

Policy number (if quoted)	Comment
	Having attended the 'drop in' consultation at the Village Hall on June 12th I was pleasantly surprised to find nearly all the proposed sites acceptable, especially developing land to the north and south of the present 'centre' thus retaining the linear structure of the village and making space for new infrastructures (water pipes/communications wires/sewage systems) to be put in.
	<p>In principle agree with the entire policies + strategies accepting that we are forced to accommodate 50+ houses in the next few years.</p> <p>2.1 A good site, and a welcome addition to the plan.</p> <p>2.5 A good site, but possibly not economically viable. Allow flexibility of housing mix - instead of being 8 affordable + 4 market value, permit up to 8 out of 12 to be market value.</p> <p>2.6 A site which only ranked 8th equal in the scoring + suffers from some access issues which led to the site by the school being excluded. Delete Riddens Lane site as a reserve site, and substitute the site which scored 6th in the scoring matrix.</p>
	<p>2.4 Having moved here 7 years ago (& from a busy town) I object to the proposed housing site 13PL, at the end of Strawlands, for the following reasons: 1) It is greenfield land & would involve losing 2 wildflower meadows so adding to the 97% lost in this country in recent years. 2) There have already been 2 sizeable developments on both sides of Strawlands, at Woodgate Meadow & Wells Close. 3) A development here would necessitate further deliveries of oil, gas etc so increasing air & noise pollution, & parking problems. 4) Existing problems of sewage, flooding & drainage would be compounded.</p> <p>10 My particular concern is the effects that new housing will have regarding air & noise pollution & in the effects on landscape & wildlife habitats. It is a fact that there is less air pollution where there are tree-lined streets. Regarding noise, there is already a 'rush hour' in Plumpton Green, often involving heavy traffic, comparable to that in a busy town.</p>
	<p>2.4 (reference: Wells Close & overall planning) Maximum 6 houses. At least this might help somewhat with the straying from the 'linear' plan. Also this site means the destruction of meadow land - v. little of this is now left to us. It is doubtless a kindly thought to give the relatively few who will look down from the heights of the Nat Park a pleasant view of 'rural' England - but something of an irrelevance to many of us. Do we really need 50+ houses? (ie District/County council is in error) Too many houses acquiesced; too many cars will be brought to village (+ all their delivery vehicles, etc.) No A roads in this parish. Within the limits given/accepted the committee/team have obviously put in much hard work; with thanks.</p>

Given that we are forced to accept a certain level of new housing and that no site is perfect, I agree in principle with the policies and strategies specified in the Neighbourhood Plan and supporting documentation.

2.1 Concerns re the proposal to site houses on racecourse land. 1) This was a very late addition and I understand when another site was put forward a bit earlier, it was turned down as the proposal came too late. Therefore the decision to include this site seems undemocratic. 2) Confusion as to actual situation. Said to be on the current grassy area, which would mean the proposed 19 houses would be very close together. The illustrative map showed houses right up to the site currently rented by Hill's driving school. This business has been in Plumpton for 60 years and would be adversely affected and possibly have to close. This would contravene Policy 4. 3) Policy 5. Though the site is near the centre of the village, access to be both the school and the play group with the current plan would mean that families with small children (possibly in buggies) would either to have to walk along the length of the platform, or climb up the stairs, over the bridge and down more stairs. 4) Access road. This is a major concern. The proposed road would mean that cars would be using 2 private roads and permission from the owners has not been obtained. The first bit of road passing Ashurst House is owned by the Atkinson family. From the bend, the road is owned by the Segals from Plumpton Lane, right up to Eryl, at the edge of the parish boundary. 5) Access on to Plumpton Lane. This is already very dangerous, with cars speeding once they have crossed the railway line and are heading southwards. The road at Green Cross is very narrow and it would not appear that it could be widened. There is a considerable amount of heavy traffic, lorries, tractors and buses trying to turn in to Plumpton Lane both ways and the visibility is very poor. The bridleway through the Ferrings is well used by riders, walkers and bikers. Another 19 houses will lead to a considerable increase in heavy traffic and unless there are major improvements to the road it will become increasingly dangerous, particularly for riders, walkers and bikers. 6) Development of many more houses on the current racecourse. If the racecourse were to close in the future, major development could take place on the site which would completely alter the whole village. Including this site could well be the beginning of this. Suggestion modification: 1) Omit site 12 altogether and increase the number of houses on site 11. 2) Possibly resite the access road along the north end of the racecourse coming out at the current entrance by the station. 3) Ensuring that any houses on the site are far enough away not to threaten Hill's driving school.

2.2 + 2.3 These sites will generate more cars driving south to the station, school and shop where parking is already at capacity. There appears to be an over reliance on parking provision in the 2 sites to the south of the railway line. The school is already over its projected lifespan but this has not been mentioned at all. Either remove these sites or take action to encourage walking - ie widen & keep pavements clear of overgrown hedges. Serious consideration must be made for charging for car parking. Currently car parking has been placed in the 'too difficult' pile.

2.6 Scrap all thoughts of building houses at this location. Reason 1) Increased risk of greater and deeper flooding at junction of East View Fields and Station Road, caused by the increased volume of surface water drainage into the Bevern Brook from this development. This could put houses on the Old School site once more at risk as they were before the bridge alterations. Since the bridge alterations there have still been occasions when these houses have been very close to flooding without additional water making it a certainty. It would also make Station Road impassable. Reason 2) Junction at the end of Riddens next to the shop is on the side of a hill. When cars/vans are parked in Station Road outside the shop, which they often are, turning north out of Riddens is an extremely dangerous and unsighted manoeuvre, increased traffic making this manoeuvre can only add to the problem. There is also the problem caused by large delivery lorries delivering to the shop we would not wish to see these deliveries jeopardised as the shop is extremely important to the whole village.

9 LGS 6: I like the idea of the green leisure spaces so it still feels like a small village.

9 LGS 6: By keeping the leisure spaces + bluebell woods the village will keep its character. The village needs to stay long and thin, no large developments.

9 LGS 6: I'm glad to see the integrity of the village is of high importance in this plan. The areas of green space will help to maintain the peace and tranquillity of the village.

My understanding is that land to the north of the village was put forward in the past as an area for possible 'Affordable Housing' but rejected as being too far from the centre of the village and too long a walk to amenities. What has changed? Still absolutely no provision of alternative bungalows (or even apartments) for people now living in houses too large for their needs as they become more elderly. Obviously bungalows are "not favourite" with developers as they require more ground space, but when considering the Neighbourhood Plan such matters ought to be considered, thus meeting both ends of the age spectrum. I should like some evidence that the needs of our senior citizens have been addressed ie developers have been requested to build some bungalows or apartments.

I strongly agree with the Plumpton Neighbourhood Draft Plan proposals for the following reasons: it fulfils preference for north-south development & small developments as expressed in the village survey carried out by PNDP prior to developing plan. Sites 2.1 & 2.5 south of the railway would provide extra parking much needed for the station & are within walking distance of all main facilities. I have been on top of the Downs and checked that 2.5 is well screened from view by natural rise in the land & trees. I also very much approve of the provision of local green spaces & open spaces. LGS3 Bevernside Pocket Park and LGS6 fields north of West Gate were named by many villagers in the survey as their favourite open spaces (after the village green & playing fields).

2.1 It's a private road, also very narrow down the back of the racecourse buildings and very winding, dangerous. Now let alone all the traffic, Rodney would be out of business. Suggestion modification: north of the village.

	<p>Could the amount of housing be increased in the southern sites to alleviate development in the north + Riddens Lane?</p>
2.5	<p>We agree to the plan that any development follows the linear form of the village preserving a rural aspect for new housing. Policy 2.5 especially recommended to relieve parking by the station by customers (not from our village) using the Recreation Ground and East View Fields.</p>
2.1	<p>The access etc via the existing south entrance to the racecourse is in my opinion totally unacceptable and unlikely to be improved to prevent future accidents/chaos! Surely a better solution would be a new access road between the railway line and the race track. This would not only be far better to serve the proposed development and the car parking which is promised.</p> <p>2 Provision of new properties for first-time buyers and those 'wishing to downsize'. As in most cases those who might want to consider downsizing 'stairs' would be a very important factor. The mention of "not more than two storeys" is included but no mention of single storey, ie bungalows. A serious omission in my opinion. A lot may not downsize but install suitable hoists/lifts in their existing property and therefore not freeing up larger homes.</p>
2.4	<p>Re flood risk - already an issue without extra housing being built. The stream cannot be widened to take more water as this would impede on other landowners' property. Are you aware all Woodgate Meadow rainwater/drains/gutters goes into a pond and then overflows into the stream already? Consequently the Glebe land and next field gets flooded. Also poor access to site from Wells Close as road is narrow and opening to site in turning circle of cul-de-sac.</p>
2.4	<p>This should just be called Strawlands Development. It's nothing to do with Wells Close. They have their own access. Wells Close had to build its own road. They have tried before and failed and we don't want to put up with the construction traffic in Wells Close. I don't think the drainage system can take such large developments. It is struggling at the moment, having 3 major repairs in recent years. You must know north of the Post Office it goes by gravity in one pipe to the pumping station in Strawlands and pumped back up the second pipe up over the hill. The pumping station has broken down twice in the last few weeks.</p>
2.6	<p>Proposed site is unsuitable, compared with others. Remove Riddens Lane as the reserve site and substitute a site which scored higher in the scoring assessment.</p>

2.1 I am afraid that I did miss the consultation in the Village Hall and I had no idea that the racecourse was in danger of being built on! I realise that we badly need houses in this country but I have always thought that local councils could renovate empty properties in towns and cities which could then be made into affordable accommodation for people to rent who are trying to save to get on the first rung of the property ladder. This would surely save any green land from being built on and being completed obliterated by vast housing estates. I also wonder if the proposed 19 houses will be at prices that locals and first-time buyers can afford. I rather think not! The trouble is we have a growing population and an uncontrolled migrant flow and this is not racist, it is a fact. But if we keep building over our beautiful countryside the UK will become one vast concrete jungle. Something has got to be done sensibly but I am not sure what.

8 LGS6: I believe in the plan as I think small developments around the village are more in keeping with village life. We back on to LGS6 and are pleased that no building is scheduled as we suffer from severe flooding of our garden which would be much worse with more building.

2.3 "Being to the north of village, site traffic would have the opportunity to exit to the north..." Being to the north of the village will encourage people to drive to the shops, station and amenities ie school. This will increase congestion in the village and decrease safety.

2.2 North/south development: 63% - however, many surveys were not collected from the north so I doubt this is true. Village quality: if the north is developed the pressure on parking near the station will increase by the number of homes permitted if not double. This extends the planning boundary and will create pressure to grow further. It will also be highly visible from the Downs. I don't believe the material will be sympathetic, as seen on North Barnes Road. Traffic will travel through the village dependent on people's needs and being further from amenities cars will be used to travel to shops and park at the station, increasing an already congested area and make the school unsafe.

2 Proposed site: rear of Oakfield. Add back in this site because 1) it is a heart of village development so people walk to the shop, school, station, etc. It is east of the village and, as drainage is in this direction, [illegible] no flood risk. Discounting on geological/ancient tress applies to the whole area. This would be a sensible addition.

2.5 The flood risk at this location being at the lowest part of the village and on the east run-off side would have little to no impact so this is misleading to have this in.

2.1 The proposed vehicle access via Green Cross Junction is unacceptable because Plumpton Lane at this point is very narrow, too narrow for a two-way traffic flow. There is no speed restriction, no pavement and high banks on either side. Walking down my steps on to the road is already very dangerous. Visibility for traffic turning out of Ashurst Farm Lane is poor. Policy 2.1 is only acceptable if vehicle access into Plumpton Lane from the site is via the racecourse main gate by the level crossing. Consideration would still need to be given to traffic management at the Green Cross bottleneck. Subject to these modifications I would vote for the plan in a referendum.

I believe this plan gives the village its best chance of maintaining its rural character. Small scale developments at the north and south ends of the village are the key issues for success.

2.2 & 2.3 We recognise the need for Plumpton to grow and support development in small pockets. However, these two proposals would extend the village in a linear rather than centring the village. They would unsightly and spoil the entrance to Plumpton from the north. These two sites offer space for over half the houses. Sites should be considered more centrally so: the residents could walk to the village amenities - station, shop and school; that a centre would be provided for the village rather than extremes. It is recognised that Plumpton has flooded in the past and these two large developments would upset the equilibrium of the water table. Wherever the plan take place careful consideration needs to be given to the infrastructure.

