

The following is a verbatim copy of all comments received from residents in response to the Draft Neighbourhood Plan consultation process.

We had 48 responses from residents. Of these 18 did not support the plan, 24 supported the plan and 6 either did not give an answer or said they would support if a one of the policies changed. Most respondents who supported the plan did not have any further comment to make and did not complete Part C.

PART C – General

Comments on general sections of the documents	Page and/or paragraph number	Comment	Suggested improvement
Resident 1			
Policy 11	n/a	<p>I have general comments on the inclusion of this site. I do not support this for several reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. No development south of the railway. It will adversely affect our views of the Downs and Lewes Council has already indicated they will not support any development south of this point.</li> <li>2. The 'thin end of the wedge'. I have no doubt once development rights are granted development will continue until here is a new large housing estate in this space. This cannot be allowed to happen.</li> <li>3. No access. The site does not even have access – why is it even included? What if you need to use a reserve site – you can't even use this site! The group's unwavering support for the racecourse site despite it not being proceedable seems rather suspicious.</li> <li>4. We don't have to destroy the views on the countryside to get a few parking spaces for goodness sake. Why can't folks use the playing field car park?</li> <li>5. By allowing this to happen (and it is not even logistically possible anyway) you will put another company out of business (Hill's)</li> <li>6. The racecourse is a nuisance neighbour with several complaints about it in progress with senior members of the environmental</li> </ol>	Remove the racecourse site from the plan henceforth and do not include it again.

		<p>health team at Lewes DC about appalling levels of noise from early in the morning to late at night (7am to 1am on a Sunday with banging, shouting, screaming, amplified bass music, rave music thundering through the village and even as far as East Chiltington!) and a lack of control over guest behaviour at their events. Quite how an estate of new homes will feel about this virtually in their living rooms is perplexing.</p> <p>7. The racecourse have several pie in the sky ideas about how to create access – including building a lift towering over people’s gardens, illuminating properties at night and removing any sense of privacy and affecting light (prohibited under a restrictive covenants for most properties in East View Fields), not to mention the noise issues this would cause, and the fact that an electronic lift is completely out of keeping with the local area. Bonkers, and it will never be given planning permission.</p> <p>8. My final comment is that I think there should be one large development, not several smaller ones. This will keep disruption to a minimum and hopefully prevent development ‘creep’ over time at the smaller sites.</p>	
<b>Resident 2</b>			
<b>Policy 7.4</b>	<b>48</b>	<p>Reference Policy 7.4 - The final sentence of the highlighted text <b><u>“2. be designed to avoid proximity of houses to existing properties along Station Road”</u></b></p> <p>The proposed layout is not compliant with the aims of the policy referenced above. Houses 1, 3, 4, 5, 6 have gardens backing directly onto existing properties in Station Road. (see attachment 1)</p> <p>Over 25% of the plot is given over to “Open Space”.</p> <p>There is enough space to for the developer to comply with this policy and create a significant buffer zone between existing properties and the development, thus minimising the visual and audible effects.</p>	<p>I have taken the existing proposed plan and redistributed the 6 new properties adjacent to Station Road. Part of the “open space” has been redistributed to provide a buffer zone to the existing residents. (see attachment 2 )</p> <p>The suggested layout is simply a cut and paste exercise, though it is to scale and demonstrates there is plenty of room for everyone to have space around them.</p> <p>I appreciate the commercial concerns mixing “affordable” with “premium” but there is room for all and it would not take too much effort for the architect to implement a much more sympathetic layout as it</p>

			effects existing residents.
<b>Resident 3</b>			
	<b>Page 42 Policy 7.1</b>	I do not think that Riddens Lane can cope with any more building. This is a narrow farm track used by some very large tractors and trailers and is thus not suitable for additional traffic calming measures as has been suggested and the concern about screening from the rest of the village has got to be a joke given that the new building in North Barnes Lane can be seen clearly from the National Park.	I am sorry, but I will oppose any development in Riddens Lane for the reasons given.
		I am appalled that the Steering Group would consider building in Riddens Lane. Access on to Station Road is already difficult and, as the village expands, will become more so. The shop is now the epicentre of Plumpton Green and attracts ever more traffic. The junction is on the brow of a hill, is close to other road junctions, bus stops, old people's flats and, most importantly, the primary school crossing.	I am sorry, but I will oppose any development in Riddens Lane for the reason given. There are other much less congested options.
		It is my understanding that two properties on the South side of Riddens Lane are suffering from subsidence and one has to be demolished. This may be due to alluvial silt in the Bevern Stream area or inadequate footings in the original building but I am still concerned that any new building on the South side of Riddens Lane might need to be pile driven to be sure of long term stability. Pile driving would have an impact on my property which is sufficiently close to the proposed site and would	I am sorry, but I will oppose any development in Riddens Lane for the reason given.

		be adversely affected. The same argument applies if speed humps are introduced as a traffic calming measure; I understand that this has already been proposed.	
<b>Resident 4</b>			
	<b>Page 42 Policy 7.1 Item 5.44</b>	<p>I am appalled that this site is still considered to be acceptable to the steering group despite the fact that Riddens Lane enters Station Road on the brow of a hill and this already busy and tricky junction is very close to the Primary School crossing. With the advent of further building in the village our only shop is destined to become ever busier which will only compound the traffic difficulties in this vicinity. I note that the Steering Group already recognise that there is often (my underlining) poor visibility at this junction and if that is the case why do they continue to promote the Riddens Lane site when there are much safer options?</p>	<p>I would urge the Steering Group to reconsider their opposition to the Nolands Farm site and thus remove some of the newly generated traffic away from the Riddens Lane junction.</p>
		<p>I am saddened that the Steering Group do not see fit to add the Nolands Farm site to the list of those sites supported by the SG. This site is surely a massive advantage to the village as a site which could provide almost all of our presently required allocation and it is central but just sufficiently removed from the most congested part of the village. It is also my understanding that LDC favour this site and I am very concerned that the owners will apply for and gain approval for development at this location, at some point, regardless of the SGs stated preferment. It would be outrageous if this were to occur and the properties then not count toward our allocation. Adoption of this site could also serve to concentrate development into the area East of Station Road and not disrupt the area in the vicinity of the village shop which is already heavily congested.</p>	<p>I would urge the Steering Group to reconsider their opposition to the Nolands Farm site.</p>

Resident 5			
	Page 4	<p>“maintain the ‘green gap’ to the north that is so important to many residents” – How many? Where is the evidence? How does this compare to preferences like “north-south” development which was rejected?</p>	<p>Include a section that provides an unfiltered summary of the raw survey responses. Then ensure “subjective” statements case be justified based on the survey results, e.g. (TBA)% people expressed a desire to “<i>maintain the ‘green gap’ to the north that is so important to many residents</i>” and 63% people expressed a preference for “North-South” development. The policy is therefore to... (complete as per the village’s stated preference).</p>
	Page 9 Section 1.7	<p>“In addition, PPC must be able to show that it has properly consulted local people and other relevant organisations during the process of making its Neighbourhood Plan and has followed the 2012 Neighbourhood Planning Regulations” The PCC and SG have patently failed to properly consult with local people. Examples include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ignoring survey results</li> <li>• Not responding to adequately to questions, e.g. various email sent by Mr &amp; Mrs *****</li> <li>• Disregarding historic evidence provided for Strollings and All Saints Church by Mr &amp; Mrs *****</li> <li>• SG changing the plan a short notice in March without consulting the village or PC</li> <li>• Overly economic recording of minutes, for example the minutes for PC meeting 13<sup>th</sup> June, do not reflect all the items raised in the meeting.</li> </ul>	N/A see comments
	Page 14 Section 3.2	<p>“Conserving and enhancing the historic environment (paragraph126);” Where is this actually addressed in the plan? Why is the Vicarage</p>	N/A see comments

