mid-2015. b) Policy 13 was appended at the end of 2015 when full discussions had been completed earlier in the year. c) Policy 13 has not been the subject of full and robust consideration and should not have been included in any draft plan. 5. The plan fails to address the need to provide connected networks for wildlife as specified under section 4.19. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) The field to the West of Spring Lane provides a natural habitat for many varied species of wildlife including access for deer and rabbits from Downs Link and from Central Fields. b) This is a critical access point for such wildlife and links Central Fields and Downs Link to the wider area of the parish over to the west of the industrial estates on Stane Street. c) The proposal under Policy 13 would destroy this natural habitat and the route for wildlife. 6. The plan proposes a number of sites for LGS status. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) The field to the West of Spring Lane is clearly visible to local residents and visitors from both Spring Lane and the South Downs Link and should be classed as LGS. No development should be considered for this field. 7. The proposed buildings under Policy 13 are directly adjacent to the bungalows which front onto Park Street. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Any proposal for buildings on the site should be considered within the context of the immediate surrounding area. b) The plan suggests that properties of 2 storeys would be in keeping with the local area. c) This is clearly erroneous. d) The bungalows on Park Street are single storey buildings and have a pitched roof height of around 5.5 metres and any development next to them should be restricted in height to be in keeping with the local environment.
--	--	---

		<p>8. The plan acknowledges that any development under Policy 13 needs to provide buffers to protect the outlook.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) The plan fails to include buffering to the North of the site in order to provide some element of protection to existing residents. b) Buffers to the North of the site need to be added to any plan which includes Policy 13. <p>9. The original plans from November 2015 showed vehicular access part way down Spring Lane, opposite Amberfield.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) The existing field entrance is currently at the South end of the field and we consider that this should be retained as access to any ill-considered development in order to provide some level of protection to the existing homes in the area. b) It is not agreed that the small field to the West of Spring Lane should be considered for 10 units. In relation to other sites, which are much larger surrounding areas, we consider that Policy 13 should: Be restricted to a maximum of 4 single storey units to be in keeping with open spaces proposed elsewhere and the surrounding area if the plan insists in proposing any units at all. <p>10. Policy 13 should be deleted from the Draft Plan.</p>
<p>Ref #11</p>	<p>Objection</p> <p>Policy 3: Para 4.17</p> <p>Policy 9</p> <p>Policy 11</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Object to Policy 3 (Para 4.17) 2. The Draft Plan Contradicts Slinfold’s Conservation Objectives. 3. It is disingenuous of the Draft Plan to suggest conservation of the Central Fields has been retained by re-labelling the Pub Field and the attached slither of land as the “Central Fields” or “LGS1”. 4. The Central Fields are of Historic Interest – having been Common Land. Draft Plan (Reg16) dismisses Slinfold’s Conservation Area Leaflet which stresses the need to “retain conservation views” across the Central Fields. 5. The Draft Plan totally dismisses Slinfold’s Parish Design Statement which identifies the importance of retaining the space in the Central Fields. 6. The Draft Plan dismisses Slinfold’s May 2015 “Proposed Open Spaces and Local Green Spaces” document where the Central Fields are proposed as LGS1. 7. Objection to Policy 9 The End of West Way site. Building on the site will set a precedent and will inevitably lead to development from the Pub Field to the Downs Link. Access by new residents to the site would introduce hazardous traffic conditions to the already-congested West Way and Hayes Lane. The site would have a devastating effect on existing residents by destroying their views, peace and quiet. Development would

		<p>intrude on the privacy for existing residents of West Way and Tannery Close. Wildlife on the site would also be devastated. This includes deer, grass snakes, slow worms, and great crested newts.</p> <p>8. Object to Policy 11. To develop the land West of Spring Lane, clearly rebuts the stated ambition of classifying Spring Lane as a 'quiet lane'. Development would damage wildlife, negatively affect the drainage at Tannery Close. Concern from congestion arising from the development. Negatively affect the privacy and noise levels of all of those in Spring Lane, Park Street and Tannery Close. Development is unnecessary.</p> <p>9. Lack of transparency in the plan making process and lack of consultation with local residents. Local Green Space LGS1 has been thoroughly altered in the Draft Plan.</p> <p>10. Recent developments in the village should satisfy local housing need. Further development will impact negatively on the rural character of the village. Developers will queue up to build on the Pub Field; Carter's Fields; Gaskyns; etc. Taylor Wimpey claim as many as 320 homes may be needed in Slinfold 2011-2031. This is disputed and developer's objection is centred on profit.</p> <p>11. Development should be on brownfield sites at Bridge Farm and Nowhurst.</p> <p>12. Why does Horsham District Council connive in the destruction of green space. The Southern part of LGS1 was eliminated at the direction of HDC. It was de-listed as a Green Space or Open Space at the direction of HDC. A re-run of Reg 14. was considered unnecessary at the direction of HDC. HDC and the Working Group should be protecting the village, not protecting the developer. The idea of Neighbourhood Plans was so that local people could have a voice.</p>
<p>Ref #12</p>	<p>Comment</p> <p>Object Policy LGS1</p> <p>Supports Policy PDS9</p>	<p>Land Rear of the Red Lyon Pub should be included in the Slinfold Neighbourhood Plan</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This site is clearly suitable, available, appropriate and deliverable for housing development. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) The land is approx. 1.22 ha and has the potential to deliver circa 8 dwellings and a Scout Hut/Community Hall. 2. The allocation for this land would be the most sustainable way to extend the village boundary and meet local affordable housing needs as well as the district. 3. The allocation of this site achieves all three sustainable dimensions as set out in the NPPF and in this regard the site can be said to be more appropriate as a housing allocation than any of the 5 draft allocations currently identified within the SNP. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Economic Sustainability <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (I) The development of this site would create permanent jobs as well as short-term construction jobs. (II) The future residents visiting the existing shop and services would also improve the village local economy by spending money in the local village shop and post office, using the public transport facilities b) Social Sustainability