2.6 1) Access a) It is noted that site 1 has been scored positively for B1 (transport/accessibility: impact on highway network) although it is recognised that visibility from Riddens Lane along Station Road is restricted (in both directions but I would venture to suggest that it is frequently severely restricted) whereas site 10 (land behind the school) has been scored negatively. It is submitted that both sites have similar issues in respect of access/visibility from which it follows that site 1 should also have been scored negatively for B1. b) It is recognised in the PPNP that if development was permitted at Site 1 the existing access on Riddens Lane will need to be upgraded for vehicles and pedestrians. Riddens Lane is extremely narrow in places, particularly just beyond Riddens Close. Upgrading of Riddens Lane, which will necessitate widening of the road to meet the required standards of the Highway Authority, will give rise to the potential risk of the removal of trees and hedgerows with an adverse effect on wildlife (please refer to page 16 of PPNP). 2) Riddens Lane also scored positively on suitability criteria E2 (flood risk) no evidence of surface water. It is submitted that 0 is the correct score as the land has some evidence of surface water which runs into a natural water course. 3) Site 1 was originally put forward for the construction of 15/16 units on the whole site including the land identified as being in Flood Zone 3. The site assessments for Riddens Lane (Page 11 SAR) refers to 0.6 hectares; the site (higher northern) is in Flood Zone 1; the site (lower southern) falls within Flood Zone 3 where it slopes down to a natural water course. This means that development of the site would be restricted to the higher northern part with the area within Flood Zone 3 being preserved as green space. Thus the site area for development has been significantly reduced. It is therefore submitted that any proposal for development of the Reserve Site should be for a much lower number than the 15/16 units originally proposed.

2.1 The map (page 10) of potential development sites appears to incorrectly identify Site 12 as the furthest west of all sites under consideration. It does appear that Site 12 has not been correctly plotted on the map. If that is the case then when Site 12 is correctly plotted on the map Site 1 is the furthest west of all sites, which it is submitted in conflict with the majority (63%) of residents' preference to see development on a north/south axis following the existing ribbon development along Station Road (Page 18 PPNP) and against Policy 1 - Spatial Plan for the Parish (Page 24 PPNP) and Policy 2 - New Housing in the Parish (Page 25 PPNP). Site 12 (racecourse) is an additional site put forward at a late stage capable of accommodating 19 units (the largest capacity) so that the need for a Reserve Site is questionable when a total of 61 units can be allocated in the PPNP (excluding Site 1) when the requirement is a target of 50 additional units until 2030 in the Joint Core Strategy to be adopted by Lewes District Council in mid 2016 (Page 13 PPNP).

LGS6 I am concerned about the flooding of this area which impacts on my garden regularly and am pleased that the decision to follow the traditional villages of this area in a linear direction will see no building on this policy of LGS6.

LGS6 Very pleased that a decision not to build on this ref will make a continuation of the linear plan. I also like the idea of the small development which will even out the traffic in the village rather than exiting from a large site onto Station Road.

2.2 & 2.3 I object to developments on 'land north of the Police station', 'land at Inholmes farm' and 'land adjoining Inholmes Farm'. The green entrance to Plumpton Green should be preserved and these sites would significantly impact the rural feel of the village. The sites are also too far from public transport and would increase traffic issues. I do not believe the vision of the plan can be realised by expansion on the North/South axis of Plumpton Green. Developments on 'land north of the Police station', 'land at Inholmes farm' and 'land adjoining Inholmes Farm' should be rejected from the neighbourhood plan. The selected sites should be with easy walking distance of the railway station and school. I would suggest that 0.5 miles is easy walking distance. The selected sites should enhance the village centre and not extend the village away from the pub, station, village hall and shop. The sites I object to ('land north of the Police station', 'land at Inholmes farm' and 'land adjoining Inholmes Farm') will detract from the village's rural setting and feel without bringing any benefit to the community.

1, 2, 2.2, 2.3 The proposal to put houses up the hill north of the Police House is fundamentally at odds with the objectives of sustainable development. I disagree with any housing, on either side of the road, to the north of the Old Police House.

There is no credible evidence given to support the claim that Plumpton residents want their village expanded up the hill at the North end. The survey results are based on a hopelessly biased question, and have been misinterpreted

Housing to the North would be over one kilometre from the station, inevitably bringing more traffic into the village. It is nonsense to argue that anyone living there would just drive away to the north. In any case, why would we want new village residents who avoid our shop, school, church, pub, station and village hall?

Housing on this rising ground on the two sides of the road North of the Old Police House would have a seriously detrimental impact on the landscape which would be obvious to anyone arriving at Plumpton Green from the North.

PARKING (Why is there no policy on parking?) The parking problems in the village have often been referred to by the Parish Council. The Neighbourhood Plan does nothing to describe them, let alone redress them.

STATION (Why is there no policy on the station?) We have a special service/resource in the village in our station, something which is rare in a Sussex village. The Plan does no more than just recognise its existence.

OTHER TRANSPORT (Why is there no policy on public transport?) There is nothing in the Plan to consider bus services and their role in the transport system.

Suggested modification **SUGGESTED MODIFICATIONS SITES:** choose more central and discretely placed sites near the heart of Plumpton Green village. Such sites are listed in the plan but have been ignored for no good reason. **PARKING:** make determined efforts to find parking spaces to meet the obvious demand. The Village Action Plan suggested alternatives but all have been ignored. **STATION:** make a policy to support the station and liaise with Southern to ensure the support is maintained **OTHER TRANSPORT:** Develop a transport policy, including a review of bus services and their integration with rail.

My main objection, as stated above, is against proposed development on the two northern sites which: 1) is against the LDC principles of sustainable housing, especially policy 13, on sustainable travel. 2) no credible evidence to show that village residents want their village extended up the hill. 3) too far from the station and it is not true that traffic from the houses would mainly flow northwards 4) very prominent, highly visible and detrimental impact on the landscape.

1 Proposed housing north of the village (north of Old Police Station, and Land south of Inholms Farm), could mean an additional 23-30 homes. This is presumably in keeping with the desire of 63% of respondents who wished for north-south development. The number of homes is disproportional as only 6-10 dwellings are proposed east-west (Strawlands).

2.3 The impact of development to the north is likely to mean additional residents driving to the station to commute. 15 cars (50% of houses) is probably a modest estimate. Proposed additional parking at the station (which is welcomed) is likely to be immediately taken up by commuters from the new houses, meaning that parking problems will persist around the station.

2.2 I fail to see why modest development on one of the proposed sites on the eastern side of Station Road (eg around Brighton garage) was not included. 6-10 dwellings here would not be overly intrusive with good access to Station Road, the station and other facilities and could potentially reduce the relatively large number of houses proposed north of the old Police house.

2.1 Proposed additional parking for the station is welcomed but I think the number of spaces should be quantified, as they are for the 'south of the railway site' site.

2.5 A small point but I don't think the car park area is marked on the map and can it be clarified that these 20 spaces are in addition to the 2 spaces per dwelling proposed under policy (sorry can't find the reference again)

8 I think the plan is missing a trick in not proposing additional parking at the Playing Field. Yes, it is used by commuters but that is of benefit to those of us who live near the station and, on occasion, cannot drive up our own roads or get off our driveways because of parking congestion. Users of the playing field would also benefit. On Saturday mornings cars are regularly parked in and around Station road because of the popularity of junior football. Similar situations arise with cricket, senior football and stoolball. Why not extend the carpark to the north of the existing area? Perhaps another s106 agreement could be secured from the developers and/or Network Rail could assist as part of a village compensation package.

2.1 2.5 Although I accept the overall plan, I am least happy about the two developments south of the railway, nos 2.1 and 2.5. My fear is that, once planning permission is granted, this will become a precedent for future housing growth.

I do not agree with development to the north or south of the village which are in conflict with Policy 2, Policy 4, Policy 5, Policy 8, Policy 9 and in addition I take issue with the flawed Policy 1 in relation to these proposed developments. Full details of my reasons are set out below beginning with Policy 1.

Re Policy 1 - commits to preserving the linear nature of the village.

This policy appears to be inconsistent with:

- Its own guidelines NP Draft plan May 2016 page 7 – ‘...policies will aim to protect the special character of the Parish and encourage development proposals for the benefit of the local community.’

- Both national and local planning policy which is against ribbon development and in favour of development sites that can easily access local facilities

- The National Planning and Policy framework 2012 which calls for Neighbourhood Plans to:

- o Support a prosperous rural economy
- o Protect local green spaces

Under Section 1: Heritage and Infrastructure in The NP Residents Survey the first question was laid out as follows:

1. Plumpton can be described as a Scartfoot or linear parish, being long and narrow and having developed from the foot of the downs. Would you

Answer yes or no

Prefer to maintain this characteristic with any development on a north-south axis?

Prefer to see the shape of the village change and expand widthways on an east west axis?

This is not an objective question. It is a leading question based on the shape of the parish rather than the shape of the village. It cannot be legitimate to make the statements about residents' preferences from this question. As well as confusing Parish with Village, the question is extremely loaded by strongly inferring that preference 1 maintains the status quo and preference 2 is about expansion.

The Residents' Survey questionnaire has not been made available. It is not in the appendices and not listed in the documents on the NP website. The evidence quoted for lengthening the village is completely invalid, and this very biased questionnaire should be shown to the Planning Inspector.

The parish is long and thin – approx 8 miles long. At its centre is the village of Plumpton Green with a central road (Station Road). However village development along this road runs for only approx. half a mile from the Railway to the Old Police House. It is bounded by open space at both ends. A mere 30% of all the houses in the village are in this stretch of road. The remaining 70% of houses are in the East West roads off Station Road - 50% in East View Fields, Riddens Lane, Westgate and Woodgate Meadow; 20% in Chapel Road, Barnfield, Southdowns, N.Barnes Lane, Wells Close and Strawlands.

To say (as it does) that the consultation with parish residents has shown that the preference is to maintain a long thin character is twisting the facts. The village is not linear. To the outsider it has the semblance of 'long and thin' simply because development is discreetly provided off the central road. Seeking to maintain the village character would be best served by development that emulates this pattern. 15% of respondents to the residents' questionnaire supported 'small, discreet, affordable development'. They also said that 'green surroundings and tranquillity' mattered to them.

In regard to the above The Plumpton NP group appear to have ignored the planning guidelines and based Policies 1 and 2 on the flawed misleading and misinterpreted residents survey.

Development to the north and south creates a straggle of suburban ribbon development strongly impacting on the linear character from the station to the Old Police House bounded by open fields

Re Policy 2 -providing housing development that is sympathetic to the scale, topography and character.

Of all the proposed developments these would create the greatest degree of negative impact on the visual scale, topography and character of the village.

Re Policy 4 - seeks to support the continuation of existing employment and businesses.

Housing on the far outskirts of the village is much less likely to benefit the Village shop (an important village resource). Residents would be reliant on the car and far more likely to head off to the supermarket for all their shopping. Respondents to the residents questionnaire said 'they didn't want Plumpton to become a 'dormitory'' – yet that is exactly what ribbon development on the outskirts of a community encourages.

Re Policy 5 -ensuring existing village community facilities and amenities are retained. The NP refers to a number of Joint Core Strategy (JCS) policies which they believed might, 'play an important part in shaping the PPNP. This includes Core Policy 4 which seeks to, 'stimulate and maintain the local economy through focusing retail and services around hubs and safeguard existing hubs'. As with Policy 4 the village shop and post office are far less likely to gain business from houses built on the outskirts of the village. Houses built in the village within easy walking distance of such facilities are much more likely to meet this JCS policy.

Re Policy 8- improve viability of an established community use.

The only Policy to mention the School and then only briefly. If you have to use a car to get to the facilities

it is just as easy for people living to the north of the village to take their children to school in Wivelsfield. Why is it that the NP has Policy 6 specifically focussed on supporting Plumpton College and Policy 7 with its focus on supporting the Racecourse but no specific policy supporting Plumpton Primary School? The school, in the centre of the village, and the only one to potentially offer a service to all families and is all but ignored. Why does the school not warrant its own policy and clear commitment from this NP? Without more children the school will close and development should be planned that will encourage children to go to the village school. Perhaps it is omitted because it would point up the problem of putting family homes on the outer reaches of the village in a place where cars would inevitably be needed for the school run.

Other Community Facilities The distance from a development to the north of the village to the station, Playing fields and tennis club is double that of the distance from potential development sites in the centre of the village. History shows that people are far more likely to get involved in the life of the village if the facilities are within easy walking distance within the village whereas the ribbon development both north and south would result in the loss of very significant amounts of hedging along Station Road and with it the open countryside

Re Policy 9 -resisting development of local green space.

25% of the respondents to the residents' questionnaire said that, 'views and green spaces should be protected'. Talk to the residents of Plumpton Green and you will find that everyone coming in from the north likes to see the village nestling at the bottom of the hill with fields on either side. These fields should be included in the list of possible Green or Open space. Instead this plan seeks to destroy the much loved and valued view on entering our village.