		<p>and Glebe included as sites when they are major historic sites in the village?</p> <p>Why has the information that was provided by Mr &amp; Mrs ***** not been included?</p>	
	<p><b>Page 26</b> <b>Section 4.41</b></p>	<p>"For all these reasons, it was decided to review the site allocations and submit a revised draft plan for Regulation 14 consultation."</p> <p>Yes, but 4.38 and 4.39 merely state LDC preferences and as pointed out many times, but ignored / not minuted, these are LDC preferences and are NOT mandatory. The plan does not highlight or explain why LDC preferences are given greater weight than the village's own preferences.</p>	<p>The plan needs a specify the guiding principles and criteria and then needs to clearly demonstrate how those principles where applied to each included / rejected site. At the moment, the reasoning used to include /exclude specific sites is used in isolation and scattered haphazardly throughout the document. It is currently impossible to ascertain if the site selection process was applied holistically and coherently.</p>
	<p><b>Page 26</b> <b>Section 4.42</b></p>	<p>"A further significant factor in the decision to revise the plan was LDC's advice that it has to allocate 200 additional units across the district in its Local Plan Part 2 process. ... This meant reviewing some of the previously rejected sites to find substitutes for the withdrawn site and the racecourse, and to provide sites for some additional housing." Again, the plan has not explained why the plan includes the Vicarage/Glebe land (highly historic with only vague plans for development in 5+ years) over and above other sites that could be developed today.</p>	<p>The plan needs a specify the guiding principles and criteria and then needs to clearly demonstrate how those principles where applied to each included / rejected site. At the moment, the reasoning used to include /exclude specific sites is used in isolation and scattered haphazardly throughout the document. It is currently impossible to ascertain if the site selection process was applied holistically and coherently.</p>
	<p><b>Page 28</b> <b>Section 5.2</b> <b>Point 4</b></p>	<p>"to conserve and enhance the historic environment of the parish including its archaeological interest using the Historic Environment Record and East Sussex Record Office as the primary evidence base;" Mr &amp; Mrs ***** provided the SG with copious historic information about Strollings, the Vicarage, and Glebe land. This information has also been provided to Historic Environment</p>	<p>The new information needs to be acknowledged and included in the plan. The plan needs to remove the Vicarage/Glebe site OR at least explain why this historic site has been included despite the alleged objective being to preserve historic assets.</p>

		Record and East Sussex Record Office. The SG have not acknowledged receipt of this information. The information has not been included in the plan. The matter was raised at the PC meeting on 13 <sup>th</sup> July 2017 but not actioned or minuted.	
	<p><b>Policy 1</b> Section 5.9</p> <p>(DO NOT SUPPORT)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed plan of 3 adjoining sites (albeit with screening) does not meet the “small medium” criteria</li> <li>• How many people expressed a desire for “maintaining green gaps to the north and south of the village”?</li> <li>• There is marginal benefit to the village in having green spaces on the outskirts of the village that are adjacent to vast tracts of green space. It would be far better to allocate the green space in the centre of the village where they will benefit a far larger number of people.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Avoid adjoining sites / creating “super-sites”</li> <li>• Move green space to the centre of the village where they will benefit a far larger number of people</li> </ul> <p>Or at least...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Explain why green space on the outskirts of the village adjacent to vast tracts of green space is so beneficial</li> </ul> <p>In addition, the plan should explicitly highlight that 2 members of the SG live near the sites that were rejected for development but proposed as protected green areas. To quote the Plumpton Parish code of conduct, Prejudicial Interest generally should be declared if 10(1)(b) “(b) the interest is one which a member of the public with knowledge of the relevant facts would reasonably regard as so significant that it is likely to prejudice your judgement of the public interest”. Certainly, as an impacted member of the public, I would regard non-disclosure as significant in this case.</p>
	<p><b>Policy 5</b> Section 5.21</p>	Any development in-and-around the Vicarage, cemetery, etc. fails the following criteria: <i>“The distinctive views of the surrounding countryside that are enjoyed from the many public vantage points in and around Plumpton Green should be protected and preserved.”</i>	Remove Vicarage and Glebe land from the plan
	<p><b>Policy 7</b></p>	The policy does not define any requirements for minimum distances and screening to protect existing housing from any new development.	The policy needs to define requirements for minimum distances and screening to protect existing housing from any new

			development.
	<b>Policy 7</b> Section 5.34	<p>“...Therefore, it is possible that some of these additional 200 homes could be allocated on sites in the parish. LDC has not made any decision to date on this matter, but has advised the PPNP Steering Group that allocating sites for more than the minimum required would put us in a stronger position to guide development in our parish up to 2030.”</p> <p>I believe this advice is verbal only and there is no guarantee it will prevent LDC or other windfall development. Especially given the unclear and unstated approach to site selection and rejection.</p>	<p>As suggested to SG and PC previously... Reduce the proposed number to the minimal amount required and remember to include the houses already built. Over-allocating will not protect the village if a developer pushes another site, especially if some of proposed sites are not readily available.</p>
	<b>Policy 7.3</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ignores the historic importance of the site</li> <li>• Fails to meet the requirement 5.21 “The distinctive views of the surrounding countryside that are enjoyed from the many public vantage points in and around Plumpton Green should be protected and preserved.”</li> <li>• Does not mention that the Diocese do not have any concrete plans to develop the site. Any development will be at least 5 years away</li> </ul>	<p>Acknowledge All Saints church, cemetery and war memorial as important heritage assets and remove the Vicarage/Glebe site from plan accordingly</p>
	<b>MISSING</b>	Where is the historic policy?	<p>A historic policy needs to be added and needs to include the relevant information on Strollings, Vicarage and Glebe land as provided by Mr &amp; Mrs *****</p>
	<b>Section 13</b> Page 61  <b>DO NOT SUPPORT</b>	<p>The inclusion on protected green spaces on the outskirts of the village that border vast tracts of green space is questionable and wasted opportunity.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Move green space to the centre of the village where they will be benefit a far larger number of people</li> </ul> <p>Or at least...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Explain why green space on the outskirts of the village adjacent to vast tracts of green space is so beneficial</li> </ul>