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (I) There is a compelling need to deliver significant amounts of additional housing with the district as part of the overall housing requirement. (II) The site has no restrictive covenants or other obstructions to development. (III) The site would assist in meeting an immediate identified local village need for housing as well as contributing to the district wide need. (IV) Allocating the land for residential development would also assist in releasing pressure on the constrained sites elsewhere in the district such as South Downs National Park, AONB's, SSSI's, SPA's, SNCI's and Ancient Woodland. <p>c) Environmental Sustainability</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (I) No designations on the adopted Local Plan Proposals Map. (II) At present, the land is surrounded by residential properties to the North, East and West. (III) This would be encapsulated by residential development on all sides given the proposed allocation to the South (PSD9). (IV) Considering the land has lesser environmental value and is surrounded by existing development on three sides at present, the allocation of this site for housing will maintain the environment sustainability. (V) This would be complemented by the development of the allocated land to the South. <p>d) The position of the site would not represent any substantial encroachment into the countryside and the present of existing physical boundaries serve to ensure that the site would not result in future unchecked sprawl.</p> <p>4. The representation site and the site at Policy 9 (PDS9) would complement one another.</p> <p>5. Allocating this site as local green space is contrary to paragraphs 76 and 77 of the NPPF.</p> <p>6. The site is private land and would not be appropriate, available or accessible by the public as local green space. There is no public right of access.</p> <p>7. The sites location and its accessibility to public transport facilities and local shops and services; means that the potential allocation for residential purposes should be considered as 'highly sustainable development'.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Approx. 90 metres walking distance from the local store/post office on The Street. b) Slinfold Village Hall is approx. 125 metres walk to the North East. c) Village sports fields located to the East of the land – approx. 150 metres walk. d) Slinfold CE Primary School is located approx. 300 metres to the North. <p>8. Therefore the site should be allocated for housing in the emerging Slinfold Neighbourhood Plan, and not designated as local green space.</p>
Ref #13	Comment	<p>1. Lower Broadbridge Farm is considered to represent a suitable site for allocation for residential and employment uses within the SNP (50 dwellings).</p> <p>2. The proposals for the site will deliver a range of benefits for the local and wider community and would enable the Neighbourhood Plan to meet its housing need and support further economic development within the Parish</p>

		<p>and District.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. It is in a sustainable location particularly when compared to other proposed employment and housing allocations in the Neighbourhood Plan. 4. Lower Broadbridge Farm is therefore considered to represent a sustainable site where development would have a limited impact on the character of the surrounding landscape and where appropriate on and off site mitigation measures could be provided. In comparison with land east of Hayes Lane where it is considered to be visually sensitive to the surrounding landscape. 5. In order to ensure the housing target is met, it is recommended that additional housing sites are identified in the Neighbourhood Plan. 6. Reasoned justification is sought for the anti-coalescence gap and how the boundaries were arrived at. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) The allocation of Lower Broadbridge Farm would enable the housing target to be potentially exceeded by 27 dwellings but would provide sufficient flexibility to ensure that the housing target is met in the event that any of the allocated housing sites do not come forward during the plan period. 7. The Slinfold Neighbourhood Plan Group undertook a Site Unit Assessment Background Paper (November 2016) and this considered the sites now proposed as residential allocations but not Lower Broadbridge Farm. They have therefore done their own assessment of the site using the same criteria and a copied it into their report (Appendix 2). <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) This demonstrates that the site is suitable for development.
Ref #14	<p>Objection</p> <p>Policy 9</p> <p>Paragraphs 5.29 to 5.31</p>	<p>Objection to PDS9 West Way for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Lack of a thorough consultation with the local community. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) This plot was not one of the most favoured by the local population for numerous reasons. b) Previous SHLAA's (including 2014) has stated: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) "This site is considered unsuitable for residential development. It is located outside of the built-up area boundary of Slinfold and development on this site is likely to have a detrimental effect on the surrounding conservation area and countryside". c) Poor access and infrastructure capacity; d) Poor drainage; and e) New development design will not be in keeping with the character of the village.
Ref #15	<p>Objection</p> <p>Policy 10</p> <p>Para 5.32 – 5.35</p>	<p>Objection to Policy 10 Crosby Farm/North of the Cricket Pitch (para. 5.32)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Objections to this site have not been given due weight and consideration. 2. The proposed development is in direct conflict with the fundamental objectives set out in the Slinfold Conservation Area leaflet and in the Slinfold Parish Design Statement <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) The site is inappropriate, abutting, as it does, the Conservation Area itself.

		<p>b) The Slinfold Conservation Area leaflet clearly states: “New development should respect the characteristics set out in this leaflet. Special regard should be had to – The retention of views in and out of the Conservation area, in particular those visible from the street”. It is of concern that site 4 would be in clear violation of the consideration outlined above and it should also be noted that the proposed development at this location would also remove the only clear view to the countryside from the centre of the village.</p> <p>c) Slinfold Conservation Area leaflet, under ‘Character Assessment – Landscape Setting’, it further states: “The fields directly abutting the Conservation Area, should be preserved as they reflect the original form of the area which dates from before the 12th Century. The loss of these fields to development would not preserve or enhance the area’s special character. There are a number of important views of the landscape setting, from within the Conservation Area that maintains the rural character of the area. These should be retained, particularly the views from the street”. This principle is restated again in the Slinfold Parish Design Statement, on page 21. Under ‘Views’ it states:</p> <p>(I) “The relatively flat nature of the village itself means that most views within the village do not occur as a result of the lie of the land, and so have to be mindfully protected. The conservation area leaflet sets out several views of the village that should remain unspoilt – these and others are marked on the maps in this document. Of particular note are: (towards the church over the fields from the Randon Hall Hotel – and back the other way, towards the church over the fields from the Downs Link,) over the cricket field and beyond from Lyons Road”.</p> <p>(II) Attention is also drawn to the map on the inside back cover marking the views (page 27), not only from the Street looking North, but also from the fields/public footpaths looking back towards the village.</p> <p>(III) The site borders the Conservation Area and would be in proximity to listed buildings, adversely affecting the area.</p> <p>(IV) ‘Sweeteners’, in the form of a new cricket pavilion and a new scout hut with car park, should have no part in such a scheme, and are totally inappropriate.</p> <p>(V) The farmer would have to take down existing farm buildings. If he then wanted to replace them elsewhere, (potentially creating a new ‘niche’ field for development in the future), where would these replacement farm buildings be sited.</p> <p>3. Slinfold needs to be preserved as a distinct and rural village, and maintain the integrity, not only of the conservation area, but of the whole village as it stands.</p> <p>4. The proposed development is a threat to Barn Owls who nest in the boundaries of this field and would therefore be directly affected by the proposal which would destroy their habitat. Barn Owls are protected by law and the threat to their environment is unjustifiable.</p>
Ref #16	No Objection	No comment.