Development to the north of the village cannot assist in meeting the following NP Objectives:

1 – 'to protect the character of the Parish' ... see comments re Policies 1 & 2

2- 'to retain and enhance existing community services and amenities' - see comments re Policies 4, 5

3 – 'to identify sites for development that are sympathetic to the scale, topography and character of the Parish and

that will not have a detrimental impact on the setting'... see Policy 2

4 – 'to plan for some housing to meet local needs, in particular for young families' – see Policy 8 re the school

5 - 'to secure the future of the existing employment uses within the Parish and plan for their growth' ... see Policy 5
 Early drafts of the NP plan had a commitment to the environment and reducing reliability on the car. This is not covered either in the objectives or in a policy – perhaps because it is quite clear that housing to the north of the village will increase car use.

Re comment 1.

Drop the proposal for housing to the north and south of the village and look objectively at the proposals for discreet developments off Station Road (Woodgate Meadow offers a good example of a centrally placed development that has an unobtrusive entrance and whose residents have played a very active and supportive part in village life over the last 25 years). Such developments would meet all the Policies and Objectives put forward.

Suggested modification In its present form this plan does not meet the policies and objectives set out in the draft plan, It is not conducive to the long term development of an active and inclusive village; it adds to the likelihood of its becoming a dormitory village and promotes reliability on the car.

2.5 Allocation of Land South of Railway Line, Plumpton for new housing and car park. This site is not suitable for development, as such development will harm the setting of the National Park and the amenities of neighbouring residents. There are better performing sites listed in the Plumpton Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment Report that should be included instead. Flood risk and highway safety have not been fully considered either.

More detailed information contained in Lewis and Co Planning letter.

Suggested modification Further consideration should be given to allocating more suitable sites for development, for example: Land at Little Inholmes Farm, or Land adjoining the Rectory (Glebe). More detailed information contained in Lewis and Co Planning letter.

Site 12 Plumpton Racecourse I feel that this site is unsuitable for inclusion. The whole racecourse is visible from the downs with no screening. Access to the village via the railway station for pedestrians most unsatisfactory particularly for disabled, children or parents pushing buggies.

Suggested Modification: Removal from list of preferred sites.

I support the inclusion of sites south of the railway line Policy ref:2.1 and Policy ref: 2.5. They are close to the village amenities and could provide much needed car parking for rail users. Any objection to these sites on the grounds of development being visible from the Downs/National Park is spurious and can be dismissed. We already have a recently built ,brightly coloured, development on North Barnes Lane that is clearly visible from the park. This proves the National Park Authority is not concerned and creates the precedent. These two sites (2.1 and 2.5) would be much less obtrusive than the North Barnes Lane development.

2.2 and 2.3 Currently the total number of units is between 23 and 30. Either number presents a large development in one place and would create more traffic through the village as I doubt many residents would walk from there to the school, shop or station. On the East side (2.3) there are many mature trees and these should be protected.

Re: the site 05PL, rear of Oakfield – Difficult to see how this site can be ignored. The loss of the Brighton Garage is given as a reason to not use this site but this establishment could probably be relocated within the Parish. In fact the Garage today causes congestion on Station Road due to the number of vehicles waiting for repair being parked for extended periods. If the Garage were to go I believe this would in fact be welcomed by most residents around that part of Station Road.

Suggested modification Be more specific on the extent of the development of each site. Re: Policy Refs: 2.2 and 2.3, ensure developers are obliged to make binding promises to keep the trees and provide screening from the road as a condition of granting planning permission. Reconsider the use of 05PL in the centre of the village and follow the wishes of the village survey by spreading the total development around more sites each with fewer units.

The two proposed developments north of the village (NP policy refs: 2.2 and 2.3) as described in the plan would comprise 60% of the total development. This is not the wish of the majority of residents as evidenced by the survey that showed a large majority wanted to limit the developments on a single site to 10 – 20 units. I would argue the two sites being opposite one another should be considered a single site and limited to 20 units to comply with this wish. Furthermore the visual impact of new development here would be considerable since the road is elevated and the current idyllic view when entering the village from the north will be spoilt. This current vista of our downland village should be protected as much as possible by limiting the number of units on these sites.

It is certain that the new residents in the north of the village would use their cars to get to the school, shop and station. The Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (SHELAA) December 2015 states site 20PL (NP Policy ref: 2.3) is “Not within walking distance of local services or facilities. Bus stop, with limited services to Lewes and Haywards Heath, 850m from site.” I don’t think we can assume all traffic will travel North – Further reason to limit the number of new homes on these sites .

Sites were offered in the middle of the village but have been ignored. For example the Rear of Oakfield – (LDC SHELAA ref: 05PL), would appear to be better positioned in terms of its proximity to the school, shop and station and would get the support of LDC since it is identified in SHELAA December 2015 as Suitable, Available & Achievable.

Suggested modification Limit the development of sites ref: 2.2 and 2.3 to 10 units each maximum – this would still amount to 33% of current planned number of units. The target number of units can easily be made up by using the Riddens Lane (2.6) site and Rear of Oakfield site (05PL).

Comment: Policy 1: Linear development is all very well if it is truly linear but the character of the village was changed from that style many years ago with the development of first East View Fields and then other side roads, cul de sacs and estates. Continuing to the north might be regarded as linear but building to the south of the railway on the racecourse land is certainly not.

Policy 2: I do not believe that new housing to the north of the village on open fields will be "sympathetic to the scale, topography and character" of the village.

Policy 4: I believe that local employment will be lost if the racecourse land is redeveloped and Hills of Plumpton is forced to move or close down. Developments which are not within walking range of the village shop and post Office will be less likely to encourage support for this valuable local business.

Policy 5: As with policy 4 the shop will be less likely to benefit, as will the railway station, the village hall, the school and other amenities and activities in the middle of the village if houses are further away from the centre. We are constantly told that cars should be used less and stretching the village will do nothing to improve the amount of traffic going through the village.

Policy 8: Putting new housing so far away from the school, shop and station does not help to improve the viability of "established community use", rather it makes it more likely that residents will go outside the village to other local facilities. The school particularly needs to increase its' pupil numbers but more importance seems to be put upon supporting Plumpton College and the Racecourse than on this primary school which should be at the very heart of village life. If people can walk to a local facility they reduce traffic, improve their fitness, have a chance to speak to each other and generally enhance the community, sadly the Plan does not seem considered or given much importance to building a strong core for the village when given the opportunity.

Policy 9: I do not see that building on green fields to the north of the village is "resisting development of local green space" and thus this argument fails at the first test Other green field sites could just as easily be included and would have less obvious effect on the feeling of green space around the village.

Policy 10: Making the village more linear would appear to necessitate the loss of more trees, hedges and wildlife habit than other schemes, this would be going against the wishes of villagers as quoted following the residents' questionnaire from which it was deemed that 90% of respondents favoured the conservation of such assets to the locality.

Suggested Modification: More thought should be given to the community benefits and effects of the location of the essential new housing. As presently recommended some of the development might as well be anywhere between the Plough Inn and the Half Moon given the likelihood that householders will want to use their cars to reach the station, school or shop. Thus building on the land to the north of the village should not be considered.

Development to the east or west of Station Road within the current boundaries of the village will increase the sense of community and reduce dependence on the use of cars to reach the local facilities.

Would you vote for this plan at a referendum? (Answer yes or no): No. It will not be a benefit to the community as it stands. whilst accepting the need for houses I do not believe that the plan as proposed gives as much to the village in terms of community, transport and local benefits and hope that my thoughts can be given consideration.

If no, why?: I do not feel that it is in the best long term interests of the village to make it more linear than it is already. The better options are the sites close to the school, shop and village hall to reduce the need for locals to drive around the village in the future.

I would like to record my thanks to the committee for all their efforts as whatever is felt about the Neighbourhood Plan a lot of hard work has gone in to it and there are many good points contained in it. These are intended to be constructive comments and is in no way a complaint.

Suggested Modification: I am totally opposed to the proposed development of the site at Plumpton racecourse. I am totally suspicious of its inclusion at the last moment. I am very sceptical about the motives of the racecourse owners and Lewes DC. It would be the thin edge of the wedge for future development of this site. It has no meaningful access for homeowners and would be a completed nightmare on race days. This should be struck off.

I accept the plan with conditions but I do not agree to development of land development at Plumpton Racecourse because the access is inadequate and would be extremely detrimental to area bordering designated National Park

I am disappointed that the NP committee did not challenge the "allocation" of 50+ houses to be added to this constantly-expanding village. The problem is house prices - caused by excess demand, which will not be helped by spoiling small village communities with over-burdened infrastructure. there has been a strong negative response to ANY extra housing, which has not been properly reported by the NP committee. Social housing does not need to be extra buildings, but existing stock could be bought and used by housing associations, etc..

2)I am concerned that local knowledge of conditions, particularly traffic bottlenecks and land drainage status has been ignored in preparation of the plan. I have been directly involved in the site beyond Riddens Lane and am deeply concerned that drainage of this field is particularly poor. Building on this site would threaten the stream on the south side with sudden flooding. This condition has been ignored by the "authorities", who have generalised figures and have not taken warnings such as the above into account. Similarly, the traffic at the junction of Riddens Lane with Station Road is particularly perilous, yet this local problem has been deemed non-existent.

- 2.1 In my opinion this is a quite impractical proposal. I cannot see how a young mother with a pushchair or pram could negotiate the footbridge into East View Fields. I further do not believe that Network Rail would permit the railway station platform to be used as a public footpath, has anybody asked for their opinion on this? This does not sound to me to be a safe option for mothers and toddlers and the upshot would be that mothers would drive their youngsters to school, rather than take the risk, thus adding to the congestion that already exists. Gone are the days when kids walked to school un-attended.

Policy ref. 2.5

This proposal saddens me because I have always hoped that the Plumpton Green southern boundary would remain as it is. I appreciate the temptation to gain a car park but not at any price.

Policy ref. 2.6

I am annoyed because at least some of my neighbours believe that the proposal to build in Riddens Lane has gone away and I do not believe that to be the case. It is my personal opinion that the proposed racecourse site (2.1) is so unrealistic and impractical that it will be rejected at the planning application stage by LDC and the upshot of such refusal will automatically promote the Riddens Lane site as a replacement.

I fail to understand why the White House farm proposal was not adopted as one of the preferred sites. It is ideally located and is already partially developed, has ready access to the main road and all the necessary services exist or can be easily accessed. I have heard that an argument against this site is that it is visible from the National Park, if that is the case, then I suggest that the developer be asked to plant a few trees. It is my view that this site will eventually get the go ahead from LDC whatever the view of the Parish Council and it would be a great shame if this were to happen and the houses did not then count as part of our 50. My same general comments apply to the Oakfield site and a combination of these two sites would more than make up for the loss of option 2.1.

Use the racecourse site (2.1) as a season ticket car park for rail users. It would provide revenue for the racecourse and make practical use of a patch of un-used ground in a potential flood zone. Make the area around the station resident and permit holders only. This to include the recreation ground car park, East View Fields and our lay-byes.

Policy 1 - commits to preserving the linear nature of the village.

This policy appears to be inconsistent with:

■ Its own guidelines NP Draft plan May 2016 page 7 – ‘...policies will aim to protect the special character of the Parish and encourage development proposals for the benefit of the local community.’ ■ Both national and local planning policy which is against ribbon development and in favour of development sites that can easily access local facilities ■ The National Planning and Policy framework 2012 which calls for Neighbourhood Plans to:

- o Support a prosperous rural economy
- o Protect local green spaces

The Draft NP Plan of May 2016 states that, “Its policies will aim to protect the special character of the Parish and encourage development proposals for the benefit of the local community”. There is little the NP can do with regards to the character of the Parish but much can be done to retain the character and identity of Plumpton Green.

Policy 1 should contain an overarching commitment to preserving (as much as possible) the look, identity and character of the village. Instead it seeks, together with Policy 2, to develop, what is effectively unnecessary ribbon development which will suburbanise our village and associated problems of such development on the outer fringes of an established village. The basis of this decision can be found in misleading and misinterpreted NP Residents Survey for example below. Under Section 1: Heritage and Infrastructure in The NP Residents Survey the first question was laid out as follows:

Plumpton can be described as a Scartfoot or linear parish, being long and narrow and having developed from the foot of the downs. Would you Answer yes or no : 🗳️ Prefer to maintain this characteristic with any development on a north-south axis? 🗳️ Prefer to see the shape of the village change and expand widthways on an east west axis? This was not an objective question and is a leading question based upon the shape of the parish rather than the shape of the village. It cannot be legitimate to make the statements about residents' preferences from this question. As well as confusing Parish with Village, the question is extremely loaded / biased by strongly inferring that preference 1 maintains the status quo and preference 2 is about expansion. Therefore I believe it is highly likely that respondents were influenced by the opening statement of the questionnaire which was highly biased and skewed toward the "linear" development of the village. I would like to know how these questions were formulated and by whom as the locality of where the steering group members live may have influenced the wording of such a question – resulting in potential nimbyism from the Steering Group who ultimately defined the preferred development areas.

When information of Survey results are referred to within the Draft NP and evidence reports they are misleading and refer to residents as opposed to respondents of the survey – as 43% of the 622 households within the Parish did not respond.