			<p>and in addition...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the plan should make it clear, that 2 members of the SG live near the sites that have been rejected for development but proposed as protected green areas. To quote the Plumpton Parish code of conduct, Prejudicial Interest generally should be declared if 10(1)(b)“the interest is one which a member of the public with knowledge of the relevant facts would reasonably regard as so significant that it is likely to prejudice your judgement of the public interest”. It is reasonable to assume that failure to disclose this information would be construed in a poor light by most people.</li> </ul>
<b>Resident 6</b>			
		<p>I support the concept of a Steering Group and of a Neighbourhood Plan – however, I am very concerned about the basis on which judgements are being made on the most suitable plots to build on, and the apparent limited restrictions being put in place for any new developments. Individual Landowners should not be able to influence the Steering Group, and judgements should be made on the overall best interest of Plumpton Green, which has been chosen by residents as a small rural community.</p> <p>The wording describing the total number of additional properties being built in Plumpton needs to be restricted. At the moment it refers to a minimum number – this is extremely dangerous and could see Plumpton being unfairly and disproportionately grown. A maximum number of new dwellings should be considered and noted</p>	
<b>Policy 1</b>	30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is not appropriate to restrict developments to the ‘centre of the village’ when the village itself does not cover a great geographical area</li> <li>This unnecessary high concentration in a small section of the village puts pressure on surrounding existing residential properties</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reconsider 2,3,4,5, 9 and 10. No valid justification for exclusion has been given. All are still within very reasonable walking distance of village amenities.</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The village itself extends from The Plough PH to beyond the station – it does not seem sound judgement to not cover the whole area</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No reference is made to why sites 2, 3, 4, 5, 9 and 10 have been removed from consideration. Site 9 would provide enhanced benefit compared to site 8, as would not involve removing a vibrant local business nor be adjacent to other sites, which creates a ‘super-site’ against the small development only principles of the plan.</li> <li>• Site 3 and 5 provide excellent opportunities for development and appear not to contradict any of the policies set out. These should therefore be included.</li> </ul>
<b>Policy 2</b>	<b>31</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Point 5 states that “where development sites are adjacent, maintain a clear separation between them by means of a green landscape buffer”. Initial plans shown by the architect for 7.4 shows a number of new properties directly bordering existing properties – severely impacting the privacy of a number of existing Plumpton Green residents.</li> <li>• Reference is made to helping to “retain the rural character of the village” – yet building houses directly overlooking existing properties, as in planned in 7.4 contravenes this.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider sites that do not bear such a significant impact on existing residents</li> <li>• Specific details should be given to any construction companies to outline a minimum of 10 meter landscape screening – with reference to mature plants that provide instant screening and protection for any local residents impacted by new developments.</li> <li>• Layouts of any new developments should take into consideration any existing residents that are affected and ensure that new housing is laid out in a sympathetic manner to ensure minimal impact. Preference should not be given to Landowners who are building their own property on the site!</li> </ul>
<b>Policy 5</b>	<b>34</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reference to landscape screening is too minimal – need to build in more protection for local residents</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure all new properties developments do not directly overlook / existing residential properties. Respect to be given to existing levels of privacy.</li> <li>• Screening to include mature plants that provide instant screening, protecting existing residents.</li> </ul>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Minimum of 10 metre buffer zone to be put in place to prevent ‘town feel’ of houses backing directly onto one another. Careful selection of sites should mean that impact on existing residents can be kept to a minimum.</li> </ul>
<b>Policy 7</b>	<b>Item 4</b> (Page 39)	It is not clear why housing needs to be clustered around the village centre. The village amenities are spread from the Plough PH, through the old brickworks to the Station / Playing Field (and arguably the Half Moon PH) and therefore there is no justification for clustering housing around the centre.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reference to housing being clustered around the village centre should be removed.</li> <li>• All identified sites are within a reasonable walking distance from village amenities, and arguably building north of the village would have positive impact on businesses positioned within this vicinity eg: The Plough Pub</li> </ul>
<b>Policy 7</b>	<b>Item 7</b> (Page 39)	The screening requirements for new developments must be much more specific and include a set screening distance.	Add landscape screening to be a minimum of 10 meters, and be mature planting not something that will take 5+ years to take effect.
<b>Policy 7.3</b>	<b>Page 46</b>	This site clearly does not meet the flooding concerns defined in section 4.19, does not spread the development evenly around the village defined in section 4.20.	Site 7 should be removed from consideration and replaced with sites 3, 5 or 9 (see Map 3 comments)
<b>Policy 7.4</b>	<b>Page 48</b>	<p>This inclusion of this site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does not protect view and green spaces referred to in section 4.7.</li> <li>• Congregates development in one location, which contradicts the feedback in section 4.20 (development spread evenly around the village).</li> <li>• Does not deliver to the ambitions of 69% of respondents (section 4.28) and in fact does the complete opposite and will force an existing business to cease trading.</li> <li>• From the outline plans shared by Cala Homes at the open event, this has not been designed to avoid proximity to the existing properties</li> </ul>	Site 8 should be removed from consideration and replaced with sites 3, 5 or 9

		along Station Road. In fact the proposed design aligns properties to overlook the gardens of existing properties significantly altering the privacy of existing housing which has no natural screening currently.	
<b>Policy 8</b>	<b>Page 52</b>	This policy states that the loss of existing employment or business use will be resisted. The inclusion of Policy 7.4 as a favoured site completely contradicts this and will close a vibrant local business.	Site 8 should be removed from consideration and replaced with sites 3, 5 or 9
<b>Policy 9</b>	<b>Page 53</b>	See Policy 8	
<b>Resident 7</b>			
		<p>I have provided below some specific points in relation to the sections of the document but would like to highlight some broader concerns with the plan as proposed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It fails to deliver on the vision it sets out.</li> <li>• A 'minimum' target makes the document worthless. A 'maximum' needs to be agreed with LDC.</li> <li>• It has simply reiterated the site allocations set out by Lewes, in fear of the now over-turned situation that happened in Newick in relation to Micklewood Farm.</li> <li>• The justification for the inclusion and exclusion of each site is in some cases non-existent and in other cases very weak.</li> <li>• It is entirely focused on housing location, and does not address the shortage of recreational space, broader village infrastructure nor house styling.</li> <li>• It fails to protect existing residents with suitably robust controls.</li> <li>• No timing is set out for development.</li> </ul> <p>Overall, I do not consider the plan to be cohesive, consistent nor robust and in its current form is blank cheque to developers and landowners to over develop the village in</p>	

		a short time frame without robust controls.	
<b>Foreward</b>	<b>4</b>	<p>Maintain the 'green gap' to the north that is so important to so many.</p> <p>The plan doesn't deliver any additional 'Local Green Spaces', and in fact does the opposite by adding additional strain on the existing green spaces, and in particular recreational space.</p> <p>The plan does not protect important community assets – namely the garage Brighton Garage Services nor does it offer these local businesses the support they need to grow. The inclusion of site 7.4 does the complete opposite to this and will close it down!</p>	<p>The proposed sites to the north of the village whilst shrinking the 'green gap' still leave a considerable gap. It should also be quantified how many object to this compared to those that didn't object. These sites should remain under consideration within the plan. At least one of the sites proposed should include additional recreational space.</p> <p>The inclusion of policy 7.4 should be reconsidered.</p>
<b>Joint Core Strategy</b> (Local Plan Part 1)	<b>3.8</b>          <b>3.9</b>	<p>The number of net additional units should be a maximum not a minimum, otherwise this essentially become a 'blank cheque' to an unlimited number of dwellings which would contravene everything that the policy sets out to achieve.</p> <p>The 200 net additional units need to be allocated to settlements across the district should be challenged.</p>	<p>The word 'minimum' should be replaced by the word 'maximum'.</p> <p>The NP Steering Group need to challenge LDC on their proposals on how these houses are allocated.</p>
<b>Policy 5, item 6</b>	<b>Item 6</b> (Page 36)	The screening requirements for new developments must be much more specific and include a set screening distance and details of the nature and timing of screening being introduced.	Add landscape screening to be a minimum of 10 meters, and be mature planting that provides near instant screening.
<b>Policy 7</b>	<b>Item 4</b> (Page 39)	It is not clear why housing needs to be clustered around the village centre. The village amenities are spread from the Plough PH, through the old brickworks to the Station / Playing Field (and arguably the Half Moon PH) and therefore there is no justification for clustering housing around the centre.	Reference to housing being clustered around the village centre should be removed.
<b>Policy 7</b>	<b>Item 7</b> (Page 39)	The screening requirements for new developments must be much more specific and include a set screening distance.	Add landscape screening to be a minimum of 10 meters, and be mature planting not something that will take 5+

			years to take effect.
<b>Map 3</b>	<b>Page 41</b>	<p>No reference is made to why sites 2, 3, 4, 5, 9 and 10 have been removed from consideration. Site 9 would provide enhanced benefit compared to site 8, as would not involve removing a vibrant local business nor be adjacent to other sites, which creates a 'super-site' against the small development only principles of the plan.</p> <p>Site 3 and 5 provide excellent opportunities for development and appear not contradict any of the policies set out. These should therefore be included.</p>	<p>Reconsider sites 3, 5 and 9. Provide details of why sites have been excluded.</p>
<b>Policy 7.3</b>	<b>Page 46</b>	<p>This site clearly does not meet the flooding concerns defined in section 4.19, does not spread the development evenly around the village defined in section 4.20.</p>	<p>Site 7 should be removed from consideration and replaced with sites 3, 5 or 9 (see Map 3 comments)</p>
<b>Policy 7.4</b>	<b>Page 48</b>	<p>This inclusion of this site:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Does not protect view and green spaces referred to in section 4.7.</li> <li>b. Congregates development in one location, which contradicts the feedback in section 4.20 (development spread evenly around the village).</li> <li>c. Does not deliver to the ambitions of 69% of respondents (section 4.28) and in fact does the complete opposite and will force an existing business to cease trading.</li> <li>d. From the outline plans shared by Cala Homes at the open event, this has not been designed to avoid proximity to the existing properties along Station Road. In fact the proposed design aligns properties to overlook the gardens of existing properties significantly altering the privacy of existing housing which has no natural screening currently.</li> </ol>	<p>Site 8 should be removed from consideration and replaced with sites 3, 5 or 9 (see Map 3 comments)</p>
<b>Policy 7.5</b>	<b>Page 50</b>	<p>This site has very poor access, on to a dangerous section of Plumpton Lane. Alternative means to access need to be considered for this site to stand.</p>	<p>This site should be reconsidered.</p>