<p>Ref #17</p>	<p>Objection</p> <p>Policy 8 Policy 9 Policy 10 Policy 11 Policy 12</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. After reviewing the 'Housing Need Considerations for Slinfold Parish Neighbourhood Plan' (December 2015) Report produced by Dowsett Mayhew Planning on behalf of Slinfold Parish Council – it was concluded that out of the 7 methodologies, method 4 was the most appropriate because it was the only method which included a robust data set. It was also concluded that method 2, despite being very simplistic, was useful as a comparison as it uses the 10 year trend observed between the 2001 and 2011 censuses for Slinfold Parish. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) They consider that the number of dwellings required in Slinfold to 2031 to be at least 175. As shown in Method 2, this is considerably lower than previous 10 year trend. Housing need based on the census trends was estimated to be 330 dwellings (once the 3% household to dwelling conversion rate has been applied). b) Taking into account the publication of the 2014 Household Projections since the Regulation 14 consultation, they conclude that the number of dwellings needed in Slinfold between 2011 and 2031 is between 175 and 330. c) The Draft Slinfold Neighbourhood Plan currently identifies 5 sites which it states will deliver around 77 new dwellings. The plan states that this is toward the upper end of the identified range of housing need. Therefore they consider that this is well below the appropriate range of 175 to 330 dwellings for Slinfold and will not meet housing need. 2. The representation proceeds highlighting a number concerns regarding the lack of an evidential basis for the proposed residential site allocations in the plan, particularly in respect to sustainability, landscape impact and heritage impact. 3. They object to the designation of part of Land to the East of Hayes Lane as a Local Green Space. They consider the site to be an extensive tract of land that has been designated without the requisite compelling evidence base in respect to the site's significance and value to the local community. 4. The level of housing provision on land to the East of Hayes Lane should be revisited and they consider that it is a suitable allocation for up to 50 residential houses, open space and children's play space. This is on the basis of the identified housing need (increased since Regulation 14 stage when factoring in the 2014 household projections) and the fact that housing supply from site allocations has been reduced. 5. Land East of Hayes Lane <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) The site incorporates a long distance walking route and the Sustrans route 223. b) The site is very well contained by the existing dense boundary hedgerows. c) The site is not covered by any statutory or non-statutory designations for landscape character or quality. d) The site is generally of medium landscape quality, comprising pasture with patches of scrub and scattered immature and semi-mature trees. e) Residential development can be accommodated on the site without giving rise to any significant landscape or visual impacts on the surrounding area, as well as how mitigation measures can be incorporated to soften or screen any remaining views. This can be seen on the Illustrative Masterplan. Appendix E.
-----------------------	---	---

<p>Ref #18</p>	<p>Objection and Comments on</p> <p>Local Green Space</p> <p>Policy 6 Policy 8 Policy 9 Policy 10 Policy 11 Policy 12</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Slinfold Neighbourhood Plan is in principle an acceptable policy document and will form a good basis for Slinfold to continue to develop in a managed and sustainable way. 2. Commentary is made on a number of sites allocated in the emerging Neighbourhood Plan. A requirement to make most effective use of land as well as meeting its obligations in terms of meeting OAN housing needs. The following comments include: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Policy 12: The Cobblers for example is a previously developed site which is proposed to accommodate a net additional 10 dwellings alongside the replacement or upgrade of the existing 17 units. Given the size of the site and the existing development, this site could potentially accommodate further development. b) Policy 11: West of Spring Lane also appears to potentially be accommodating only a very low density of housing development which does not make the most effective use of land. c) Policy 9: End of West Way includes “development is designed to preclude any extension of the road way into adjoining land”. This criteria would have the effect of sterilising the site itself and its surroundings for development in the long term. d) Policy 6 and the Slinfold Parish Design Statement clearly set out the criteria under which the design of new development will be assessed. This should also be read alongside the design policies and guidance set out in the HDPF. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (I) It is therefore unclear why a number of the proposed housing allocation policies have included a series of strict and overly restrictive design criteria. (II) This results in no consistency between the Design policies themselves and between each individual allocation. e) Policy 8: East of Hayes Lane includes policy criteria, to not be more than two and a half storeys in height to reflect local vernacular. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (I) This criteria is not required within Policy 8 as this is already controlled by Policy 6 and this results in an overly restrictive policy in terms of design. (II) The vernacular of the local area is very varied in terms of design and the height of buildings and it is not clear from the policy wording the exact meaning of “two and a half storey”. (III) For example how are two and a half storeys and three storeys differentiated under this policy. f) Policy 9: End of West Way similarly includes a criteria for “no more than two storeys in height to reflect local vernacular”. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (I) Again this policy is overly restrictive and the design is already controlled by Policy 6. (II) For example it is not clear whether the policy would prevent accommodation being located within the roof space of a dwelling or whether dormer windows would cause a dwelling to not meet this criteria. (III) There are numerous examples of roof space accommodation and dormer windows throughout the village and in close proximity to this site and this therefore forms part of the vernacular
-----------------------	---	--

		<p>and character of the local area.</p> <p>g) Policy 10: Crosby Farm and Policy 11: West of Spring Lane includes a similar unclear and overly restrictive policy criteria restricting building heights to two storeys.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. The Neighbourhood Plan should allow for all sites to be judged on their own merits at detailed application stage controlled by development management procedures. This will allow the individual characteristics of different sites to be assessed and the design of the proposals to be appropriately assessed as part of the planning balance. 4. There are opportunities that the Neighbourhood Plan should utilise to ensure an adequate supply of housing units over the Plan period, for example allowing for proposed residential sites to be increased in size and further units to be provided if a local need were to arise. This is likely to be particularly important in the latter period of the Neighbourhood Plan. 5. A number of the proposed designations for Local Greenspace remain contrary to the guidance set out in the NPPF and the designations do not meet the relevant criteria. It would appear that these designations are being used to unjustifiably restrict development, rather than protect important green spaces. 6. There is commentary on the Design policies found in the emerging plan but should be consistent with design policy found within the HDPF. Applications should be assessed on their own merits at detail application stage through the normal development management process.
<p>Ref #19</p>	<p>Objection General.</p>	<p>Lyons Farm (SA386) & Broadbridge Heath Farm (SA103)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There is a housing crisis in the UK, where less than half the amount of houses needed have been delivered. 2. This plan is proposing “some 77 new homes” over the period of 16 years up to 2031. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) The objector is promoting an alternative site between Lyons Farm and Broadbridge Heath Farm for over 550+ houses. b) Over 200 social houses is proposed. c) There is no coalescence between this development and Slinfold Village d) The site is closer to Broadbridge Heath and opposite Wickhurst Green, than Slinfold village. e) The site is approximately 1 mile from Slinfold village. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (I) It is not a strategic gap. (II) Not a conservation area (III) No visual or physical coalescence with Slinfold or any other village. (IV) 30 acres of green space for recreational use and green areas was proposed. 3. The site is large enough to provide the suggested development without use of the very small plot that is liable to some winter flooding. 4. This was an opportunity for a strong improved natural drainage function and SUDS implementation. 5. This would have assisted access to Slinfold and protected surrounding residents from flooding.