The neighbourhood plan is said to be a parish plan for the settlements of both Plumpton and Plumpton Green; however the majority of the focus of the plan is placed upon housing development within the Plumpton Green settlement!

The Residents' Survey questionnaire has not been made available but briefly summarised in Neighbourhood Plan - Stage 1 Report: Community Evidence Report. The actual survey is not in the appendices and not listed in the documents on the NP website. The evidence quoted for lengthening the village is completely invalid, and this very biased questionnaire should be shown to the Planning Inspector.

Furthermore, I am not convinced that enough measures have been taken to mitigate the threats and risks of bias and objectivity of the Steering group given that the majority live close to sites suggested/proposed in the centre of the village (east-west axis) which have not made it to the "preferred" list of sites.

The north end: Incorporating 2.2 Land South of Inholmes Farm and 2.3 Old Police House

Policy 2 - providing housing development that is sympathetic to the scale, topography and character. Of all the proposed developments these would create the greatest degree of negative impact on the visual scale, topography and character of the village. If the fields to the north of the village are built upon a precedent will have been set and before we know it Plumpton Green will be back to back housing to the Plough with no open countryside. The village then will become a ribbon development, and lose its character that the village and villagers want to so badly to retain! A prime example of badly designed housing is that of Sun Close whereby the roof tiles are not in keeping with the rest of the village and the development sticks out like a sore thumb and can be clearly seen from the South Downs.

Policy 2. "sites mainly to the north and south of the planning boundary have been preferred with a view to allowing vehicular traffic to escape the village without necessarily having to travel through its centre". This will actually exacerbate the traffic congestion within the village as those sites to the north given the distance from facilities within the village will and continue to use their cars to travel to the village centre and beyond. The statement is actively encouraging and contributing to the village becoming a ribbon development and commuter town. It contravenes both national and local planning policy which is against ribbon development and in favour of development sites that can easily access local facilities. Re: Policy 2: the 30 mph speed limit is extended northwards to ensure safe access for traffic. Where will the existing 30mph extend to as currently both the northern proposed sites are positioned on a 60mph road where existing traffic already speeds into and out of the village before getting to the 30mph signs, and this was deemed too dangerous for speed safety checks to be conducted in the vicinity. This will also be exacerbated with site traffic entering the village from either north or south of the village.

Policy 4 - seeks to support the continuation of existing employment and businesses. This contradicts Policy 2 "sites mainly to the north and south of the planning boundary have been preferred with a view to allowing vehicular traffic to escape the village without necessarily having to travel through its centre". Housing on the far outskirts of the village is much less likely to benefit the Village shop (an important village resource). Residents would be reliant on the car and far more likely to head off to the supermarket for all their shopping. Respondents to the residents questionnaire said 'they didn't want Plumpton to become a 'dormitory' – yet that is exactly what ribbon development on the outskirts of a community encourages. Furthermore it was referred to in the landowners presentations that more shopping facilities could be considered in particular at the northern end of the parish. The northern end of the village did have several shops for example a Butchers (now a showroom for an internet based business Southdown Stoves), a Dairy and a general Store called "Southdowns Store". This shop closed in 1990 and was converted into a house, and 2 additional houses were built on the shop site too. In times of austerity/recession I think it is highly unlikely that such a business would be viable. History has shown that patronage of local shops did not increase with housing development, and it could be argued that it partly contributed to their demise. In fact there were more shops when the village of Plumpton Green had less people. Now the village is served by just one shop, one garage, 2 pubs and a school whereas compared to the 1980/90s when Plumpton Green's population was far less - it had 3 pubs, 2 shops incorporating a post office, a butchers, hairdressers, school, doctors surgery and 2 garages.

Re Policy 5 - ensuring existing village community facilities and amenities are retained. The NP refers to a number of Joint Core Strategy (JCS) policies which they believed might, 'play an important part in shaping the PPNP. This includes Core Policy 4 which seeks to, 'stimulate and maintain the local economy through focusing retail and services around hubs and safeguard existing hubs'. As with Policy 4 the village shop and post office are far less likely to gain business from houses built on the outskirts of the village. To reiterate history has shown that patronage of local shops did not increase with housing development, and it could be argued that it partly contributed to their demise. In fact there were more shops when the village of Plumpton Green had less people. Houses built in the village within easy walking distance of such facilities are much more likely to meet this JCS policy.

Policy 8- improves viability of an established community use. The distance from a development to the north of the village to the station, Playing fields, and tennis club is double that of the distance from potential development sites in the centre of the village. History shows that people are far more likely to get involved in the life of the village if the facilities are within easy walking distance. A typical example is the village school run.

Why has there been no mention of burial sites within other village community facilities which needs to be considered as additional burial sites will need to be factored in given the potential growth of the number of village residents as the existing burial sites at All Saints and St Michaels have limited room. A few parishioners including myself understood that the church had set aside land for burial site on the land adjacent to the existing churchyard at All Saints which is grazed currently by horses. I believe this is the land referred to as "the Glebe". This issue has been raised previously but somehow has been omitted from the NP.

Policy 9 - resisting development of local green space. 25% of the respondents to the residents' questionnaire said that, 'views and green spaces should be protected'. The majority of Plumpton Green residents coming in from the north enjoy seeing the village nestling at the bottom of the hill with fields on either side. These fields should be included in the list of possible Green or Open space. Instead this plan seeks to destroy the much loved and valued view on entering our village. The reason why this "undeveloped gap" has not been built upon is because it has been protected by the LDC adopted settlement planning boundary until now. I strongly disagree that "filling this gap will provide an opportunity to consider the sense of entrance and arrival into the village"(from the Plumpton Parish Neighbourhood Vision Paper (page 9 option 2)). There is already an obvious entrance and arrival to the village. The sense of a village also comes from the existing open countryside from the Plough until arrival at the 30 signs (very much like the southern end of the parish i.e Plumpton) which may not be agriculturally farmed for cereal crops but grazed by sheep, and refreshingly once again after a gap of over 25 years by cattle. Unfortunately or through misfortune Plumpton Green is not afforded the protection of being in the South Downs National Park unlike its neighbour Plumpton.

If the fields to the north of the village are built upon a precedent will have been set and before we know it Plumpton Green will be back to back housing to the Plough with no open countryside. The village then will become a ribbon development, and lose its character that the village and villagers want to so badly to retain! No new housing developments (i.e. Lateral roads) have been considered outside the village curtilage until now. As previously stated this would set a precedent for housing to creep towards the Plough Public House and beyond. One would question would these landowners have offered their land up for development if the steering group hadn't approached them in the first place. Many of the landowners especially in the northern end have no affinity to the village as they don't actually live in the village or have little to do with the community or village life.

Policy 10. Landscape and biodiversity. Almost no hedges would need to be removed to facilitate the proposed developments within the village whereas the ribbon development both north and south would result in the loss of very significant amounts of hedging along Station Road and with it the open countryside. This would greatly impact the wildlife, ecology, habitats and biodiversity that exist should development take place to the north. This will take decades to recover from the impact on the wildlife, ecology and habitats - if at all.

If the fields to the north of the village are built upon a precedent will have been set and before we know it Plumpton Green will be back to back housing to the Plough with no open countryside. The village then will become a ribbon development, and lose its character that the village and villagers want to so badly to retain! No new housing developments (i.e. Lateral roads) have been considered outside the village curtilage until now. As previously stated this would set a precedent for housing to creep towards the Plough Public House and beyond. One would question would these landowners have offered their land up for development if the steering group hadn't approached them in the first place. Many of the landowners especially in the northern end have no affinity to the village as they don't actually live in the village or have little to do with the community or village life. It is also very visible all along the Downs between at least Mount Harry and Ditchling Beacon and from considerably lower levels too. A number of planning applications in the area have been refused (raising roof lines etc) for very reason of visibility from the Downs.

Policy 12: Sustainable Drainage Serious drainage problems affect a number of the houses on Station road to the south of this development – some (eg Inholmes Cottages) need to have pumps permanently in place to prevent flooding due to the large amount of surface run-off largely originating on this slope. Any new development would need to incorporate Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS). The pond next to the Inholmes development when it reaches capacity overflows into the adjoining property via ditch. Will the storm drain area in the corner of the field be maintained as hasn't so far?

Early drafts of the NP plan had a commitment to the environment and reducing reliability on the car. This is not covered either in the objectives or in a policy – perhaps because it is quite clear that housing to the north of the village will increase car use

Suggested modification

There is plenty of natural infill area within the village

Reconsider the proposal for housing to the north of the village and look objectively at the proposals for discreet development. Woodgate Meadow offers a good example of a centrally placed development that has an unobtrusive entrance and whose residents have played a very active and supportive part in village life over the last 25+ years). Additionally, the "land south of the railway" appears to tick all the boxes and has the scope for 50 houses given the size of the land, and this was reiterated at various consultation events and would be less vehicular use given close proximity to the railway, school and village shop. Such developments would meet all the Policies and Objectives put forward

In its present form this plan does not meet the policies and objectives set out in the draft plan, It is not conducive to the long term development of an active and inclusive village; it adds to the likelihood of its becoming a dormitory village and promotes reliability on the car. It will destroy the countryside, open and green spaces, loss of wildlife, environmental and ecological impact and the identity of the village

Amend the allocation boundary of Policy 2.3 so it corresponds with the Policies Map allocation.

I note that the Maps D and E do not include Sun Close. For a variety of reasons it is wise not to bring forward the development initially proposed to build behind the school on North Barnes Lane which would be further to the recent construction of Sun Close. Perhaps lessons will have been learned about the siting, elevation and colour of construction of the Sun Close units, when considering new development (Policy2) since much of this development, especially at the front of the close, is a blot on the landscape when viewed from anywhere south, southeast or southwest

I object to Policy 2.6 for 2 main reasons: a) I believe the access to the site on the brow of the hill opposite another junction and adjacent to the shop would be problematical. b) the gardens in East view Fields flood regularly at the current time. With development on the proposed site there would be a greater run off and potential for more regular flooding and flooding to a greater depth. If this site was chosen what compensation would be available to those who suffered as a result of increased flooding?

Site 12 – Racecourse Site

I was not informed of the proposal to build on part of the racecourse green space as this was not publicised by the PPNP Group – it was just added in at the last minute with no plans available. Two storey houses would dwarf the bungalows in East View Fields & would have a detrimental effect on those of us living in East View Fields. The site would not be suitable for the elderly, as they would much prefer bungalows. Whether young or old people lived in the proposed new development on the racecourse, the elderly would not be fit enough to be able to use the bridge over the railway for access to the shop & would therefore have to walk along the station platform, then along the road to cross the railway crossing. Likewise young families would not be able to take their pushchairs over the railway bridge & would also have to walk along the station platform & cross over the railway line before reaching a footpath. If families have several children the thought of them running along the station platform & then straight onto the road must surely be a high health & safety issue. Car parking issues would not be solved with the building of houses on the racecourse as people would not be prepared to drive the extra miles to park – they would still park as near to the station as possible. The access into the racecourse from the road is a very dangerous junction, the road is narrow & bends & again would be a major health & safety issue with extra traffic. If the access was widened it still wouldn't alter the fact that the lane is too narrow for more traffic. On race days they have marshalls helping the flow of the traffic, without them it would be disastrous. If the racecourse is allowed to build houses on their site, then there is even less parking for the race days so the village will suffer further. If houses are built on the racecourse site it will severely affect the tranquil setting of the races, one of the main reasons many go there. I feel that this site was not given enough publicity or the same time for comments as all the other sites were.

Suggested modification Surely the other sites north of the railway nearer the village shop & school would be far safer & more suitable for development rather than the racecourse site?

AGREE WITH THE PLAN AS PRESENTED, ALBEIT I HAVE A PREFERENCE FOR FEWER THAN THE 50 DWELLINGS PROPOSED, ESPECIALLY GIVEN RECENT AFFORDABLE HOUSING PROVISION IN THE VILLAGE AND WINDFALL SITE BUILDS. I AM MOST IN FAVOUR OF THE SITES THAT PROVIDED ADDED BENEFIT TO THE VILLAGE (E.G. PARKING) AND AM VERY KEEN ALL DEVELOPMENT IS ON SMALL SITES. ONLY ONE SITE SHOULD BE DEVELOPED AT A TIME, WITH THE COMPLETION OF THE IDENTIFIED SITES BEING SPREAD OVER THE DURATION OF THE PLAN AND NOT DONE IN ONE GO

My comment is regarding the Riddens Lane proposal. Whilst I do not object to the site I believe the number of units proposed is too high due to traffic implications. The junction by the shop is very busy with residents traffic, school children crossing and shop traffic/deliveries. The visibility at the junction is also often poor.

Prior to this site being selected I believe the implications for the junction should be clearly understood. For example would it result in the need for double yellow lines along station road in the vicinity of the junction and do residents want this change to the village character? What is the risk of the increased traffic?

16 units are currently proposed. I believe that a much smaller development (possibly half the size) would be more appropriate.