<b>Policy 7.6</b>	<b>Non-Existant</b>	These policies should cover the other sites previously included and now excluded from the plan to explain the justification of their exclusion. They cannot simply be removed without explanation.	There needs to be transparency of these sites and how they stack up against the evaluation criteria.
<b>Policy 8</b>	<b>Page 52</b>	This policy states that the loss of existing employment or business use will be resisted. The inclusion of Policy 7.4 as a favoured site completely contradicts this and will close a vibrant local business.	Site 8 should be removed from consideration and replaced with sites 3, 5 or 9 (see Map 3 comments)
<b>Policy 9</b>	<b>Page 53</b>	See Policy 8	
<b>Resident 8</b>			
<i>Do not support</i>	1.6	This response form shows that the draft 2017 PPNP does not meet the basic conditions of neighbourhood plans.	The 2017 PPNP needs amending to be consistent with national and local planning policy and promote the principles of sustainable development.
Do not support	1.7, 4.1,4.37-4.39	<p>The 2016 draft PPNP was the product of three years of consultation with residents and statutory consultees and it gained overwhelming approval via the Reg 14 consultation.</p> <p>Paras 4.37-4.49 cite that the reason the 2016 PPNP site allocations were changed was because LDC in its Reg 14 response didn't approve the northern sites. This is LDC's actual Reg 14 response: <i>'The district council does have some concerns over the loss of the green gap between the village and the farm to the north and the distance to village services, as evidenced in the SHLAA, however it is acknowledged that this site reflects the parish resident's aspirations for linear growth of the village over the plan period and that efforts have been made to overcome these concerns and so the policy supported.'</i></p> <p>The northern sites are also classed as <i>'Developable'</i> and <i>'Achievable'</i> in LDC's 2016 SHLAA.</p> <p><i>The draft 2017 PPNP does not meet its own Terms of Reference.</i></p>	<p>Return to the sites allocated in the draft 2016 PPNP. Plumpton and the villages that surround it are geographically and historically linear and residents and LDC over a three-year consultation period supported a small proportion of linear development in the north.</p> <p>Begin the consultation process again. There has been no prior consultation with residents of the sites for the 2017 PPNP and so it does not meet NPPF Requirements of Neighbourhood Plans.</p> <p>The PPNP 2017 does not meet NPPF terms of reference for Neighbourhood Plans. For example, the vast majority of the current PPNP SG and PPC own houses/land adjacent to the rejected sites or Green Spaces and this has not been openly declared.</p> <p>The 2017 PPNP SG has not met its own terms of reference regarding transparency. There is evidence of non-quotate decisions being made, no minutes, private meetings and decisions being made by the SG</p>

	<i>General notes</i>		<p>without PPC's approval.</p> <p>Some sites were rejected based on Viability reports however not all sites were tested to see if they were financially viable/sustainable. Most sites were not visited by the SG to see their suitability and impact on neighbouring properties. The same selection procedure needs applying to all sites equally to see if they are financially viable/sustainable/suitable before submission to a further Reg 14 consultation.</p>
<b>Do not support</b>	<b>2.1</b>	<p>This historical Evidence report was according to its author David Millum 'compiled based on the sites allocated in the draft 2016 PNNP'. Since then a study of the history of All Saints Church, its burial ground, its war memorials, The Rectory and adjacent properties has been conducted and sent to PPNP SG, PPC, Historic England, ESCC HER, SDNPA, LDC prior to the formal adoption of the draft 2017 PPNP by PPC, yet there is no reference to it. Contrary to NPPF para 126 guidelines there is no Policy on heritage or historic environment.</p>	<p>NPPF Historic environment 169 states '<i>Local planning authorities should have up-to-date evidence about the historic environment in their area and use it to assess the significance of heritage assets and the contribution they make to their environment. They should also use it to predict the likelihood that currently unidentified heritage assets, particularly sites of historic and archaeological interest, will be discovered in the future.</i>' To meet NPPF guidelines the 2017 PPNP needs to redo its Historical Evidence Report to include the evidence that was sent to the SG and PPC regarding the history of All Saints Church, its burial ground, its war memorials, The Rectory and adjacent properties.</p> <p>Create a Policy in the PPNP 2017 on heritage or historic environment.</p>
<b>Do not support</b>	<b>Policy 1</b>	5.9	<p>The 2017 PPNP does not provide small to medium clusters which are sustainable and enhance the existing character of the village as Policy/site 7.2, 7.3 and 7.4 are adjacent and provide a cluster of 52 units which is almost the whole of LDC's allocation. Site 9 was rejected as being too big with 50 units. The same principle must be applied to the above sites with the one in the middle 7.3 being removed. Sites to the</p>

			<p>North and South were preferred by residents and statutory consultees over three years of consultation as evidenced in the 2016 PPNP Reg 14 consultation.</p> <p>Any development of Policy/site 7.3 would not conform to Policy CT1 Planning Boundary and Key Countryside Policy and would not be in line with Policy SP1 and SP2 of the LDC JCS.</p>
<b>Do not support</b>	<b>Policy 2</b>	<p>Summary Panel</p> <p>5.13</p> <p>5.14</p> <p>5.15</p>	<p>States <i>'new development will...complement the architectural and historic character of the surrounding area.'</i> Any development of Policy/site 7.3 would not meet this policy requirement.</p> <p>States <i>'every effort should be made to maintain local habitats, ancient woodlands and hedgerows which in turn sustain wildlife corridors.'</i> Any development of 7.3 would not meet this Policy requirement.</p> <p>Maintain a clear separation between adjacent sites. Policies/sites 7.2, 7.3, 7.4 are not significantly separated by green space. Site 7.3 needs removing from PPNP 2017 to create this clear separation.</p> <p>Any development of Policy/site 7.3 would not meet retained Policy ST3, ST11 and CP10 Natural Environment and Landscape Character of the LDC JCS or Policy CP8 Green Spaces. It would also not meet NPPF guidance on building on residential gardens.</p>
<b>Do not support</b>	<b>Policy 3 &amp; 6</b>	5.16	<p>The 2016 Reg14 response from Southern Water warned PPNP SG that <i>'a complete upgrade of waste water/sewage removal'</i> will be needed if any more houses are built in Plumpton Green. The main sewer</p>