		<p>6. No impact on the vast areas of greenfield spread throughout Slinfold Parish.</p> <p>a) The proposed development is on the boundary of Slinfold opposite the new Broadbridge Heath development.</p> <p>7. Plans were put forward when the Wickhurst development was under way.</p> <p>a) HDC considered any development would be premature until the adjoining Wickhurst Green project had completed.</p> <p>b) This is expected to be completed soon with the road infrastructure and houses now built.</p> <p>c) Its completion will in itself prove the excellent connectivity of this site to the new development as it is across the road.</p> <p>d) There are no major constraints on this site.</p> <p>e) The main body of the development will be 750m from the centre of Broadbridge Heath and hence connectivity issues may arise; there are no other comments, on any other issues that have now been raised in the draft SNP.</p> <p>f) The site is one bus stop away from Broadbridge Heath centre.</p> <p>g) There is an existing bus stop outside the site.</p> <p>h) All this is holding up a provision of 500 houses with 200 social houses, and social amenities.</p> <p>8. Central Government gave powers to Neighbourhood plans to assist in providing a solution to the housing crisis and fix the “UK Broken Housing Market”.</p> <p>9. The Government states “where houses are particularly unaffordable, local leaders need to take a long, hard honest look to see if they are planning for the right number of homes”.</p> <p>10. 77 houses over 16 years by any standard fall far short to have any impact on housing needs.</p>
Ref #20	Comment with modifications	<p>1. Southern Water welcomes the inclusion within Policy 3: Protection of Local Green Spaces of an exception for the provision of utility infrastructure within designated areas (should this be proven necessary). However, this designation is site specific and does not cover the remainder of Slinfold Parish. For example, it may be the case that additional wastewater treatment capacity at Slinfold Wastewater Treatment Works might be required over the life time of the Neighbourhood Plan in order to serve.</p> <p>2. This designation is site specific and does not cover the remainder of Slinfold Parish. It may be the case that additional wastewater treatment capacity at Slinfold Wastewater Treatment Works might be required over the life time of the Neighbourhood Plan in order to serve new development, or to meet stricter environmental standards. The NDP does not meet the basic conditions necessary for a Neighbourhood Development Plan, namely: to have regard to national policies and contribute to the achievement of sustainable development. A new policy should be added to ensure that the basic conditions are met, including having regard to the NPPF and NPPG. This policy should be:</p> <p>a) <i>‘New and improved water supply and water waste infrastructure will be encouraged and supported in order to meet the identified needs of the community, subject to other policies in the development plan’.</i></p>
Ref #21	Comment Policy 3	<p>1. General comments regarding protecting sport pitches and loss of playing fields, which do not mention specific points from within the plan.</p>

<p>Ref #22</p>	<p>Objection and comments</p>	<p>Objection to the plan making process and draws attention to inconsistencies during the process. It is considered there is conflict and contradictions between the emerging plan and published literature such as the Slinfold Conservation Area Leaflet and the Slinfold Design Statement. A request is made to remove Site End of West Way from the plan. Support is given to Hayes Lane with modifications.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Public Notice of Publication of the Slinfold Neighbourhood Plan issued by HDC and included, as “Public Notice”, within the downloadable documents listed on their website is incorrect in stating that: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) “Copies are also available for inspection between 7am and 5pm Monday to Friday at the Slinfold Village Store, The Street, Slinfold, Horsham, RH13 0RP and between 8am and 7pm on Saturdays and 8am to 2pm on Sundays” <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (I) The Village Stores are not open on Saturday afternoons. (II) When recently asked at the Village Stores for a copy of the published Plan, they were told that there were none available. 2. In their view – the Public Consultation held in Nov 2015 was biased in that the Feedback forms asked users to assess each site on certain criteria, while the display boards failed to disclose key relevant information. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) A number of residents attending the event stated that they found it difficult to assess the sites, because: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (I) There was insufficient information provided; (II) They did not feel competent to do so; (III) There was insufficient time to complete the forms with sufficient thought. (The forms had to be completed before leaving the exhibition and could not be returned later.) b) Residents were asked to score each site in a manner that even the NPWG had not done themselves. The scoring method was therefore untested. c) Many residents in fact ‘scored’ the sites not based on the specified criteria, but on whether they were in favour of the site and/or whether it affected them personally. d) Many residents also completed the scoring form in respect of only a few sites, yet when the scores were totalled, no account was taken of whether or not a score had been entered at all; i.e. a blank score was treated as a zero score, thus making the total scores meaningless. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (I) Yet those total scores were used to determine which development sites would be included in the Draft Plan. 3. Regarding: Foreword. The last paragraph on the first page states: “Fundamentally the centre of the Village has the majority of the facilities particularly ... bus stops ...” <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) This is factually incorrect. b) There are bus routes and bus stops on all through roads within the parish except Hayes Lane, Haven Road, Rowhook Road, & Bognor Road, Clemsfold. c) Hence most of the parish is well served by bus routes & bus stops. d) Therefore the reference to “bus stops” should be omitted.
-----------------------	-------------------------------	--

		<p>4. Regarding: Environment and Heritage</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) The current impression from the plan is that the earliest relevant history is 500-600 years later than reality. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (I) The parish contains two Roman Scheduled Monuments (II) Numerous Roman remains have been found in the parish b) The plan refers to “a number of manors within the Parish”, but fails to acknowledge the remains of “Manorial Strips”, which are referred to in the Parish Design Statement: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (I) “Of special interest are the fields to the east of the parish that form the ends of three narrow ‘Manorial Strips’ running down to West Chiltington”. c) The plan should be amended to include mention of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (I) The two Roman Scheduled Monuments (II) The Roman Road running right through the parish (Stane Street – A29) (III) The numerous Roman remains that have been found in the parish; and (IV) The ‘Manorial Strips’ in the context of “manors within the Parish”. (V) Additional Policies should be added to protect these sites. (VI) ‘Warnings’ should be included to alert people that there may be Roman remains present during development. (VII) Maps should be included to show all such designated and important historical sites. <p>5. Regarding: Paragraph 2.10. “... in the last half of the 20th century, the Village significantly expanded and increased almost ten-fold in size.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) The statement needs to be clarified to say whether “size” refers to population, housing/property, area or something else. <p>6. Regarding: Paragraph 2.12 & 5.1. “[There] was an increase of 172 houses in the 10 year period from 2001. This includes the development of Six Acres, approved in May 2001 and comprising a total of 56 dwellings.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Questions the correctness of this statement. b) Suggests that the figures are verified. c) Further Census data is given in para. 5.1 <p>7. Regarding: Paragraph 2.15, 2.22 & 8.3. The “Village Shop [incorporating the / including] Post Office)”. </p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) The Post Office has now been closed for several months. b) There is little likelihood of it being re-instated. c) The tenants of the Village Shop have expressed a desire not to re-open it but to use the space for other purposes. d) This statement needs to be reviewed at some stage. <p>8. Regarding: Paragraph 2.17. “The A29 runs through the Parish in a broadly southwest northeast direction, from Billingshurst to where it meets the A281.”</p>
--	--	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) This is factually incorrect. b) The A29 does not end. c) The A29 does not leave the Parish – at its junction with the A281. d) It is suggested that this is clarified and the description is corrected accordingly. e) Paragraph 7 also covers the same subject. <p>9. Paragraphs 4 & 4.9 – 4.11, which include objectives, intents and statements are directly contradicted by the inclusion of some of the proposed development sites.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Specifically Site PDS 9: End of West Way. b) And to a less extent, Site PDS 10: Crosby Farm. c) Both of those sites: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (I) “directly [abut] the Conservation Area”; (II) will severely impact on several “important views into and out of the Conservation Area” thus affecting “the rural setting and wider character of the Conservation Area.”; and on (III) “important views of the Conservation Area gained from the extensive network of ProW’s in the area” d) Site PDS 9 will involve “loss of [part of the Central] [F]ields to development [which] would not preserve or enhance the area’s special character”. e) It is suggested that Site PDS 9: End of West Way is removed from the Plan. <p>10. Regarding: Policy 1, Policy 3 and numerous other places</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) These Policies use the abbreviation “PDS” without introduction. b) Therefore the meaning of “PDS” should be explained. c) Either on first use (Policy 1) or earlier in the plan. d) A list of abbreviations and/or technical terms used in the Plan would be useful. <p>11. Regarding: Paragraphs 4.16 & 4.17. The original area proposed for designation as Local Green Space LGS1 is now considered to be “too extensive a tract of land”.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) The requirements for designation of land as ‘Local Green Space’ are set out in the Open Spaces and Local Green Spaces Background Paper accompanying the SNP. b) It is noted that that document lists 7 Appendices, none of which has been included in the documents published as part of this consultation. Specifically, the Correspondence with Horsham District Council (Appendix 7) has not been published. c) Failure to publish key documents prevents the public from commenting properly on the current Plan. d) Section 5 of that document refers to discussions with HDC and others which resulted in the removal of the southern part of the originally designated area. But no substantive reason has been given for that removal except that it is considered by HDC to be “too extensive tract of land to be appropriate as a Local Green Space”. e) That is clearly a subjective judgement, but Planning Guidance states:
--	--	---