Like most other villagers I am opposed to the whole idea of so many homes being built in our village. Given that this is mandatory I believe that the style and nature of the village will be best served by small developments in the linear fashion of existing North West Villages and Hamlets in the area as outlined in the Plan. The major fear for me was a large development and change in the central area between the Fountain and Westgate. This area suffers badly with flooding and our rear garden regularly has large portions under water for some days. I have listened to the arguments re dispersion of water but I am not so sure that this will help. I have not seen any of these experts around when the fields go under water and am certain that this theory will not hold up given that we are told that Global Warning will increase days of heavy rain.

Policy 1 (PPNP page 24) In our opinion this policy and in particular presentations and the questionnaire unfairly guided respondents to align to a linear plan. Trapped into this ourselves, we wonder how many other people were affected and following discussion with other residents, this seems to be widespread. After consideration this could be due to the steering group wishing for personal reasons to avoid infill within the centre of the village area. Infill would make much more sense and align to policies within the NPPF to retain the village protect local green spaces, conserve and to enhance the natural environment and to community views to preserve wildlife habitats and reduce flooding.

Policy 2.2 (south of little inholmes) & Policy 2.3 (north of police house) (PPNP page 28-31) These policies directly contravene the requests of the community to retain the feel of the village and green spaces. 25% of respondents stated that views should be retained. For many, as you past Little Inholmes Farm the view to the Downs with the V in the distance is the essence of Plumpton Green. Despite a small margin of green belt being retained, housing will be rising up the hill rather than starting in the basin. Contrary to other developments within the plan (and those no longer included) this would not be hidden by natural woodland/hedges. Due to the steep embankment (policy 2.3), housing would tower across the village as a whole ruining the aesthetic and also causing noise pollution. The basin already floods and with the increase in hard surfaces on elevated land this will undoubtedly worsen. Residents of Woodgate Meadow fully maintain the ponds at the basin and costs for this are likely to unfairly increase. The woodland itself has been nurtured and birdlife now established with woodpeckers returning annually and protected flower species in evidence (which restricted the build line originally for WGM)

Particularly disturbing is the number of plots compared to others within the plan and if both 2.2 (up to 10) & 2.3 (up to 20) go ahead a very high percentage (60%) of the overall requirement very obvious at the entry to the village. This is worse than one larger/hidden development

The overviews state that as they are on the north of the village, traffic would be reduced as vehicles would travel out – rather than through the village. This is nonsense as 1-3 bed houses will undoubtedly house a high proportion of families. The plan states that local employment is predominantly the College, the Racecourse and of course out of the village towards Brighton & Lewes in the south or by train to Haywards Heath, London etc. This is likely to mean that residents would travel by car south to work, to the village hall, shop, school and railway station and in many instance completing double trips through the centre. Commuters are more likely to park as this is the furthest distance from the station. There are no play facilities to the north of the village and children would need to walk or driven to the playpark.

Completely remove these developments from the plan and reconsider developments on the east/west axis to infill where residents can be fully involved in the community without causing further traffic flow and the environment and character of the village can be retained.

Suggested modification I understand that the potential developers of the site to the rear of Oakfield, station road would be prepared to reduce the number of properties originally scoped and I feel that this should seriously be considered as an alternative. The site would be hidden (much like WGM), would balance across the village (opposite Westgate).

One of my biggest concern would be the loss of green space, I recognise the need for affordable housing but with it comes increased traffic and noise pollution. Although I haven't been here long I can see there is a sense of community however this can feel a little isolating if you are new to the village. I have noticed that there doesn't appear to be a lot for young people to do and if they are to be encouraged to stay then some focus should be placed on their needs. I do enjoy the night sky and wouldn't want to see this changed but worry about older residence and whether they spend more time indoors alone for fear of travelling the unlit roads. Plumpton is a beautiful place to live and wouldn't want to see it change too much but I accept that some changes will be made.

2.1. Site Land at Plumpton Racecourse. This site being very close to the racecourse buildings will unfortunately find that when events run at the racecourse the noise from the events will cause noise nuisance for the occupiers or restrain the racecourse from running certain events.

With access to these properties off Plumpton lane, the traffic issues will be increased and the potential incident risks increased where the racecourse entrance meets Plumpton Lane. There has been a couple of “near misses” and one vehicle damage incident that we know of since living our property.

A mention of natural screening? On the East side there is no natural screening

2.5. Site south of the railway crossing

The document states “ appropriate surface water drainage is provided”. I regret to inform you that on a number of periods in the winter months a “lake appears” with ducks etc enjoying environment. By placing houses on this area, the water shed will increase and many sad occupants experiencing damage to properties and contents.

The document states "safe pedestrian access with an appropriate crossing point is provided on Plumpton Lane between the site and the station / village centre ..." I assume you mean the level crossing which is not an ideal crossing point especially with the type of barrier whereby a person could access the tracks not mention NO footpath provision on the road which has a bend that could potentially increase risks to pedestrians.

The racecourse is very close to the site and as such on event days could create a vehicle issue with an increased amount of vehicles in that area close to the level crossing and race course entrance.

In addition. The race course events will unfortunately disturb these residents with the noise which then will cause issues to the race course

Finally. We are amazed that land should be considered not to mention the linear design of growth moving closer to the South downs. A structured village layout moulding itself sympathetically around amenities of the shop, public houses and church would seem in keeping to Government guidelines "The Restriction of Ribbon Development Act 1935"

Suggested modification

Surface water is a big issue to main sites in the UK. Our water courses (Rivers) that would be required to remove the excess water of the proposed sites need to be maintained. In the past few years the village has seen an increase in surface water issues.

I am writing to submit my very strong objection to the last minute addition to the plan to turn the racecourse at the foot of the south downs and on the cusp of the national park into a housing estate. The attached document covers the main points that contravene the council's obligation to preserve the character of the countryside.

It is vitally important to preserve the unique approach to the downs, which, whatever the highly loaded comments on the document say, would be seriously affected by turning the view from the station into a view into another housing estate. It is the first point of contact for visitors to the village and area. Even if I no longer lived here I would feel just as strongly about it.

As I live right by the bridge I have to option but to watch walkers, cyclists, visitors and locals on the bridge every day, at all hours. Almost everyone, locals and visitors alike, pause at the top and look out at the uninterrupted sweep of perfect countryside towards the downs at exactly the point at which a housing estate is proposed- to say this would not impact the village, or it's character or attractiveness to visitors should come and spend an hour watching the effect it has and then decide if that should be lost forever. It would be impossible to screen this due to the height of the bridge.

I do live right where the proposed building is, and would look right onto it, so for me too there would be a huge impact, but even if I move, which I may do, I would feel just as strongly- these areas cannot be replaced, and the racecourse could then push through more houses.

It would undoubtedly open the door what would undoubtedly be further building on the racecourse property in future. On Saturday I counted, by 9.30, at least 40 people walking across the bridge with their dogs and enjoying the access to the unspoiled space.

There are many other long term options for the future of the race course and attracting visitors to the area- which could include car parking- without ruining the fantastic resource that we have of a spectacular view from an unspoilt mainline station- we should preserve and exploit that for the villages benefit, not destroy forever.

I have looked at, and discussed the implications at length, and, having read the comprehensive document sent by my neighbour, have included it as it echoes exactly my sentiments in much more detail and more clearly than I could.

I cannot emphasise enough how much of a mistake this decision would be and what an invaluable resource this is for the village- it is short sighted in the extreme when other sites in less crucial locations are already there- I do wonder who from the racecourse has got power to have this pushed through as the "much preferred option" at this late stage.

I am concerned about the development proposed south of Plumpton level crossing for the following reasons: (a) This is outside the Parish boundary (b) It is proposed to build twelve dwellings and provide a car park for Plumpton Station. I am very concerned that the extra traffic movement this will create will be hazardous. This is very close to the station - the road is narrow and there is a bend as you come to or from the station. Even with the new proposed speed limit there is will to be congestion at this point. There is also a proposal to have a footpath to the station. As I have said this is not a wide road - I do not believe a footpath to be a safety option. (c) This will be seen from the South Downs and will have an enormous impact

Policy 2

"housing will be provided in small to medium clusters in northern and southerly locations to maintain the linear form of Plumpton Green".

This contradicts the stated vision which refers to "small clusters".

"Sites mainly to the north and south of the planning boundary have been preferred with a view to allowing vehicular traffic to escape the village without necessarily having to travel through its centre. This would offset any possible vehicle use necessary to access village amenities distant from these sites, as highlighted in the Site Assessment Report under the promotion of sustainable transport".

I'm not convinced that it would offset the extra cars accessing, and parking at, the school, station and shop.

2.2 & 2.3 Recommending development of sites either side of Station Road to the north will conflict with the stated vision of “small clusters on sites that do not detract from the character and setting of the Parish”. 8-10 units on Land South of Inholms Farm plus 15-20 units on Land North of Old Police Station is hardly a “small cluster”. I am concerned that the 2 developments on opposite sides of Station Road at the north end of the village will, as a whole, detract too much from the existing setting and character of the Parish, and, being a good distance from the school and station, will increase the traffic and parking problems in these areas. Development of both sites will surely conflict with the narrative in Policy 10 Landscape and Biodiversity: “The distinctive views of the surrounding countryside that are enjoyed from the many public vantage points in and around the built-up area should be protected and preserved”. Whether driving, walking or cycling, the view of the village and the downs beyond as you enter into the village from the north is surely one of the most distinctive views in the neighbourhood.

Suggested modification “Sites mainly to the north and south of the planning boundary have been preferred with a view to allowing vehicular traffic to escape the village without necessarily having to travel through its centre. This may offset any possible vehicle use necessary to access village amenities distant from these sites, as highlighted in the Site Assessment Report under the promotion of sustainable transport”. I suggest that one of the 2 northern sites is replaced by the reserve site in Riddens Lane.

POLICY 1

The Plumpton Parish Neighbourhood Plan 2016-2030 (May 2106) is in direct conflict with Lewes DC’s Joint Core Strategy and the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group wishes to ‘steer’ the necessary housing development away from the perfectly suited, central village sites, towards an extension of the ribbon development, beyond the existing and established village boundaries, of the railway station in the south and The Old Police House/Trillium in the north. This Plan flies in the face of sustainable development.

Plumpton Parish Council writes, in the June 2016 Plumpton & East Chiltington News, under the heading of Parking, that “...this is a perennial problem and one that has occupied countless hours of Parish Council time over the years, but a universally acceptable solution has evaded all studies”.

The problem to which this statement refers is the ever increasing volume of parked cars, along the length of Station Road, from the railway station, to the northern village boundary, the latter of which is clearly defined by The Old Police House (east side) and Trillium (west side).

The solution is to build on sites which do not adjoin Station Road.

It is perverse, therefore, that the same Council’s draft Neighbourhood Plan favours development of sites adjacent to Station Road, which, if approved, would set a precedent for further ribbon development of land adjoining Station Road, from The Half Moon Pub, in the south of the parish, to The Plough Pub, in the north.

National and local policy opposes ribbon development and any more in this parish will do nothing to “...encourage development proposals for the benefit of the local community.” (Draft NP Plan, May 2016).

New home owners of, and visitors to, any sites developed adjacent to Station Road, beyond the existing and established village boundaries (see above), will inevitably use Station Road as overspill parking, creating hazards for road users. The sites beyond the northern boundary (Site 3 – Shaw Farm/Inholms Farm, Site 4 – Inholms Farm North, and Site 5 – Lentrige/Old Police House, are each more than 800 metres from the village shop, 1,000 metres from the primary school, and 1,200 metres from the railway station.

Residents living in houses on these sites, if developed, will mostly not work in the village, but commute out of the village, either driving to and from the station daily, and at weekends parents driving their families and children to and from the heart of the village and its amenities, will destroy any prospect of a sustainable transport policy and do nothing to boost the sense of community around the principal public and social amenities which this village offers, including the Church and its Meeting Room, the Village Hall, the Village Shop, the School and the Station.

There are numerous sites identified within the heart of this community as being both available and suitable for development and these are sites that are not adjacent to Station Road, but are close to the local amenities. These are the sites that should provide the 50 houses needed. If they are not developed as part of the necessary allocation, they will be, in time, over and above the allocation.

Suggested modification Abandon any thought of developing sites beyond the existing and established Village boundaries, of the railway station in the south and The Old Police House/Trillium, in the north.

I am against the development of houses on the Straw lands area with the actual entrance in Wells Close or so I believe?

I see all sorts of people living in Wells Close, I see families, I see children playing in their gardens and out in the close itself.

With any new developments we see more people, traffic, noise and whatever issues they bring with them. We do see our community grow, the shop grow, business's grow and of course our village grow with whatever issues they bring with them.

I have noticed in the last couple of months more noise, litter (beer cans in Strawlands, beer cans in the Recreation ground and around the Village hall. This Sunday morning I noticed a used condom in the round opposite the Church and we have been on the receiving end of car damage 3 weeks ago when 7 cars were scratched.