			<p>pipe runs the length of the village down the main road and was built in early 1900s for less than 100 houses. All current houses in Plumpton Green feed into this pipe and due to its age and size it is constantly blocked and needs urgent repair. (SW has a log of call outs). To simply put the onus on developers to provide their own piping to feed into this current system is ignoring the advice of Southern Water and will overburden a system which has is already working at full capacity and is not coping.</p> <p>The draft 2017 PPNP has ignored the advice of Southern Water and does not meet policy CP7 Infrastructure of the LDC JCS.</p>
<b>Do not support</b>	<b>Policy 5</b>		<p>Any development of Policy / site 7.3 would not meet the requirements of retained Policy ST3 Design, Form and Setting of Development and ST11 Landscaping of Development of the 2003 LDC LP and Policy CP10 Natural Environment and Landscape Character of the LDC JCS. Policy CP8 Green Infrastructure or NPPF para 118.</p>
<b>Do not support</b>	<b>5.2</b>	<p>This Biodiversity Evidence report is based on the sites included in the 2016 PPNP. Since then a study of the biodiversity of All Saints Church, its burial ground, its war memorials, The Rectory and adjacent properties has been conducted and sent to PPNP SG and PPC.</p>	<p>To meet NPPF guidelines include the evidence that was sent (via email on 10th June) to PPNP SG and PPC regarding the biodiversity of All Saints Church, its burial ground, its war memorials, The Rectory and adjacent properties.</p>
<b>Do not support</b>	<b>Policy 7</b>	<p>No mention is made of a need to preserve sites of historical importance. To comply with NPPF para 126 PPNP needs to <i>'have a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment. In doing so, it should recognise that heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource and conserve them in a manner appropriate to their significance.'</i></p> <p>To comply with para 141 the PPNP SG should make information about the significance of the historic environment gathered as part of plan-</p>	<p>The 2017 PPNP needs to include a Policy on protecting heritage assets and the historic environment. The PPNP needs to make the four reports that it was sent in early 2017 on the History and Biodiversity of All Saints church, its Burial Ground, its War Memorials, the Rectory and its garden, and Strollings public and add it to its Evidence base. The PPNP SG then needs to consult with residents as to whether the whole area is</p>

		<p>making or development management publicly accessible. It should also require developers to record and advance understanding of the significance of any heritage assets to be lost (wholly or in part) in a manner proportionate to their importance and the impact, and to make this evidence (and any archive generated) publicly accessible.</p> <p>The Glebe- it is not just the glebe land.</p>	<p>designated as a Conservation area or Green Space.</p> <p>See also improvements to paras 5.56 &amp; 5.57.</p>
7.3		<p>There are no listed buildings in the vicinity The site may require demolition of the Rectory. The site will affect a number of adjoining properties.</p>	<p>Add 'The Rectory, and Rectory garden' to the title.</p> <p>The Rectory and garden is being used by the Rector for the next 5 years plus. This needs adding to the text.</p>
5.57		<p>Access would be on Station Road with a point of good visibility.</p>	
5.58		<p>There is a presence of protected species and ancient trees and hedges. There are three TPOs, two at the site entrance.</p>	<p>Add '<i>All Saints Church, its war memorials and burial grounds, The</i></p> <p>Rectory and adjacent property form one of the most important groups of heritage assets in Plumpton Green. Applications are in process for these and their curtilage to be Listed by Historic England. In addition, applications have also been made to ESCC/SDNPA/LDC for the site to be <i>given non-designated heritage status.</i>'</p>
5.59 & 5.61			<p>Add '<i>where the traffic does not naturally slow down</i>' as in the 2016 site assessment report. Add '<i>If this site is developed there will be entrances to four housing</i></p>

	5.61	<p>There is no evidence of archaeological interest</p> <p>Natural screening should be preserved and steps taken to mitigate the effects of development and wildlife and biodiversity.</p> <p>Development of the site would need to conform to Policies 2-6.</p>	<p><i>developments within close proximity of each other.'</i></p> <p><i>Amend to say 'This site has the highest concentration of ancient trees and hedges out of all the proposed sites which would have a significant effect on current wildlife.'</i></p> <p><i>'Any development of this site would mean there is nowhere for the wildlife to migrate to/move freely as the site is situated in the middle of 7.2 and 7.4 development/ sites.'Retaining the natural screening would make the development unviable as the root structure of the current trees/hedges would be compromised, making them unstable.'</i></p> <p><i>Add 'Access to this site would require the removal of two TPOs which goes against PNNF Policy 118'.</i></p> <p>This is not true. PPNP SG and PPC have been given documentation on the History and Biodiversity of All Saints church, its Burial Ground, its War Memorials, the Rectory and its garden, and Strollings and there is significant historical interest.</p> <p>Had the PPNP SG and PPC visited the site they would have seen that the natural screening comprises extremely large oak trees and ancient hedges- any damage to their roots would make them unstable. If they are to be retained it would make the site financially unviable. There would be no way of mitigating the effects on wildlife as there would be no natural corridor for them to migrate.</p>
--	------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

			<p>Amend to say that the development of the Rectory and garden and the glebe land does not meet the requirements of PPNP Policy 3.2 or NPPF para 109, conserving and enhancing the natural environment and para 126 conserving and enhancing the historic environment or NPPF para 118.</p> <p>Any development of this site would not meet PPNP 2017 4.12, 4.17, 4.20 (1), 5.2 (1), 5.2 (3), (4), (7), and Policy 5.4 and 5.5. or 5.13</p> <p>In addition, development of this site would not meet LDC's JCS 2016 Policies 10 &amp;11 to conserve the cultural heritage of the area.</p> <p>This site was rejected in the 2016 PPNP and should be rejected also within the PPNP 2017 as any development of it would be against local, regional and national planning guidelines.</p> <p>This site should be assessed as being a potential site to be designated as a green space for the reasons specified in the section below.</p>
<p><b>Do not support</b></p>	<p><b>Policy 13</b></p>	<p>LGS5</p> <p>LGS 5,6 and 7</p>	<p>No specific survey of landowners or residents as to which sites they would prefer LGS designation has been conducted as advised in para 77 NPPF.</p> <p>Is an 'extensive tract of land' which NPPF para 77 specifically says should not be designated as a local green space. The evidence to support this in the 'PPNP Local Green Space' report has been somewhat misappropriated.</p> <p>These sites were included as being potential developments in the 2016 PPNP &amp; LDC 2016 SHLAA</p>

		Additional/replacement LGS- Policy 7.3	<p>and were considered acceptable by the majority of residents and statutory consultees so it is surprising to see them now as Local Green Spaces.</p> <p>Policy/ site 7.3 should be considered for designated as a green space as it meets a significant number of criteria as specified within NPPF para 77.</p> <p>By being designated a LGS it would provide a natural corridor to wildlife which will have been displaced by 7.2 and 7.4 as well as preserving Plumpton Green’s most valuable listed heritage assets.</p> <p>Part of the site should automatically be designated as it contains a cemetery. It would make sense to also include the Church, its war memorials, the Rectory and its garden within this LGS.</p> <p>The Report that the PPC and PPNP SG has on the History and Biodiversity of All Saints church, its Burial Ground, its War Memorials, the Rectory and its garden, and adjacent buildings needs making public and residents consulted as to whether they agree that it should become a LGS.</p>
<b>Resident 9</b>			
Section 2 Assessment Process	Page 4, Para 1, Parish Quest ...	<p>“There was strong support (87%) for pockets of small-scale development between 10 &amp; 20 units, in keeping with development in the last 100 years.</p> <p>Misleading – EVF 68 Units, Woodgate Meadow 30+, West Gate 25+</p>	
Section 3 Site Assessments	Page 10 Site 1	<p>The junction by the village shop is a major hazard, the worst junction in the village. The document says “there is poor visibility at the brow of the hill approaching Riddens Lane from the north” There is also poor visibility from the south. There is parking at the side of the shop which is</p>	<p>This site should be removed. The access is not safe and the plan gives no detail for any scope for safe access at the Station Road junction.</p>