		<p>f) Local Green Spaces may be designated where ... spaces are demonstrably special to the local community</p> <p>g) Local Green Space designation should only be used where the green area concerned is not an extensive tract of land. Consequently blanket designation of open countryside adjacent to settlements will not be appropriate.</p> <p>h) Both the Slinfold Conservation Area Leaflet and the Slinfold Design Statement, make it abundantly clear that the entirety of the 'Central Fields' are considered 'sacrosanct' by many local residents as the remains of former Common Land.</p> <p>i) The originally proposed wider scope for LGS1 is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (I) Demonstrably of local importance; (II) Not 'open countryside'; (III) Is not an extensive tract of land, being clearly well defined by existing boundaries. <p>j) It is suggested that the originally proposed scope of LGS1 should be reinstated (subject to the appropriate boundary corrections where parts of private gardens were inadvertently included).</p> <p>12. Regarding: Paragraph 4.22. This paragraph refers to "the designated Slinfold Stream and Quarry Site of Special Scientific Interest" and to "numerous pockets of defined Ancient and Semi Natural Woodland".</p> <p>a) It would be helpful if these items were identified on one or more maps as part of the Plan</p> <p>13. Regarding: Policy 5. This policy refers specifically to protecting "designated sites, protected species and ancient or species-rich hedgerows, grasslands and woodlands".</p> <p>a) None of these are designated in the Plan.</p> <p>b) Therefore how can the Parish Council or anyone else ensure that they are protected?</p> <p>c) The plan should include maps and/or another means of identifying at least the currently known sites and relevant locations.</p> <p>14. Regarding: Paragraph 5. The "Objectives" are number 5-8 for no apparent reason.</p> <p>a) If the Objectives are intended to follow on from those in paragraph 4, then the numbering should start at "6."; otherwise, the numbering should start at "1."</p> <p>b) It appears from later parts of the document that the numbering of the Objectives is intended to be cumulative, in which case, the numbering used in Sections 6, 7 & 8 (pages 28, 31 & 34) also need adjustment.</p> <p>15. Regarding: Policy 7. "Housing developments which provide a suitable mix of one, two and three bed dwellings to accommodate smaller households will be supported. This also includes centrally located level sites suited to the needs of older residents."</p> <p>a) This paragraph is grossly ambiguous</p> <p>b) The first sentence can be read as suggesting that any "Housing developments which provide a suitable mix of one, two and three bed dwellings to accommodate smaller households will be supported."</p> <p>c) It is not clear whether the second sentence ("This also includes ...") is intended to modify the first</p>
--	--	---

		<p>sentence as an additional condition; or whether it refers to a separate type of housing development that “will be supported”.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> d) Does this mean that “developments, which provide a suitable mix of one, two and three bed dwellings ... will be supported ONLY IF they are "centrally located level sites"? e) Or that f) Developments which are "centrally located level sites suited to the needs of older residents" will be supported IRRESPECTIVE OF whether they “provide a suitable mix of one, two and three bed dwellings”? g) It is suggested that this is clarified. <p>16. Regarding: Policy 8 – East of Hayes Lane</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) The current Policy proposes 15 housing units on this site, but there is no indication as to where that number comes from, although I know that some limitation arises from the five trees (along the road boundary) that are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (TPOs). HDC have suggested a Site Capacity of up to 30 units. b) The Parish Council comments suggest that they are staying with the proposed plan because of advice from HDC. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (I) In respect of several other sites, they are quite prepared to ignore the site & landscape capacities set out by HDC in the various HDC assessment documents. (II) It is quite contradictory to rely on HDC assessment for this site alone. c) Those units could still reflect the ‘style’ of the existing development on the western side of the road. d) It is understood that the existing residents would be more amenable to development further back in the field, with the Open Space towards the front of the field. <p>17. Regarding: Paragraph 5.27. “SPC are keen to ensure that over development of this site does and seeks to support an appropriate number ...”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Over development should be hyphenated. b) It appears that there is text missing in the part “over development of this site does”. c) Clarification of the intended meaning is required. <p>18. Regarding: Policy 9 – End of West Way. This proposal is contrary to recommendations and advice from the following document:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Appraisal of Potential Housing Sites at Slinfold, commissioned by the Parish Council, as regards: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (I) the capacity of the site for housing; (II) the importance of this being historic common land; (III) the importance of it constituting a green gap between Spring Lane and Hayes Lane; b) Slinfold Conservation Area Advice Leaflet, and c) Slinfold Parish Design Statement, as regards: the importance of maintaining the village’s central fields,
--	--	---

		<p>for historical reasons; because of the open views; their importance to the setting of the Conservation Area; and because of their uniqueness;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> d) Slinfold Parish Design Statement, expressly stating that “The fields at the centre of village ... must be retained”; e) Policy 6 of the Draft Plan specifically reaffirming the above; f) Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHELAA) from HDC, as regards: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (I) the difficulty of access through the junction with Hayes Lane; (II) the important contribution made by this area to the setting of Slinfold and its sensitivity to development; g) HDC's 2014 Landscape Capacity Assessment (see Attachment A6) (Landscape Study Area: SF1), states that this area: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (I) is “very sensitive to housing development”; (II) provides a “very important contribution to the village setting”; and (III) has a high visual sensitivity from adjoining residential properties”; (IV) has “a low/no capacity for small scale housing development” <p>19. Regarding: Policy item 9.6. “... will be supported where: ... Proposals create Public Rights of Way to enable access through LGS1.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) There is currently no formal public access to the site proposed as LGS1. b) The only current access to that site is through the car park of the Red Lyon and the field behind it, by permission of the landowners / tenant of the Red Lyon. c) Therefore amendment and/or clarification is required. <p>20. Regarding: Paragraph 5.28. “To the north and east are properties fronting The Street. To the northwest are properties in Tannery Close, and to the south-west and north is open land.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) It states “To the north ... are properties fronting The Street” and “to the ... north is open land”. b) This is self-contradictory. c) Amendment and/or clarification is required. <p>21. Regarding: Policy 10 – Crosby Farm. The proposals and policy now put forth are materially different in several respects from those put forward at the last public exhibition & consultation in November 2015.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) While it is appreciated that the current proposals need to be carefully worded, they would nevertheless permit a development that does not accord to the proposals on which the public previously voted. b) The proposals were originally presented as including suitable retirement properties for villagers and/or for disabled persons. c) The policy wording should reflect that, possibly using wording such as “with a focus on the elderly and disabled” d) The policy should be revised to meet the proposals and requirements on which residents originally voted. <p>22. Regarding: Policy item 10.3. “A suitable mix of dwelling type and sizes to meet the needs of current and future households is provided”.</p>
--	--	---