I object to the Plumpton Draft NP on the following grounds.

1. I do not have faith in the criteria used to assess potential housing sites and do not feel that it was objectively applied. One of the criteria refers to Listed Buildings, there is only one in the village and it is listed because of internal features so no development would affect it. Another criteria was potential affect on flora and fauna and yet not all sites were assessed. One site was dismissed through inaccurate and subjective application of the criteria - site to east of Station Road.

2. The selection of sites referenced as 2.2 and 2.3 directly contravenes the Lewes District Local Plan Core Policy 13 Sustainable Travel. This policy states

1. Ensuring that new development is located in sustainable locations with good access to schools, shops, jobs and other key services by walking, cycling and public transport in order to reduce the need to travel by car (unless there is an overriding need for the development in a less accessible location).

1. Ensuring that new development minimises the need to travel and incorporates appropriate measures to mitigate for any transport impacts which may arise from that development.

As a resident at the north end of the village I am fully aware that the majority of people drive to the shop ,the station and the school from this part of the village. The proposed sites are further still from these facilities and therefore traffic through the village will increase and parking will become even worse than it already is.

The road at the top of the village has poor visibility and is bendy, it is not conducive to walking or cycling.

3. Core Policy 12 of LDC plan regarding flood policy

Steering development away from areas of flood risk (as identified in the latest Environment Agency and SFRA flood risk and climate change maps) where possible. Development in areas of flood risk will be required to meet the national Sequential and Exception tests, where relevant.

The area to the north of the village identified as policy 2.2 land south of Inholmes Farm is directly above an area identified as at high risk of flooding. As one of the residents directly below this land I know from experience that we and our neighbours suffer from high water levels and have suffered flooding. Members of the NP said they hadn't considered flooding as part of their remit. I think this is negligent. The point of a NP is to reflect local needs and use local knowledge to achieve those needs. At a consultation drop in numerous residents were hi-lighting flooding issues and were not listened to and told it was not relevant to the NP.

A recent development within the village has caused flooding to houses below it. We can not rely on developers to address flooding issues. It is our responsibility to protect peoples property when we know flooding problems already exist.

The NP in its questionnaire to the village refers to the Village as a linear village which is a misrepresentation. We live in a linear parish. There are more houses on an east west axis within the village than on a north south one. This statement in the questionnaire was worded to suggest that a vote for linear was maintaining what we had which is not the case. Ribbon development has never been a good planning policy. To extend the village to north and south contravenes policy 9 and 10 of the NP. It destroys

Suggested
modification

Re-consideration be given to sites in the middle of the village, many of which meet all the objectives of the Plan, and that the disregarded site to the east of Station Road to the rear of the Brighton Garage be included in the list of preferred sites.

I strongly oppose extending the length of the village by developing north or south. Planning policy is normally against such ribbon development and we should be encouraging development in locations within the centre of the village that provide easier pedestrian access to the Village Hall, Shop, School, Playing Fields, Railway Station and the majority of existing houses. Any development to the north or south will result in unwanted and unnecessary additional car use within the village.

Vehicular use in the village has become a major problem: dangerous parking around the shop (on the brow of the hill) – a lot of pedestrians in this area including children some crossing the road between parked vehicles; excessive parking all along Station Road adding difficulty for all road users including cyclists needing to weave in and out of parked cars, let alone pedestrians when vehicles park up on the kerb; inadequate parking around the popular Railway Station causing dangerous parking on the bend to the south of the level crossing and near the junctions with the entrance to the Playing Field/Barnfield/Station Close/East View Fields/Smithys Close causing very restricted and dangerous visibility displays for vehicular traffic and pedestrians in those areas; difficult vehicular access to the School at Southdowns caused by extensive and sometimes dangerous parking of cars in that vicinity at pick up and drop off times.

Development particularly to the North (Policy 2.2 and 2.3) will create unwanted additional vehicular movements and parking in and around the above mentioned facilities within the village. Due to the distance, new residents will not often choose to walk into the village from any development to the north in particular due to its distance from the facilities (I don't and I live closer to the facilities). This is one of the reasons new development should be in and around the centre of the village.

The NP should be a commitment towards reducing the need for a car within the village, one can only presume it doesn't state such a policy because the NP committee have decided to encourage north and south development which is hard to justify if such an environmental commitment was included within the NP.

The NP survey for residents to complete was clearly designed to encourage a positive response for north south development by asking whether one supported "maintaining" a north-south axis or "changing and expanding widthways on an east west axis". This was totally misleading and unhelpful, it could be said the words chosen were intentionally biased towards the pre determined preference of the NP committee (It should be noted by the inspector that the north south sites were not originally put forward by the landowners, the sites were sought out and nurtured by the NP committee members).

The fact is that East View Fields, Westgate, Southdowns, North Barnes Lane, Woodgate, Wells Close, Chapel Road, Strawlands and Riddens Lane are all existing "widthways" developments and this type of development is a central part of the village character.

The process of site selection and preference scoring should be reviewed by the inspector, sites located in a more central position in the village that were deemed unsuitable by the NP committee should be reconsidered. In particular the site behind the current "Brighton Garage Services" just south of the Church is an ideal site and apparently was dismissed because the developer wanted to put "too many" houses on it, yet I understand the developer was willing to reduce the original number. I was told by a NP committee member that this offer by the developer to reduce the number of dwellings "came in too late" for the NP committee to re consider their decision. I would ask the inspector to investigate this matter and determine whether this particular site has been incorrectly dismissed by the NP committee. It is in an ideal central location, reducing the need for car use within the village. Under policy 2- this site would be sympathetic to the scale, topography and character of the Parish and would not have a detrimental impact on the setting. It would blend in very well with other existing "widthways" developments previously mentioned. It has a natural water drainage to the east which does not affect other properties.

Suggested modification

Do not propose sites to the north and south for development when sites more centrally located would be better suited to meeting the objectives of suitable additional housing.

Review some of the sites that have been dismissed and do not now form part of the draft plan, and review the scoring method used.

All scoring results and the dismissed sites should have been included in the draft Plan.

I have concerns that once planning permission was granted for the racecourse site it could open the door for development of the whole of the racecourse for housing at a later date. Although the other site on the south side of the railway sounds good I feel that if planning was granted for this it would naturally mean that any housing on the racecourse site would have to be granted.

I do not agree that there is natural screening. I feel that both these sites would be very visible from the downs and neither of these sites come into the National Park boundary so would probably have no reason to be refused.

Suggested Modification: I do not think that there can be a modification to these sites. I just don't think building on the south side of the railway is conducive to the nature of the village for the above reasons.

My preference would be for the Wells close and Riddens lane sites as they are more central to the village followed by the sites further north

I am generally not in favour of extending the village from either end though the arguments are more compelling on the North end of the village than the south.

The objections from both ends:

Core policy 12: Sustainable Drainage

Serious drainage problems affect a number of the houses on Station road to the south of this development – some (eg Inholmes Cottages) need to have pumps permanently in place to prevent flooding due to the large amount of surface run-off largely originating on this slope. Any new development would need to incorporate Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS)

Core policy 13: Sustainable Travel

Measured on Google maps from the lowest point of this development where it joins the road, the distance to the School is 1125 Metres and to the Station is 1290 Metres. New houses, especially affordable housing, will have significant numbers of children all emerging to go to school by car every day. Additionally the traffic to the station with one or both parents commuting will be significant.

Additional comments: Significant impact upon neighbours. Two new exits onto Station Road shortly after the corner. Even if speed limits are changed it will be a dangerous new hazard.

2.3 Land North of Old Police Station

Core policy 10: Natural Environment and Landscape Character

The entrance to the village would be adversely impacted. The village is a largely compact village within a long thin parish. Ribbon development would completely change the nature of the village and the impact upon entering it.

It is also very visible all along the Downs between at least Mount Harry and Ditchling Beacon and from considerably lower levels too.

A number of planning applications in the area have been refused (raising roof lines etc) for very reason of visibility from the Downs.

Core policy 13: Sustainable Travel

Measured on Google maps from the lowest point of this development where it joins the road, the distance to the School is 1125 Metres and to the Station is 1290 Metres. New houses, especially affordable housing, will have significant numbers of children all emerging to go to school by car every day. Additionally the traffic to the station with one or both parents commuting will be significant.

The south end:

2.1 Land at Plumpton Racecourse and 2.5 Land South of Railway

Core policy 10: Natural Environment and Landscape Character

The entrance to the village would be adversely impacted. The village is a largely compact village within a long thin parish. Ribbon development would completely change the nature of the village and the impact upon entering it.

It is also very visible all along the Downs between at least Mount Harry and Ditchling Beacon and from considerably lower levels too.

A number of planning applications in the area have been refused (raising roof lines etc) for very reason of visibility from the Downs.

Suggested
modification

There is plenty of natural infill area within the village Creation of the Local Green Space LGS6 in what is natural infill within the village is unreasonable. The western side of it would be reasonable but the eastern half should be considered natural development space.

Policy 2.5 – Allocation of Land South of Railway Line, Plumpton for new housing and car park.

This site is not suitable for development, as such development will harm the setting of the National Park and the amenities of neighbouring residents. There are better performing sites listed in the Plumpton Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment Report that should be included instead. Flood risk and highway safety have not been fully considered either. Development of the site will harm residential amenities.

Suggested modification	<p>More detailed information contained in Lewis and Co Planning letter</p> <p>Policy 2.5 should be deleted from the scheme.</p> <p>Further consideration should be given to allocating more suitable sites for development, for example: Land at Little Inholmes Farm, or Land adjoining the Rectory (Glebe)</p> <p>More detailed information contained in Lewis and Co Planning letter.</p>
	<p>I would wish that any of the suggested sites for Housing development have learnt from the awful eyesore affordable houses that have been built along North Barnes Lane.</p> <p>Too tall and clad in the wrong materials they stand out like a sore thumb and do not blend in to the Village, totally ruining the landscape with their bright Orange tiles. We were promised that the materials used for these builds would be sympathetic to the surroundings, clearly the PPC and the Lewes Planners were duped by the developers</p> <p>Suggested Modification: Have the colours and materials defined and agreed, and make any developers accountable</p>
	<p>Policy 1 (PPNP page 24)</p> <p>I believe this policy and in particular presentations and questionnaire unfairly guided respondents to align to a linear you have to question how many other residents were affected after talking to other residents this seems to be widespread. After looking at where the majority of the steering group reside you have to ask could this be due to the steering group wishing for personal reasons to avoid infill within the centre of the village area. Infill would reduce traffic flow through the village as residents use the train, school and village shop and would drive if living in the outer reaches of Plumpton and it would align policies within the NPPF to retain the village protect local green spaces, conserve and enhance the natural environment and to community views to preserve wildlife habitats not to mention the risk of flooding.</p> <p>Policy 2.2 (south of little inholmes) & Policy 2.3 (north of police house) (PPNP page 28-31)</p> <p>These policies directly contravene the requests of the community to retain the feel of the village and green spaces. 25% of respondents stated that views should be retained. For many, as you past Little Inholmes Farm the view to the Downs with the V in the distance is the essence of Plumpton Green. Despite a small margin of green belt being retained, housing will be rising up the hill rather than starting in the basin. Contrary to other developments within the plan (and those no longer included) this would not be hidden by natural woodland/hedges. Due to the steep embankment (policy 2.3), housing would tower across the village as a whole ruining the aesthetic and also causing noise pollution. The basin already floods and with the increase in hard surfaces on elevated land this will undoubtedly worsen. Residents of Woodgate Meadow fully maintain the ponds at the basin and costs for this are likely to unfairly increase. The woodland itself has been nurtured and birdlife now established with woodpeckers returning annually and protected flower species in evidence (which restricted the build line originally for WGM) including a rare orchid snakes slow worms.</p>

Particularly disturbing is the number of plots compared to others within the plan and if both 2.2 (up to 10) & 2.3 (up to 20) go ahead a very high percentage (60%) of the overall requirement very obvious at the entry to the village. This is worse than one larger/hidden development

The overviews state that as they are on the north of the village, traffic would be reduced as vehicles would travel out – rather than through the village. This is nonsense as 1-3 bed houses will undoubtedly house a high proportion of families. The plan states that local employment is predominantly the College, the Racecourse and of course out of the village towards Brighton & Lewes in the south or by train to Haywards Heath, London etc. This is likely to mean that residents would travel by car south to work, to the village hall, shop, school and railway station and in many instance completing double trips through the centre. Commuters are more likely to park as this is the furthest distance from the station. There are no play facilities to the north of the village and children would need to walk or driven to the playpark. If you go to the school or the park the major of children are driven there.

Suggested
modification

Policy 1,
2.2 & 2.3

Completely remove these developments from the plan and reconsider developments on the east/west axis to infill where residents can be fully involved in the community without causing further traffic flow and the environment and character of the village can be retained.

I understand that the potential developers of the site to the rear of Oakfield, station road would be prepared to reduce the number of properties originally scoped and I feel that this should seriously be considered as an alternative. The site would be hidden (much like WGM), would balance across the village (opposite Westgate).