	Riddens Lane	<p>required. There is parking on the other side of the road for the flats that is required. There is a small lay-bye which obscures vision from the south. To remove this would make the situation worse with people parking outside the shop on the brow of the hill.</p> <p>There is also limited pedestrian access on the road.</p> <p>This planning application is the only one which fails shows the size of the properties planned.</p> <p>Having gone to the Downs on 30th July 2017, this site is clearly visible.</p>	
Section 3 Site Assessments	<p>Pages 21-26 Site 6 Wells Close</p> <p>Site 7 Glebe Land</p> <p>Site 8 Land Rear of Oakfield</p>	<p>The current plan, which will become evident soon, is for 45 dwellings (net 43, as 2 houses will be demolished), the majority of which are 1,2 and 3 bedroom dwellings with considerable landscaping and tree planting etc. The site is practically invisible from the Downs. There will be ample parking available for vehicles currently parked on Station Road, therefore there are no visibility issues and it is sufficiently far from the brow of the hill to eliminate any concerns.</p> <p>There is also virtually no contact with other housing (apart from the side of Sun Close), so will cause the minimum problems with neighbours.</p>	Meet with Fairfax Developments and study their plans in detail.
Section 3 Site Assessments	Page 29 Site 10, Land behind the school	<p>Having discussed this with Fairfax Developments it is not known where this has come from. There are no plans and have never been plans to develop this area.</p> <p>This should be removed from all plans</p>	
Section 3 Site Assessments	Page 31 Site 11,  Racecourse Land	There is no way of resolving the village access issues with this land. It is clearly a danger and certainly should not be on the reserve list as stated.	This should be eliminated from the plans.
<b>Resident 10</b>			
Section 4	Page 10	The access to and from Station Road to this site is of great concern. This is already a busy junction and there does not appear to be any way of	This site should be removed. The access is not safe and the plan gives no detail for any scope for safe

Site Assessments	Site 1 Riddens Lane	<p>improving it short of removing the car parking facilities for the shop and residents at the entrance to Riddens Lane, thus widening the road and being able to provide some pedestrian access also. There is a lot of vehicle movement at this part of the road with vehicles reversing out of parking spaces directly into the road which is a safety issue for pedestrians and other road users. The Plan only states that the site is 'subject to the provision of suitable vehicle and pedestrian access to Station Road' but no detail as to how this could be achieved. Then there is the issue of the poor visibility problems onto Station Road due to the extremely close proximity of the brow of the hill and the fact that vehicles regularly park on the brow on both sides of the road to use the shop and the restricted view with cars parked in the layby on Station Road. In view of the above safety concerns I cannot see how this site can be promoted as an option. The plan also states that this site is partially screened and not visible from the Downs. Having been on the Downs recently this land appears to be very visible from the Downs.</p> <p>This is the only site which has given no indication as to the size and type of housing to be built. I cannot see how parishioners can support a development where the size and type of housing has not been identified.</p>	access at the Station Road junction.
Section 4 Site Assessments	Page 21 Site 6 Wells Close Page 23  Site 7 The Glebe Page25  Site 8 Land Rear of Oakfield	<p>2. Methodology, para 2.2 Assessment Process</p> <p>In this paragraph the plan states that 'there was strong support (87%) for pockets of small-scale development of between 10 and 20 units, in keeping with the pattern of development in the last 100 years ...'</p> <p>This is not correct. Development over the last 100 years has included East View Fields, Woodgate Meadow and Westgate, all larger than 20 units.</p> <p>Whilst I have no particular concerns about these developments, I do have a concern regarding the combined size of the three sites together. If the plan is to follow the preference of the parishioners, combining three separate adjoining sites totalling</p>	The plan should state although separate developments, this would be a development of adjoining sites totalling 52 dwellings.

		52 dwellings does not meet the criteria.	
Section 4 Site Assessments	Site 9 Land East of Nolands Farm	<p>Issues with the assessment of this site are as follows. The plan states that this site is too large. This is a smaller site than the 3 separate plots of Wells Close, The Glebe and Oakfield. Only two properties either side of the access road and Sun Close would be affected by this development and extensive tree screening is included in the plan.</p> <p>The assessment mentions that there is a listed building within the vicinity. Is this a relevant comment as this house is not on the land proposed for development and shouldn't this house also appear on the suitability paragraph for the Oaklands site.</p> <p>The current plan for this site places the new housing at a considerable distance from Station Road and would provide ample parking (if required) for Station Road residents. There is only one house opposite this proposed development which does not have a drive. In any case any development with an exit onto Station Road has the potential to have cars parked opposite the exit road. The lack of visibility is far more prevalent for the Riddens Lane development yet this development is on the plan.</p> <p>Having been on the Downs recently it cannot be this development is not any more visible from the Downs than any of the proposed sites</p>	As this plan has changed and is now providing a majority of one, two and three bedroom homes, which is what the parish has indicated it is in favour of, it would be advisable for the Steering Group to revisit this site.
Section 4 Site Assessments	Page 31 Site 10 Racecourse Land	<p>I acknowledge that this site is a reserve site, but I do not understand how this can be promoted when there is no safe and sensible pedestrian access. i.e. railway footbridge or having to walk over the road at the level crossing. As there does not appear to be a straightforward resolution to this problem it does not appear to be a sensible option to have in reserve.</p> <p>Although it includes the promise of more car parking for the station there could be a danger of that car parking being filled and cars still congesting the roads. This has been a conundrum now for several years and extra parking does not necessarily mean less parking on the road.</p>	This site should be removed from the plan.



		residents of the Close has risen significantly, with many of them parked in the roadway and children regularly playing in it. If planning permission for this site is granted access to it should not be via Wells Close for site vehicles as the Close is not large enough.	
<b>Resident 12</b>			
	Policy 1 Policy 2 (and Policy 5)	Reserve site at Racecourse is outside boundary. You state it will not be supported anyway.  Item 5 – green buffer between sites – impossible as hedges/tress will have to be taken our anyway	
	Policy 4  Policy 6  Policy 7.3	Car parking – no mention of spaces for smaller houses apart from the elderly. (Does this mean mostly larger homes?)  Existing properties in Wells Close are already have problems with sewers and surface water  You admit the size and proximity to other developments and existing houses could be a problem! Wells Close, the Glebe and Oakfield would end up as one big building site.	
<b>Resident 13</b>			
	Policy 6  Policy 7.2	I am saying the drainage is not up to it. There has been major repairs four times in the last two or three years. It is major problem as the pitch fibre pipe has gone oval shaped. To replace it, the village would be in chaos for a year or more.  Will you stop calling it under the title Wells Close. It should be called Straw lands development. It has its own road and access and our road is not wide enough for all the extra traffic plus all the construction traffic.	
<b>Resident 14</b>			
	Policy 7.1	Query minimal impact on other properties. 16 dwellings, 32 cars	

	5.39	<p>minimum. Upgrade of lane –does it include widening and where extra land coming from?</p> <p>Drainage and sewage a concern for both lane and village drains, both overburdened. Lighting in a lane?</p> <p>Egress onto main road – many near misses as it is.Take into account that existing properties mainly bungalows.</p>	
<b>Resident 15</b>			
	41	<p>Sites 7 &amp; 8 and to a lesser extent site 6, effectively make one large site. This is against the general feeling of small sites of 20 or less</p>	<p>There could be definitive green space corridors to avoid the sites becoming one. I.e. build on the north of site 7 and south of site 8.</p>
		<p>There is little detail on the problem of parking in the station area Commuters already park inconsiderately.</p> <p>No mention is made of the fact the school was supposed to have a 30-year lifespan and was built in 1974</p> <p>This is really a planning document and very little consideration has been given to any other matters. It appears to merely satisfy a tick box exercise</p>	<p>Charge for parking in the Playing Field for non-users</p> <p>One of the sites could have been considered for a new primary school.</p>
<b>Resident 16</b>			
	5.9	<p>Development to be around the centre of Plumpton Green. This will lead to further congestion of traffic and worsen traffic flow problems.</p>	<p>Disperse the developments throughout the village i.e. use the north and south areas too.</p>
	Policy 7.2	<p>This site is not north of Wells Close but to its northeast.</p> <p>The proposed 12 new houses will increase the size of Wells Close by 60%, so not in sympathy with the surroundings!! Access from Wells Close has been denied for about 20 years, it should be regarded as an extension to Strawlands, as it was in the planning applications of the early 1990s.</p>	<p>Reduce the number of new houses and access from Strawlands</p>
<b>Resident 17</b>			