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) "current ... households" is unclear. b) There are no "current ... households" on the site. c) The reference to "future households" is meaningless unless one can predict what "dwelling type and sizes" future buyers will require. d) The policy should specify the desired type of housing in terms of, for example, property size (bedrooms, living rooms, etc.), or type of household for which they are intended (e.g. single person, couple, family, etc.) <p>23. Regarding: Policy item 10.7. "... will be supported where: ... Proposals create Public Rights of Way to link the site to existing Public Rights of Way".</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) That requirement is nonsense and meaningless because it is already met: The site (as shown on the Map/Plan of PDS10) already includes a public footpath along its northern boundary. That footpath is already "link[ed] ... to existing Public Rights of Way", namely, at its western end, to a PRow through the churchyard of St Peter's Church and, at its eastern end, to the public footpath leading northwards up the hill along the access track to Crosby Farm (formerly Rowfold Farm). <p>24. Regarding: Additional Policy item 10.x</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) There were originally proposals that a footpath should be provided from the southwest corner of this site along the western edge of the cricket ground to join up with the small footpath that currently runs between The Street and the cricket field. This proposal was linked to the proposal that this site should be particularly aimed at elderly & disabled people. Accessing the centre of the village (especially the shop & pub) would be shorter and easier using such a route rather than the more circuitous route from the Northwest corner of the site through the churchyard. b) Although such an access path is not within the gift of the proposed developers because it crosses the cricket field, but the provision of such a path could be linked to the specified facilitation of a new cricket pavilion. c) Therefore it is suggested that an additional policy item or modification of an existing one is implemented to specify that requirement. <p>25. Regarding: Paragraph 5.33. "[There are] ... currently ... two agricultural buildings in the northeast corner"</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) The "northeast corner" of the site is to the east of the access road/track, whereas the two agricultural buildings referred to are to the west of the access track, and north of them are buildings not included within the site. b) This needs amendment or clarification. <p>26. Regarding: Policy 11 – West of Spring Lane. The proposals for this site are contrary to the recommendations and assessments in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Appraisal of Potential Housing Sites at Slinfold, which was commissioned by the Parish Council b) When, at a meeting of the NPWG, it was pointed out that proposal for 10 units on this site was very different from the independent professional assessment commissioned by the PC, which suggested: c) Only 1-2 properties in very large plots, set back from Spring Lane might be feasible.
--	--	---

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> d) The response from the chairman was along the lines of “Once you’re building 2, you might as well build 10: there’s not much difference.” e) Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHELAA) from HDC f) Landscape Capacity Assessment (Landscape Study Area: SF1) from HDC g) The wording of the Policy does not reflect the proposals previously presented — and ‘voted’ on by — to the public, specifically that there would be: “a predominance of single storey dwellings in large plots”. h) Current policy states: “The houses are no more than two storeys in height ... “ i) Aim 4 of the Draft Plan proposes that Spring Lane should be designed by the highway authority as a ‘Quiet Lane’. That seems in contradiction to this proposal which would substantially increase the amount of traffic using the lane. <p>27. Regarding: Paragraph 5.36. “The site ... is bordered to the north by the built-up area boundary comprising residential properties that front Park Street.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) This reads as if “the boundary compris[es] residential properties” b) The residential properties” are not part of the “boundary”. <p>28. Regarding: Policy 12 – Cobblers</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Support <p>29. Regarding: Policy item 12.4</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) The references to “current and future households” may need review b) The policy should specify the desired type of housing in terms of, for example, terms of size, type of household, etc... <p>30. Regarding: Policy item 12.4 & Paragraph 5.41. Consideration should be given as to whether the references to “focus on the elderly” should also include “the disabled”.</p> <p>31. Regarding: Paragraph 7.1. “The A29 (Stane Street) which runs ...”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) This is not actually a sentence in that it contains no main verb. b) It should be part of the first sentence, with a colon after “through the Parish”. c) Therefore it should read: “There are three main roads which run through the Parish: the A29 (Stane Street) which runs ...” d) This paragraph covers much of the same ground as Paragraph 2.17, but differs in its description: e) Paragraph 7.1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (l) “The A29 (Stane Street) ... runs north south” f) Paragraph 2.17 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (l) “The A29 runs through the Parish in a broadly southwest northeast direction, from Billingshurst ...” <p>32. Regarding: Paragraph 7.2. “The Parish benefits from a public bus service ...”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) This is misleading b) It should be changed to read: c) The Parish benefits from several public bus services ...” <p>33. Regarding: Paragraph 7.10. “explore opportunities to improve public transport within the Parish”</p>
--	--	---

		<p>a) The word “within” should be changed to “throughout”.</p> <p>34. Regarding: Aim 7. “New housing development within the Parish will be supported ... where there is satisfactory capacity at Slinfold Primary School for the needs generated by the development”</p> <p>a) This is only an “aim”.</p> <p>b) Capacity at Slinfold Primary School has not previously been mentioned in connection with any of the proposed development sites.</p> <p>c) Clarification is required.</p>
Ref #23	Comment	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed allocations have been directed to the areas at the lowest probability of flooding and are all located within Flood Zone 1. It is not noted how wastewater will be dealt with. There is an expectation that sites should be connected to the mains foul sewer.
Ref #24	Support Policy 9 Policy 11	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Aim 4 includes the proposal to designate several roads in the parish as Quiet Lanes. Any proposal for this legal status should be supported by sufficient evidence. Without evidence this should be removed; if it is to be retained then it could be stated in a ‘community aspirations’ section. It Support is given to Policy 9 and Policy 11 as a walking and cycle link would be advantageous for future residents. The Joint Minerals Local Plan has been submitted for Examination, which includes policies on safeguarding minerals including Clay which underlays the parish of Slinfold. The overall level of development proposed in the Slinfold Neighbourhood Plan is in accordance with the forecast estimate of background traffic growth assumed in the Strategic Transport Assessment. The Strategic Transport Assessment indicates that there will be no severe impacts on the transport network that cannot be mitigated to a satisfactory level. The County Council considers that this provides sufficient evidence to justify the overall level of development proposed in the Slinfold Neighbourhood Plan. Therefore, it is not necessary to produce further transport evidence before allocating the sites proposed in the Neighbourhood Plan for Slinfold. As development takes place there will be a need for improvements and / or financial contributions to be secured towards the delivery of these improvements. It should be noted that site specific matters in the Neighbourhood Plan will need to be tested and refined through the Development Management process (through the provision of pre-application advice or at the planning application stage) or as part of a consultation for a Community Right to Build Order. Whilst the County Council supports the proactive approach undertaken to allocate sites in the Neighbourhood Plan.
Ref #25	n/a	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> No further comment. Reference is made to maximising biodiversity opportunity during the plan making process.
Ref #26	Objection Policy 10	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Objection to Crosby Farm. The view across the cricket pitch from Lyons Road is protected. Reference is made in relation to Jordans (Bucks) Cricket Club case study where housing is not permitted near a cricket club on the grounds of health and safety.
Ref #27	Objection Policy 3	<p>Objection to a number of proposed Local Green Space designations. They do not meet the requirements of the NPPF</p> <p>Comment on Policy 6. The policy and the Slinfold Parish Design Statement clearly set out the criteria under which the</p>