Having reviewed the scoring methodology and the application of the criteria contained in the PNP, I have the following concerns:

it appears that the scoring criteria has been very selectively applied to ensure that the proposed sites at both ends of the village are top ranked.

The plan appears committed to supporting further ribbon development and I am not surprised that a subjective application of the criteria has achieved this objective ranking development at either end of the village as being the most desirable.

I do not think Site 11 is suitable given its visual impact and the fact that it is so obviously at odds with planning policy on ribbon development. The proposal flies in the face of almost a hundred years of planning policy to avoid urban sprawl in rural areas. In 1935 a specific Government Act was introduced to discourage ribbon development, The Restriction of Ribbon Development Act 1935 was passed because the view of the countryside is diminished creating ugly urban sprawl by developments such as this.

Plumpton Green is already elongated and this plan encourages further ribbon development

Site 11 South of the Railway

B1 No pedestrian access so should be zero not positive. New car access will be required from the road.

B2 Currently traffic speeds up as it leaves the built up area of the village and so the scoring should have been negative not positive.

D3 Several sites have Geodiversity marked as negative, but include no justification for this scoring. Conversely this site has a positive statement as regards Geodiversity without any justification for this. Unless there are specific reasons why other sites have been given a negative it should be consistent with other undisturbed greenfield sites and marked negative.

D5 There are listed buildings in the vicinity. The site borders on to Rylands Farm to the south which in the official listing is described as 17th century farm or earlier timber-framed building. As a result this means that this should have been marked a negative.

E2 There is extensive surface water flooding that does not naturally drain away in the winter. This item should have been marked negative instead of zero.

I The ultimate objective for this site is to have 25-30 units on the site as illustrated in the map of sites on page 10. As a result this should have been marked negative as it is more than 21 units.

J This is an additional weighting promoting ribbon development that is against planning policy.

K3 The north west corner of the site is very evident from the Downs and so should have been marked as a negative rather than zero

The net effect of the scoring even allowing for the committees preferred ribbon development is that the site comes out as joint rank 11th - which means it should be at the bottom of the ranking and not the top.

In the commentary on this site it ignores the impact of the view on entering the village that is extended in to the countryside. It closes the gap between the village and Rylands Farm. On Site 4 this is seen as the major obstacle to recommending this site at the other end of the village but on this site it is completely ignored in assessing this site. As it is at the end of the village it is suggested that it will result in less traffic congestion- this is wishful thinking. This assumes a higher percentage of the traffic will drive south. This is unlikely due to the local road layout in accessing local towns. As traffic heading north and will have to go through the whole village rather than just part of it, it will in fact create more congestion than traffic from a more central heading location heading north.

A thorough impartial review of the assessments and scoring is required, prior to the rankings being used as a basis for recommendation of sites for development.

The plan is fundamentally flawed, lacks objectivity and the conclusions open to legal review. It does not have my support.

A) It is astonishing to me that the race-course was able to submit its proposal about a year later and have it accepted by the Steering Committee for inclusion in the Plan. I have concerns about this site as follows:

- It sets a worrying precedence for future development on the race-course site

<p>Suggested modification</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · The site is clearly visible from the South Downs and I do not believe that screening can be made to be adequate to prevent such visibility · Access to and from the southern end of the race-course is already dangerous at Plumpton Cross with very poor visibility – increased traffic would exacerbate this issue <p>Will the site be immediately available for development in terms of ownership of the road access?</p> <p>I feel that the race-course site should be eliminated from the Plan for the above reasons – the ‘due process’ being the principal objection.</p>
	<p>I do, however, object to the density of housing (15 -20) proposed for site 3 in the current draft. The proposed development on site 2 of 8 - 10 houses opposite site 3 means that there will be up to 30 new dwellings and their occupants vehicles accessing Station road at much the same point. This is unnecessary when there is reserve site 6 which could be used to take some of the housing which is accessing the road at a different point. I would therefore like to put forward the proposal that site 6 be included in the draft proposal reducing the number to be allocated to site 3.</p> <p>I also object to 19 units allocated to site 1 as I consider that there would be a traffic hazard with vehicles turning into Plumpton Lane at a point where it is effectively single lane and a quite severe corner with consequent inability to see car approaching from the North.</p> <p>I feel that it would be useful to include an map showing all 6 sites and the numbers proposed for each site in the draft document and was surprised not to see one.</p>
	<p>Proposed building on the race course</p> <p>This is an important place in the village. Before I moved here I stood on the bridge I spoke to the first couple who walked up on to the bridge. The view and the friendliness of the couple is what sold Plumpton Green to me. To put houses on this land would remove this view ever. It would possibly the start of future building on and around the race course.</p> <p>19 houses could easily be put elsewhere within the village.</p>
<p>Suggested modification</p>	<p>Can just suggest we are a bit more prescriptive on the design statement. I think Westgate is a great example of what fits in well as is Sun Close. So white weatherboard and red tile cladding, red (local?) brick construction and emphasis on individual designs. Slate or tile roofs?</p>
	<p>The plan is committed to elongating the village with further ribbon development and so its is not surprising that a subjective application of the criteria has achieved this objective ranking development at either end of the village as being the most desirable.</p>

Even from a cursory analysis of the scoring shows that there are scoring inconsistencies and issues that have been raised at other sites as being negative issues, but seem to have been ignored for the favoured sites. In particular we will address the highest ranked site which we do not think this is suitable given its visual impact and the fact that it is so obviously at odds with planning policy on ribbon development. The proposal flies in the face of almost a hundred years of planning policy to avoid urban sprawl in rural areas. In 1935 a specific Government Act was introduced to discourage ribbon development The Restriction of Ribbon Development Act 1935 was passed because the view of the countryside is diminished creating ugly urban sprawl by developments such as this. Plumpton Green already is an urban sprawl and is not as attractive as other more compact Sussex rural villages. Plumpton Green has no core. It is just a sprawl. This development makes it worse.

Site 11 South of the Railway

B1 - No pedestrian access so should be zero not positive. New car access will be required from the road.

B2 - Currently traffic speeds up as it leaves the built up area of the village and so the scoring should have been negative not positive.

D3 - Several sites have Geodiversity marked as negative, but include no justification for this scoring. Conversely this site has a positive statement as regards Geodiversity without any justification for this. Unless there are specific reasons why other sites have been given a negative it should be consistent with other undisturbed greenfield sites and marked negative.

D5 - There are listed buildings in the vicinity. The site borders on to Rylands Farm to the south which in the official listing is described as 17th century farm or earlier timber-framed building. As a result this means that this should have been marked a negative.

E2 - There is extensive surface water flooding that does not naturally drain away in the winter. This item should have been marked negative instead of zero.

I - The ultimate objective for this site is to have 25-30 units on the site as illustrated in the map of sites on page 10. As a result this should have been marked negative as it is more than 21 units.

J - This is an additional weighting promoting ribbon development that is against planning policy.

K3 - The north west corner of the site is very evident from the Downs and so should have been marked a negative rather than zero

The net effect of the scoring even allowing for the committees preferred ribbon development is that the site comes out as joint rank 11th - which means it should be at the bottom of the ranking and not the top!

In the commentary on this site it ignores the impact of the view on entering the village that is extended in to the countryside. It closes the gap between the village and Rylands Farm. On Site 4 this is seen as the major obstacle to recommending this site at the other end of the village but on this site it is completely ignored in assessing this site. As it is at the end of the village it is suggested that it will result in less traffic congestion- this is wishful thinking. This assumes a higher percentage of the traffic will drive south. This is unlikely due to the local road layout in accessing local towns. As traffic heading north and will have to go through the whole village rather than just part of it , it will in fact create more congestion than traffic from a more central heading location heading north.

A thorough impartial review of the assessments and scoring is required, prior to the rankings being used as a basis for recommendation of sites for development.

The development to the North of the village is totally unacceptable. This will create immense amounts of traffic into the village for the village shop, the school and the station. I also feel that the location of where PC members live needs to be detailed if we are to believe this is not a NIMBY solution. There are adequate locations in the centre of the village which need to be adequately explored. The ongoing delays will result in an imposed solution which will suit nobody.

Suggested
modification

I am commenting on the proposed developments north of the police house. I do not understand why these are favoured above others which are much closer to village amenities. The plan states that this will keep the linear nature of the village. I do not understand this reasoning as most of the housing is not on the main road but are off to the east and west so how is the village linear? As for less traffic through the village it is too far for people to walk down to amenities and we will have more people driving to take their children to school where we already have congestion and parking problems. There are viable alternatives for this development without pushing the village further up the road.

Include proposals on the plan which are within sensible distance from all local amenities.

I have a number of concerns about the plan, regarding some aspects of the consultation process, the policy-making, the site selection and the final sites included.

- Policy 2, allowing for housing outside the current planning boundary seems to contradict the desire to reduce traffic through the village. By building houses outside the boundary, and particularly on the sites to the North which are quite a distance from the shop and other amenities, it seems that more people will be driving through the village to reach amenities, which will not be offset by people being able to leave the village without driving through the centre.

- the inclusion of another site - at the Racecourse - after all the consultations and landowner meetings is undemocratic. This site has not been subjected to the same scrutiny by the general public as the other sites.

- the site selection criteria do not appear to have been applied in a consistent manner to all sites. Factors which are considered decisive for one are not taken into account for another. For example, for some sites, the impact of traffic on neighbouring properties is taken into account (e.g. site 10, behind the school) but not considered for others (e.g. the site at the Racecourse).

- the site selection does not appear to tally with the criteria applied in the site assessment report i.e. sites were ranked according to the criteria, but then not chosen in the order in which they were ranked. For example, the site at Riddens Lane has been included in the site selection (ranked 8a) but not the site at Nolands (ranked 7). This seems to undermine the whole process of ranking them according to criteria.

- criteria have not been applied equally. It seems that impact on neighbouring properties has been given a higher priority than impact on the village as a whole, skewing the ranking in favour of sites away from the centre of the village. As noted above, I think that central sites are more likely to reduce traffic through the village than sites on the outskirts.

regarding site 2.1, at the Racecourse, it seems to go against Policy 4, because it will adversely affect Hills Driving School, a long-standing local business. It is unsuitable for a number of other reasons:

- it is suggested that this site would have minimal impact on adjacent properties, but there would be a significant, substantial increase in traffic past the properties to the South of the racecourse.

- it is suggested that the access to Plumpton Lane from this site is at a point where 'visibility is good' but it is a very difficult corner, turning into the road at a point where it narrows considerably

- it is suggested that there is no problem with access because of the existing roads to the south of the racecourse. This does not take into account the fact that these access roads are both private roads and there has been no discussion or consultation with the owners of those roads over whether they would be willing to grant access. The Racecourse cannot guarantee that.

- more broadly, an agreement to allow building on the Racecourse site, in order to address their financial difficulties opens the floodgate to future development on that site, which has been something that Plumpton residents have been against for a very long time.

regarding sites 2.2 and 2.3, I think that two new sites opposite each other could cause traffic congestion and dangerous junctions.

- I am disappointed that Policy 3 does not contain anything about sustainability of the buildings to be erected i.e. taking into account the sustainability of housing stock in the village in terms of insulation, energy use, energy sources etc.

Suggested modification

I think that the preference for sites outside the planning boundary does not reflect accurately people's concerns to maintain the linear nature of the village, as many of the suggested sites fill in gaps between existing buildings and therefore maintain the linear nature. I suggest referring back to the selection criteria and applying them fairly and equally to all sites, taking into account that all sites, not just some of them, will impact negatively on neighbouring properties. I suggest that more sites in the centre of the village are chosen, rather than prioritising those to the north and south.

Unfortunately, on detailed analysis of the application of the criteria used for scoring it appears there has been some selective application of criteria to achieve the ends that presumably have the support of the committee.

The plan is committed to elongating the village with further ribbon development and so it is perhaps not surprising that a subjective application of the criteria has achieved this objective ranking development at either end of the village as being the most desirable.

From an analysis of the scoring for Site 11 South of the Railway there are scoring inconsistencies and issues that have been raised at other sites as being negative issues, but seem to have been ignored for this favoured site.

In particular, South of the Railway site is not suitable given its visual impact and the fact that it is so obviously at odds with generally accepted planning policy on ribbon development. The proposal flies in the face of almost a hundred years of planning policy to avoid urban sprawl in rural areas. In 1935 a specific Government Act was introduced to discourage ribbon development: The Restriction of Ribbon Development Act 1935 was passed because the view of the countryside is "diminished creating ugly urban sprawl" by developments such as this. Plumpton Green has no core and is already an urban sprawl and so is less attractive than other more compact Sussex rural villages. This proposed end of village developments makes it worse.

Reviewing the scoring used for Site 11 South of the Railway

B1 No pedestrian access so should be zero not positive. New car access will be required from the road.

B2 Currently traffic speeds up as it leaves the built up area of the village and so the scoring should have been negative not positive.