On proposals for land East of oakfield		Feel that the development is pushing too far eastwards with the one large 5 bedroom house infringing on unbuilt and unoverlooked open space.	
<b>Resident 18</b>			
		Overall comment – many thanks to the Steering Group for their hard work on what is too often a thankless task.	
Parking	Policy 4	It is touched on in the reserve site policy but otherwise no mention of the need to provide extra parking to support the railway station.	Add in a call for extra parking to be supported
Local employment/ Village Centre/CommunityF acilities	Policy 8 Policy 9 Policy 12	There is little mention of the village primary school, which is also a local employer along with the racecourse and the college (which get their own policies). Hamsey’s neighbourhood plan for example has a separate policy for their school including a commitment to seek funding to replace their pre-fabricated classrooms with permanent buildings. Plumpton Primary School (which has just received a “good” Ofsted rating and if the village is going to grow more funding for the fabric of the school will be needed) has three of these classrooms, and is an example of where extra funding is needed to replace the buildings.  I think there is a good opportunity to support environmentally sustainable measures such as encouraging rainwater harvesting and making good use of renewable energy. Also with the recent government announcement over the phasing out of diesel and petrol engines can external charging points outside new builds be supported in the plan?	Add in call to support improvements to the school buildings – or ideally to support the replacement with new school buildings, or similar words.  This would best sit in policy 9. Otherwise it could sit in the community infrastructure projects in section 6.4 on page 72.
Housing Design	Policy 7		Add support for such measures in building design – eg in policy 7 add support for the plan to encourage the use of measures such as rainwater recycling and

			renewable energy and support external charging points on new homes.
Riddens Lane development	Policy 7.1	This is the only planning proposal which has already come before the Parish Council (In January 2015) where it was unanimously rejected at a meeting where 70 members of the public were present. The minutes showed the planning committee were especially concerned over access issues, including the junction with Riddens Lane and Station Road (the minutes state that the committee saw this junction as “exceedingly dangerous”). Concerns were also expressed at this meeting about pedestrian access. And with parked cars on both sides of the junction end of Riddens Lane (at The Riddens flats and the shop) it is difficult to see how safe pedestrian access can be provided (I accept both car parks are necessary to provide parking space for the shop and Riddens flats). Having looked at the plans on display at the public drop in session it is unclear how things have improved in this regard since the original application. This is in contrast to the policy for the Racecourse site which will not support the Have a similar condition to the racecourse site – that the site should only be released once the concerns over safe pedestrian access both at the junction and on the lane itself have been met.	Have a similar condition to the racecourse site – that the site should only be released once the concerns over safe pedestrian access both at the junction and on the lane itself have been met.
Local Green Spaces	Policy 13	Can the plan add the lower part of the field next the Riddens Lane development (7.1) as a Local Green Space? It does at the moment include a footpath with the bridge going over the Bevern stream and is a route over to East View Fields.	Add new local green space as suggested.
<b>Resident 19</b>			
		I would like to thank the steering committee for producing such a detailed and responsible plan for the future of the Parish. I would like to partially welcome the inclusion of a site for old people to downsize, which will further free up existing family sized homes and encourage new more families to join the village along side the inclusion of affordable homes.	

		Furthermore, the protection of green spaces is an extremely important policy for the protection of the village and I agree strongly with the designations that have been outlined.	
<b>Resident 20</b>			
	Policy 1	<p>All the sites put forward in the 2nd draft plan are outside the planning boundary.</p> <p>The selection of sites 6 and 7 regardless of a nominal 'buffer' constitutes a development of 40 units, which goes against this policy Plans should not allow for housing to be placed directly in front of existing residential properties</p>	There are other sites considered in the initial draft plan which are outside the planning boundary which could/should be adopted to prevent this More consideration is required to mitigate this in the policy
	<p>Policy 2 5.14</p> <p>Policy 7.2 5.51</p> <p>5.52</p>	<p>Selecting sites 6 and 7 side by side means that in essence, despite a buffer, this will be visible and seen as a large development of 40 houses both for those living within and around the development and from the south Downs</p> <p>Placement of housing in provision plan does not assist this point</p> <p>Units plan does not allow open space between existing development of Wells Close</p>	<p>Quantify the size of the buffer. It needs to be substantial to partially offset this.</p> <p>House plan needs to demonstrate a better awareness of the need to mitigate surface water flood risk</p> <p>Group development to the northern area primarily to allow some demarcation between developments, in other words, a 'buffer'</p>
	Policy 7.3 Point 1 and 2	The screening needs to be substantial and not to be part of unit15 garden as this would mean residents in close proximity would have no control over this screening	Clarity over who owns buffer and screening, and ownership should be stipulated
	5.57	The eastern portion of this site is partially screened by trees on site 8 in summer. This is not the case in winter and will not be the case if trees are removed for development on site 8. The two sites together will be visible from the South Downs.	Careful consideration to placement of housing, buffer and screening taking into account the fact that both site 7 and 8 adjoin each other. Not allowing two such large developments next to each other would be a better

	<p>5.6</p> <p>Policy 13</p>	<p>Placement of units alongside stream</p> <p>No open space between sites 6/7/8</p>	<p>solution.</p> <p>A reasonable area alongside the stream should be designated as a wildlife/nature reserve in consideration of mitigation of surface water flood risk</p> <p>Allow for open spaces</p>
<p><b>Resident 21</b></p>			
	<p>Policy 7.1 P42</p>	<p>It is noted that development in this location:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. will upgrade Riddens lane with a suitable surface to provide safe access for vehicles between the site and Station Road. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A. The phrase 'suitable surface' should be defined</li> <li>B. The draft working plan should confirm that the upgrading of the surface of Riddens lane should not involve any widening of Riddens lane between the site and Station Road.</li> <li>c. The draft working plan should make it clear that the upgrading of the surface of Riddens lane will not contravene Policy 5 landscape and biodiversity in particular sub paragraph 1 and 3.</li> </ol> </li> <li>2. 'Obtrusive features such as lighting will be kept to a minimum' – for the avoidance of doubt, it should be confirmed that, as now, there will be no street lighting in Riddens Lane (policy 2.3)</li> <li>3. In paragraph 5.4.4 of the draft plan it is stated that there are concerns about the impact of vehicles on traffic flow where Riddens Lane enters Station Rod at a busy intersection. There is also often poor visibility at this junction due to parked cars in Station Road. With respect, the wording of this paragraph understates the problems caused by the prevailing situation.</li> </ol>	