	<p>Policy 6</p> <p>Policy 8</p> <p>Policy 9</p> <p>Policy 10/11</p>	<p>design of new development will be assessed. This should also be read alongside the design policies and guidance set out in the HDPF</p> <p>Objection to Policy 8: East of Hayes Lane includes policy criteria, to not be more than two and a half storeys in height to reflect local vernacular. This criteria is not required within Policy 8 as this is already controlled by Policy 6 and this results in an overly restrictive policy in terms of design.</p> <p>Objection to Policy 6. End of West Way similarly includes a criteria for “<i>no more than two storeys in height to reflect local vernacular</i>”. This policy is overly restrictive and the design is already controlled by Policy 6.</p> <p>Policy 10: Crosby Farm and Policy 11: West of Spring Lane includes a similar unclear and overly restrictive policy criteria restricting building heights to two storeys.</p>
Ref #28	<p>Nov. 2015 Consultation</p> <p>Policy 8</p> <p>Policy 9</p> <p>Policy 10</p> <p>Para. 5.33 Policy 10.9</p>	<p>Replaces previous submission in July 2017 made by Ref. 22 As stated previously, the reference felt that information was being withheld during the consultation stage in November 2015 and resign from the steering group.</p> <p>Comments are grouped into: Procedural, Designated Housing Site, Other Substantive Issues and Editorial issues.</p> <p>Notes that Consultation Statement has changed ‘substantially’. With re-wording of the section on the November 2015 Consultation, with certain subsections from the following section moved into the Nov. 2015 comments. Arguing that important information was purposefully removed in the lead up to the consultation.</p> <p>A new Section 3. Designated Housing Sites has been given to previous and new arguments made: No indication where housing number of 15 comes from, comments on nearby TPOs (Tree Preservation Order), looks at HDC’s SHELLA (Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment) and makes suggestion to make remainder of site Local Green Space (LGS). HDC comments contradict Slinfold PC’s comments (3.1.3)</p> <p>Strongly opposes proposal as it is contrary recommendations and advice (3.2). Going against Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Appraisal, Slinfold Conservation Area Advice Leaflet, SPC Design Statement, Policy 6 of current Plan, SHELAA and HDC 2014 Landscape Capacity Assessment . The site proposes 18 houses from Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Appraisal with parts of the report’s summary withheld at the Nov. 2015 Consultation. This site will have an effect on Heritage (3.2.3) with close proximity to Conservation Area and within Village’s Central Fields, going against the PC’s Design Statement , the NPPF, Slinfold’s own Plan through Policy 2 and HDC’S 2014 site assessment.</p> <p>Supports policy with modifications (3.3). Notes the changes from what was originally proposed back in Nov. 2015 with increase in units (21-24), tenure, scale and lack of affordable homes. Also noting ‘current households’ as unclear as there aren’t any. Suggestions are made to describe desire type of housing and Public Rights of Way along site.</p>

		Amend/Clarification required. Amend/Clarification required.
	Policy 11	Oppose due to confliction with Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Appraisal of Potential Housing Sites at Slinfold, SHELAA and Landscape Capacity Assessment (Landscape Study Area: SF1) from HDC. This also looks at narrowness of Spring Lane potentially being effected up to 20 additional cars, thus contradicting Aim 4 of making Spring Lane being designed as a Quiet Lane. The scale was also changed after public vote on November 2015.
	Policy 12 Policy 12.4 Policy 12.4 & para. 5.42 Para. 2.8	Support with modifications. Policy should specify the desired type of housing in terms of, for example, terms of size, type of household, etc Consideration should be given as to whether the references to “focus on the elderly” should also include “the disabled”.
	Para. 4.23	Omit reference to bus stops. Include two Roman Scheduled Monuments. Fails to include Manorial Strips as referred to in Parish Design Statement. These historical areas need to be mentioned in paragraph 2.8
	Para. 2.12 & 5.1	Also fails to mention Roman Scheduled Monuments.
	Para. 4 & 4.9 – 4.11	Figures need to be verified and if there has been a BUAB change, this needs to be mentioned.
	Policy 3	Those objectives, intents and statements are directly contradicted by the inclusion of some of the proposed development sites — specifically Site PDS 9: End of West Way — and, to a lesser extent, Site PDS 10: Crosby Farm. Both of those sites: Site PDS 9 will involve “loss of [part of the Central] [F]ields to development [which] would not preserve or enhance the area’s special character”. Suggested improvements / modifications. Remove Site PDS 9: End of West Way from the Plan.
	Policy 7	Strongly oppose. It is stated in paras. 4.16 & 4.17 that the original area proposed for designation as Local Green Space LGS1 is now considered to be “too extensive a tract of land”. First, it is noted that that document lists 7 Appendices, none of which has been included in the documents published as part of this consultation. Specifically, the Correspondence with Horsham District Council (Appendix 7) has not been published. Failure to publish key documents prevents the public from commenting properly on the current Plan. Both the Slinfold Conservation Area Leaflet and the Slinfold Design Statement state that this should remain ‘common land’.
	Policy 9.6	Comment. This paragraph is grossly ambiguous. Clarification of the intended meaning is required.
	Aim 7: School Provision	Comment. There is currently no formal public access to the site proposed as LGS 1. What they could perhaps do is to facilitate such access on their side of the boundary between the two sites. Amendment and/or clarification is required.