		<p>No mention is made of commercial vehicles many of which are large, quite properly making deliveries to the village shop or the fact that not infrequently as a result of such vehicles being parked whilst deliveries are effected, visibility from Riddens lane into Station Road is reduced to nil.</p> <p>In addition, there is the problem of vehicles turning from Station Road into Riddens lane in order to use the parking facility at the village store. These vehicles subsequently emerge from Riddens Lane onto Station Road.</p> <p>Thus the flow of traffic at this busy intersection is already a hazard.</p> <p>If the development set out in the working plan is carried out, there will be increased traffic flow from the site along Riddens lane of between 16 and 32 vehicles, together with the service and commercial vehicles attending the site. As a result, an already busy and hazardous intersection is likely to become dangerous, with all the attendant risks which that will entail.</p> <p>It is respectfully submitted that it is essential that this aspect is fully addressed in the final version of the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>	
<b>Resident 22</b>			
	P46/47	I do not support the demolition of the Rectory and building on the Rectory garden. Strollings will become an island	Maintain rectory and some of garden to rear of Strollings.
<b>Resident 23</b>			
5.63	P47	An additional concern would be that 'Strollings' would be surrounded by roads. One of the oldest houses in Plumpton	Reduce the level of development there and allow for green space between any development and Strollings.
<b>Resident 24</b>			
	Policy 13	It is a well-considered plan, after much consultation and debate. However to properly protect LGS6 from future development, subject to	

		stipulations/conditions referred to in the policy document, the paddock with small pond on its southern boundary and adjacent to Station Road, should be included within LGS6, to prevent development on the bend in the road, at the crest of the hill leading north from the village.	
<b>Resident 25</b>			
		Connections  It would make sense to connect the two developments via a footpath/cycleway. Children and families will be able to see each other without having to go out onto Station Road.	
<b>Resident 26</b>			
Policy 13		Whilst strongly supporting the spatial integrity of the village, especially against what would be unnecessary development at the current time, it must be reluctantly conceded that the advice to allocate LGS status to a number of the sites does not meet the spirit (and potentially the letter) of the NPPF in this respect.	Policy 1 must clearly state that even within the presumption of sustainable development, the integrity of the spatial characteristics of a service village can be maintained (and legal agreements entered into in good faith should be defended).
<b>Resident 27</b>			
		Very keen to keep green strips to North and South of village	
<b>Resident 28</b>			
Policy 1		Development of this size should not go South of the railway as this detracts from the feeling of being the gateway to the SDNP.	Development North of the railway only
Policy 7 - Racecourse		Parking is available on this land already. The more parking we have the more cars we will have on the road passing through our village.  The development would be an absolute eyesore and it would destroy a much loved view for all the village.  There are proposed tall buildings (two storey) neighbouring smaller level properties (bungalows).	Take the Racecourse site out – not leave it in at all, even as a reserve.

		The issue of lighting is extremely concerning – we and the entire village have said that we want to protect our dark skies and not have more lighting.	
<b>Resident 29</b>			
Policy 7.1: Riddens Lane Page 42		1) The Riddens Lane/Station Road junction currently offers significant potential risk to both vehicle and pedestrian traffic. Visibility is poor in both directions on Station Road which is further exacerbated by buses at the adjacent stops, vehicles in the lay-by, delivery and post-office vehicles calling at the shop, as well as customers who park on Station Road itself. There is insufficient space to allow alteration to the road layout, especially as any change would certainly impact the essential parking facilities for both the flats and the shop itself. Riddens Lane is not wide enough in parts for two-way traffic, nor for a pedestrian path that would be needed as far as the site itself. 2) Residents of East View Fields will certainly, and rightly, be concerned about the flood risk (particularly given the already acknowledged need to differentiate between risk levels in different parts of the site.) 3) The site is clearly and easily visible from the Downs.	This site should not be included in the final form of the plan.
	Policy 7.3: The Glebe Page 46	I understand this site cannot be available for at least five years.	
	Policy 7, Map E, Site No. 9: East of Nolands Farm Page 41	This site – which has not been included in the Pre-submission Working Draft of June 2017 – would seem to have the potential to meet all requirements of suitability whilst impacting the lowest number of existing residents. Moreover, of all feasible available sites, it is closest to the centre of the village; for the majority of people it is within walking distance of the shop/postoffice, the school and the railway station. Fairfax Properties are in the final stages of preparing proposals for development of this site.	Discuss with Fairfax properties its proposals for the site.
<b>Resident 30</b>			
		Thank you for all your hard work throughout this process and in putting this latest draft plan together.	The Racecourse site should be withdrawn altogether –



		<p>eyesore - point 5.73 (pg.50) refers to ‘a large bund of industrial hard waste’. I am not aware of a bund??? The only area I wonder this may be is a mound of earth which was dug from the racecourse to make a reservoir – not industrial waste. Either way, this area is not an eyesore. It allows an extension of the vista across the course to the Downs and is admired by many who enjoy walks to the Downs and countryside surrounding the course.</p> <p>Point 5.75 is a little confusing. The site would be clearly visible from East View Fields – not partially screened as is stated. This is made even worse by the fact that the development is planning two storey buildings when the neighbouring East View</p> <p>Fields properties are bungalows. Point 5.76 – I am alarmed to see that there would be lighting going into this area – rather than being ‘kept to a minimum’ I would have expected there to be no additional lighting at all given the clear message from residents about light pollution. We would lose our dark skies. Would the proposed car parking coming with lighting?? The racecourse have suggested a new bridge with a lift, presumably with lighting – quite literally lighting up our skies (and with added noise pollution of a lift)!!</p>	<p>Like for like housing across developments i.e. bungalows only in racecourse plans</p> <p>No additional lighting</p>
<p>Policy 8 – local employment AND Policy 11 – Plumpton Racecourse</p>	<p>Policy 8 pg.52 Policy 11 pg. 56</p>	<p>Whilst I would like to support local business, I do not feel we should be held to ransom by the business. The racecourse representatives, I believe, have been putting undue pressure on the steering group / residents to accept their proposals. They seem to be scare mongering saying that if they don’t get this through the racecourse business will fold and then.... (with the inference that we will have thousands of houses being built there). Have you actually seen the published Accounts of the racecourse? They talk of best ever attendance levels in the Parish Mag...</p> <p>Policy 11 mentions development ‘necessary for the sustainable operation of the racecourse’. How do you define this? This current proposal could be just the thin end of the wedge.</p>	

		<p>Like for like housing across developments i.e. bungalows only in racecourse plan.</p> <p>I find the 'second biggest local employer' comment (5.92 pg.56) misleading – you have acknowledged it is a much smaller workforce than the college but have not provided numbers of which I suspect there are a very small number of permanent staff. There is also mention of the racegoers coming by train – the lovely view they and all of the other train passengers currently have as they come into Plumpton from the west, would be ruined – instead of the vista to the Downs, they would see yet another housing estate. Rather than maximising it's proximity to the SDNP, it would be detrimental to this</p>	
<b>Resident 31</b>			
		<p>I would like to register my overall agreement and approval with the Plumpton Parish pre – submission plan.</p> <p>I accept the need for additional houses in the village and I am content with all of the sites put forward in the middle of the village and numbered 1,6,7 and 8 on the diagram in the plan on page 41.</p> <p>I am pleased that the plan now protects the rural aspect to the north of the village.</p> <p>I disagree with the land at Plumpton Racecourse being put forward as a reserve site. I do not want to see any houses being put on the racecourse, it is a principal we have fought against for the last few decades and I see no reason to change that view. There is no need for this site to be a reserve and if we go ahead with such a designation we are effectively saying the village is happy for future houses there – I don't agree with that. It seems to have been suggested simply to appease the Racecourse owners who have said they are concerned about its financial future, which may just be a commercial ploy to get development on the site. Finally, I don't believe new housing is deliverable on this site in any case due to lack of suitable access.</p>	

		It is important that although the plan identifies a number of suitable sites, the village should only build the number of houses requested by LDC and over a length of time. We do not need to build all of the new houses in one go. We should not be cornered into accepting more houses than necessary just because we have now identified a number of sites which allow for more houses than we need to build!	
<b>Resident 32</b>			
		Whether development be to the east or west of the village it is imperative that access should be via new roads branching off Station Road at both north and south of the present 30 mph section. Parked cars currently transform long sections of Station Road effectively into a one lane road making it difficult and sometimes dangerous for residents to come out of their drives. With every new house liable to have at least one and probably more cars, the character of the village could become more like that of a town if all the vehicles need to use the built up section of Station Road.	