		<p>Comment. Nevertheless, this “Aim” is unclear in several respects: Does the School currently have capacity for the needs generated by the Proposed Development Sites PDS 1 – 5? Is this Aim intended to apply to the development sites already proposed in this Plan? Does this mean that some of the currently Proposed Development Sites PDS 1 – 5 should be put ‘on hold’ if the School does not have sufficient capacity to accommodate the expected needs from those sites? This requirement needs to be made much clearer within the Plan. There needs to be assessments of the current capacity of the school, and of the projected additional capacity required by each of the proposed developments.</p> <p>Editorial issues are then brought up with Paragraphs 2.10, 2.15, 2.17, 2.22, 5.28, 5.29, 5.37, 7.1, 7.2, 7.10 and 8.3. Editorial issues are also found with Abbreviations and Numbering & Presentation of Objectives.</p>
Ref #29	Objection Policy 8	<p>Objection to Policy 8: Land east of Hayes Lane</p> <p>Objection to the inclusion of the land to the east of Hayes lane in the Neighbourhood Plan. The scheme for ribbon development along Hayes Lane is proposed without thorough consultation with the community. The Parish Council historically objected to a Taylor Wimpey application on the grounds of traffic, flooding, parking, sustainability, and ecological reasons but they have included the same site in the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>
Ref #30	<p>Support with Mods</p> <p>Policy 7</p> <p>Para 5.22 – 5.23</p> <p>Policy 10</p> <p>Policy 12</p>	<p>Policy 7: Housing Mix: SUPPORT SUBJECT TO AMENDMENT Insert the words “in appropriate locations.” at the end of the first sentence of Policy 7</p> <p>Paragraphs 5.22-5.23: Affordable Housing: SUPPORT SUBJECT TO AMENDMENT Insert additional sentence at the end of the paragraph, as follows: <i>“The Parish notes that there may be circumstances where new housing developments are delivering significant community infrastructure, such that exceptionally a reduced quantum of affordable housing will be considered acceptable”.</i></p> <p>Policy 10: Crosby Farm: SUPPORT SUBJECT TO AMENDMENT – provision for Scout Hut SUGGESTED CHANGE TO POLICY 10: CROSBY FARM: (ii) Delete the requirement to provide formal and informal open space (fourth point) as this is not justified given the scale of development, location of available open space, or consistent with other proposed housing allocations; (iii) Amend point 9 to read “In the event that land for the scout hut is not provided at Cobblers (under Policy 12), proposals include land east of PDS10: Crosby Farm for the scout hut.</p> <p>For clarification: SUGGESTED CHANGE TO POLICY 12: COBBLERS: (i) <i>Insert additional requirement to make provision for Scout Hut.</i> SUGGESTED CHANGE TO CROSBY FARM SITE ASSESSMENT:</p>

		<i>(i) The site should score a “no impact or neutral impact” and coloured yellow in relation to both rural character and biodiversity having regard to the above.</i>
Ref #31	<p>Objection to Policy 1</p> <p>Objection to Policy 3</p> <p>Housing Range</p> <p>Objection to SEA</p>	<p>Objection to Policy 1: Preventing Coalescence between Slinfold and Broadbridge Heath. Does not meet the basic conditions and does not bring further refinement of existing HDPF policy.</p> <p>Objection 3: Protection of Local Green Space. Two proposed LGS are not appropriate and should be deleted to allow proposed allocations to come forward flexibly.</p> <p>Comment on housing range. Limited scope for windfall development.</p> <p>There has been no assessment of the reasonable alternatives to the sites proposed. Each site has been assessed against the 12 sustainability objectives however from this assessment it is not clear which sites score the best against environmental effects. It is therefore unclear the reasons why the site selection or the reasons why some sites have been rejected for inclusion within the plan. Without this detail it could be suggested that the choices made have been done so on personal preference rather than based on proportionate robust evidence.</p>
Ref #32	<p>Objection to Plan Preparation</p> <p>Housing Delivery is inadequate and does not meet full OAN</p>	<p>The methodology employed by Slinfold Parish Council in selecting their housing site allocations within the draft NP is considered questionable. Ref. #32 wrote to Slinfold PC about this issue in June 2016, no reply was received. Given the voting process for site allocations appears to have been informed largely by the information presented at the exhibition held on 13-14th November 2015, there were significant inconsistencies and omissions with the way in which the sites were assessed and presented within the exhibition material and this unduly influenced the voting.</p> <p>The plan fails to meet the basic conditions (set out in Paragraph 8 of Schedule 4B in the Town and Country Act 1990). It is considered that the draft Neighbourhood Plan does not support sustainable and proportionate growth.</p> <p>The draft Neighbourhood Plan estimates an objectively assessed housing need should be increased, as the figure of 77 dwellings is insufficient. Modifications are offered by changes which involve removing Nowhurst Business Park (Policy 10) which had a residential allocation of 10no. dwellings and Bridge House Equestrian Centre (Policy 12) with 4no</p> <p>Slinfold Parish Council has adopted a cautious approach which could be out of step with the housing requirement figure set by central government going forward. To safeguard against this approach, the housing delivery position in the Neighbourhood Plan needs to be appropriately bolstered. Fladgate Farm should be a considered as a viable alternative.</p>
Ref #33	Objection General/Omission to Lower Broadbridge Farm	<p>Objection is made to omission of Lower Broadbridge Farm from the Slinfold Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>Lower Broadbridge Farm is considered to represent a suitable site for allocation for residential and employment uses within the Slinfold Neighbourhood Plan. The proposals for the site will deliver a range of benefits for the local and wider community and would enable the Neighbourhood Plan to meet its housing need and support further economic development within the Parish and District.</p>

Ref #34	Policy 8 Objection	Land east of Hayes Lane Ref 34 The sentence is incomplete....'proposes to allocate should continue to read '15 houses mirroring the houses opposite' in order to make sense. Objection to this development. Lack of a transparent consultation process and does not represent the community. Limit outreach to the local community.
Ref #35	n/a	No further comments
Ref #36	n/a	No further comments
Ref #37	Policy 9 Objection	Objection to Policy 9 End of Westway. No transparency to the plan making process and there are several errors to the consultation statement. The Neighbourhood Plan was drawn up by small working group and HDC and not by residents. The site is unsustainable with the SA flawed and should not be included in the Neighbourhood Plan. The site will ruin views and does not reflect the wishes of local residents. Lists Pros and Cons of development.
Ref #38	Objection to Policy 9 End of Westway	Objection to the development at the End of Westway. There is insufficient infrastructure to accommodate addition development in the village and in particular at the End of Westway (poor access). The beauty of Slinfold Village should be protected. Development should be directed to the larger settlements such as Broadbridge Heath.
Ref #39	Objection to End of Westway	Objection to End of Westway and Central Fields. Lack of consultation with the local community and lack of appropriate infrastructure to accommodate growth and development.
Ref #40	Comment	Slinfold Village is identified as medium sized village in the settlement hierarchy. There is an expectation that emerging neighbourhood plans are required to accommodate its fair proportion of the minimum 1,500 dwellings to be delivered from Neighbourhood Plans across Horsham in accordance with Policy 15 (4). Horsham District Council fully supports the retention of a viable scout hut in the village and any loss of such an amenity and associated infrastructure will be resisted without adequate re-provision in accordance with Policy 43 of the HDPF. Horsham District Council supports the principle of Local Green Space designations. It is acknowledged that a strict criterion must be satisfied before formal designation and every proposal put forward by the local community will be required to meet the criterion stipulated by Paragraph 77 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The designation of the strategic gap in any proposal map should be clear and appropriate taking into account landform, field boundaries and natural landmarks between settlements. Changes to the policy may be required to ensure conformity with the basic conditions.