D3 Several sites have Geodiversity marked as negative, but include no justification for this scoring. Conversely this site has a positive statement as regards Geodiversity without any justification for this. Unless there are specific reasons why other sites have been given a negative it should be consistent with other undisturbed greenfield sites and marked negative.

D5 There are listed buildings in the vicinity. The site borders on to Rylands Farm to the south which in the official listing is described as 17th century farm or earlier timber-framed building. As a result this means that this should have been marked as a negative.

E2 There is extensive surface water flooding that does not naturally drain away in the winter. This item should have been marked negative instead of zero.

I The ultimate objective for this site is to have 25-30 units on the site as illustrated in the map of sites on page 10. As a result this should have been marked negative as it is more than 21 units.

J This is an additional weighting promoting ribbon development that is against planning policy.

K3 The north west corner of the site is very evident from the Downs and so should have been marked a negative rather than zero

The net effect of the revised scoring even allowing for the committees preferred ribbon development is that the site comes out as joint rank 11th - which means it should be at the bottom of the ranking and not the top!

In the commentary on this site it ignores the impact of the view on entering the village that is extended in to the countryside. It closes the gap between the village and Rylands Farm. On Site 4 this is seen as the major obstacle to recommending this site at the other end of the village but on this site it is overlooked in assessing this site. As it is at the end of the village it is suggested that it will result in less traffic congestion- this is wishful thinking. This assumes a higher percentage of the traffic will drive south. This is unlikely due to the local road layout in accessing local towns. As traffic heading north will have to go through the whole village rather than just part of it will in fact create more congestion than traffic from a more central heading location heading north.

Suggested modification Site 11 is removed from the list of recommended sites due to its unsuitability evidenced by a more objective assessment which is consistent with planning policy on ribbon development and the reserve site is adopted.

Not supported

The plan methodology and as result its recommendations is, as I have shown, flawed and lacks objectivity and so does not have my support.

We object to the proposal to develop at Plumpton Racecourse (Policy 2.1). First of all, we would like to point out that the Racecourse development has been put forward very late in the consultation process, so that effectively it has escaped true scrutiny by the village residents.

Any new housing development in this area would affect the character of the village, and of the landscape it offers both to the villagers, and to visitors to the National Park. The importance of the rural nature of the village was repeatedly emphasised by the villagers during the consultation exercise and remains a firmly held opinion. The views of the South Downs here are particularly beautiful and are part of the village and its identity. It is also important to point out that the National Park is the only area of its type in the whole region, and that obviously, special efforts should be made to preserve the landscape and the natural beauty of the park and its bordering areas.

The area on which the houses would be built is used by a wide variety of people from the village, and travellers are able to get off the train and walk straight into a beautiful landscape, which obviously enhances the value of this part of Plumpton.

It is also worrying that the initial development may not be the last near this site, and that more houses will be constructed in future years, which would place more pressure on the village's infrastructure and also further damage the rural nature of the village. Moreover, the houses recently constructed along North Barnes Farm Lane are much bigger than the average house in the village, and are located on a rise in the land, which means that they are visible from a great distance (including from the South Downs themselves). If this kind of housing is to be used as a model, the effects on the landscape and views currently enjoyed by both the residents of East View Fields and the villagers in general will be severe, since the bungalows in East View Fields would be completely overshadowed by the proposed housing.

It has been argued that the development is suitable because it is "part of a site currently in commercial use", but there is no commercial activity on this part of the site at all. It is also claimed that it has "vehicular access already in place", but this access is through and around the racecourse and is no more suitable than any of the other options under consideration.

Suggested modification If the village must take more housing, then an extension of an existing development would be better. Particularly because this development could represent a genuine expansion of the village.

1. Policy 1 states conformance to CT1, but the development for Plumpton Green is outside the boundary map on page 14, so it is difficult to see how this conforms to the spirit of CT1.
2. Policy 2.2: no clarity on what screening, trees, hedges would be preserved.
3. Policy 2.2: no clarity on where the 30 MPH boundary would be extended to.
4. Policy 2.2: states that the arrangement would be mirrored with 2.3, but that is not what is shown (the various diagrams of the site in 2.2/2.3/Policies Map on page 50 are inconsistent).
5. Policy 2.3: no clarity on what screening, hedges and ancient trees would be preserved.
6. Policy 2.3: no clarity on where the 30 MPH boundary would be extended to.
7. Policy 2.3: the site map appears to deliberately exaggerate the 'green corridor' by showing less of the site being developed than the Policies Map on page 50, and also by choosing to include some of the garden of Lentridge Barn in this corridor (in contrast to the site map in 2.2).
8. Policy 2.3 now states 15-20 units, but this number keeps varying (e.g. 12 at consultation).
9. Generally the comments on site traffic in both cases need explaining, and given the availability of previously assessed development sites within the current boundary, appear to be in direct contrast to the LDC policy with respect to sustainable transport policy.
10. The allocation of LGS status to areas that fall within the properly considered SHLAAA/SHELAA documents needs explaining

· Development to the North and South fundamentally alters the character of the village in contrast to the opening statement of the vision, and against policy CT1, and is largely unnecessary given the availability of sufficient, properly considered sites in the LDC/SDNPA SHLAA (June 2014) and SHELAA (October 2015).

· Extending the planning boundary under CT1 to the South it risks being the 'thin end of the wedge' towards mass development on the race course site and surrounding areas. To the North, developing both sides of Station Road to the extent indicated simply irreversibly extends the village beyond its current natural boundary; the green corridor is too narrow to be effective.

· The plan lacks clarity and internal consistency as per the Comments, above.

· The LDC representative assigned to support this exercise admitted at consultation that the preferred sites are not the most sustainable, and would not have been chosen by LDC.

The sites preferred are supported by an original survey that was not objective, lacked intellectual rigour, and was biased to a particular North/South outcome. The subsequent analysis has tended towards being too arbitrary and/or subjective and continues to be vague in areas that could easily be clarified.

Suggested modification Provide clarity and consistency on these aspects; remain factual in all representations.

Explain why the professionally considered sustainable sites are no longer preferable.

Suggested modification I have a number of concerns with the proposal to build close to the racecourse. A key concern is that building south of the railway line potentially represents the thin end of a wedge. In the future it could be used to justify expanding Plumpton Green to further encroach on land up to the National Park boundary. This proposal needs to be withdrawn for me to support the plan.

We were unaware of proposals to build on part of the racecourse parking area (green space to the North) this site not being publicised by PPNP Group just included at the last minute, at the time of the village meeting no plans available on the website. The racecourse and its beauty are why we bought our home. The countryside & views of the Southdown's which would change once a building development proceeds.

This will have a detrimental impact to the properties to the south of East View Fields and we do believe in the design policy that areas adjoining SDNP must avoid any significant detrimental effect on its landscape and natural beauty. This site would severely impact on our properties even though you state this would be minimal due to the presence of the railway line, which in reality is at the bottom of our gardens. The properties to the south side of East View Fields are nearly all bungalows and chalets of different styles all of whom would be affected by a development of 2 storey houses

being built at the racecourse. The approximate height from ground level to the ridge line of a 2 storey house is 9 metres; this would take away the stunning views at different angles depending on where your property and its views are in East View Fields. The notes on the proposed housing state there are few environmental issues. There will be environmental issues i.e. light pollution, car fumes, possible flooding issues, at present the grassed area proposed for housing absorbs a lot of natural rain water, where will this water then go ,where is the sewage system going to run to? Will the 19 houses proposed at present become 38 or more in years to come?

You say in the consultation that new houses would enable older residents within the village to downsize so they could remain in Plumpton Green. The proposed development is to be built with 1 to 4 bedroom houses presumably all with stairs, this will be ok for younger more agile people but not for unfortunate residents who have mobility restraints and are unable to climb stairs. Will the houses have the provision for stair lifts to be fitted? The proposals also state that houses on the racecourse car park will allow people to have easy access to village amenities [i.e. the village shop and church]. This would mean anybody with a serious disability [wheelchair user] would have to either put their life in their hands by using the station platform as access to station road or by using the bridge over the railway line, very unlikely. WHY ARE BUNGALOWS NEVER EVER PART OF THE PLANNING APPLICATIONS AS THESE ARE FAR MORE SUITABLE FOR THE ELDERLY AND THOSE PEOPLE WHO ARE FAR LESS MOBILE THAN THE REST OF US AND FOR THOSE WHO WOULD RATHER LIVE IN A BUNGALOW THAN A HOUSE!!!

These properties will add noise and light pollution to what is a very serene place to live. In probability it will decrease the values of our homes. Do you think the Council will decrease our council tax because of this development and all the detrimental points mentioned?

As for car parking, whether you think this plays a big part in the development or not, you will not get individuals to park in a car park (which if you put pay and display signs up this will definitely not happen, as people travelling from close villages park in Plumpton Green because it is free), they will deem to park where ever. People will still park in the nearest available position to the station, they will not drive an extra 1 and a half miles each day to park (three quarters of a mile each way) with the possibility of having to wait at the crossing gates for trains to pass through.

With reference to the proposed entrance and exit to the proposed development this in its self will cause problems. It is on the brow of a hill from the south, it is just around the corner of a sharp bend coming from the north end of the village. This would mean major changes to the existing junction to make it a safe place to enter and exit and more importantly will it affect the lives of the residents whose houses are in very close proximity to the junction? Will they be happy with all the extra traffic passing their doorsteps every day and night of the week on a road which at present has very little traffic use except for race days. There is also the safety aspect for horse riders who use the road at present having to cope with the extra traffic.

Plumpton racecourse has one of the most beautiful settings of any of the courses in Sussex and England. A lot of our friends come to the racing because of its setting and they have already said that they would think twice about attending if it was surrounded by houses as it just wouldn't be the same.

You might be making a profit with one hand but may end up losing it with the other.

You say 'of all the proposed sites this was shown to be the most suitable for development' we at East View Fields say NO.

Paragraph 4.3 - We object to the use of the stated conclusions of the Parish Survey as we are aware that a number of forms were not collected from residents living at the north of the village, and therefore the results cannot be considered accurate and wholly reflective.

Policy 1 - We object to the proposed extension of the settlement boundary to the north to accommodate additional housing development on the northern periphery of the village. This policy points to the principle of extending the linear form of the village. Plumpton Green is very clearly not a linear settlement with a very significant proportion of dwellings not being located on the main road through the village. The proposed development sites to the north of the village are located in a wholly unsustainable location contrary to local and national planning policy. As such their development would fundamentally alter the historic development pattern of Plumpton Green and have a significant and detrimental impact on the rural setting of the village and views over Plumpton Green towards the South Downs National Park

Policy 2 - We object to this draft policy as the proposed development to the north of the village is wholly unsympathetic to the scale, character and topography of the village and would have a significant and detrimental impact on the setting of the village. Conversely there are far more suitable sites readily available for development in the centre and on the south side of the railway.

Policy 2.2 - We object to the proposed allocation of land south of Inholmes Farm for residential development as this site is wholly unsustainable being too far from key village facilities and development here would have a significant and detrimental impact on the rural setting of the village

Policy 2.3 - We object to the proposed allocation of Land North of the Old Police Station for residential development as this site is wholly unsustainable being too far from key village facilities and development here would have a significant and detrimental impact on the rural setting of the village.

Policy 9 - The entirety of the Green Gap on the northern edge of the village should be designated as a Local Green Space (extended LGS 7 and LGS 8). This would specifically include the land that is proposed to be allocated for development under Policy 2.2 and 2.3, as this makes a very significant contribution to the rural setting of the village and to the key southerly views towards the South Downs National Park. The importance of this green gap has been clearly identified by both Lewes District Council in their 2015 SHELAA assessment and East Sussex County Council in their Landscape Assessment.

Suggested modification	<p>Please also refer to the attached letter from our appointed consultants Savills which provides further detailed considerations and should be read in conjunction with the responses given on this form.</p> <p>Residential allocations under Policies 2.2 and 2.3 should be deleted and replaced with site allocations that would offer easy walking distance to a range of village facilities, including the train station, primary school and shop.</p> <p>Please also refer to the attached letter from our appointed consultants Savills which provides further detailed considerations and should be read in conjunction with the responses given on this form.</p> <p>It is contrary to local and national planning policy as the plan is proposing unsustainable development which would have a significant and detrimental impact on the character of the village and its rural setting. There are more suitable and readily available sites in the centre and on the southern edge of the village which would be far more appropriate to accommodate the level of development which is being sought.</p>
Suggested modification 12	<p>Site 12 - it is unclear to me where the road access is routed to this site. The current southern junction to Plumpton Lane is narrow and dangerous in terms of cars having a blind corner and hill to contend with, not to mention the width of the road at this point. I would suggest access is provided at the northern end of the racecourse with a road running parallel to the railway line and with an entrance adjacent to the existing racecourse entrance. The railway level crossing should not provide any problems, you only have see the layout at Porstlade to understand that such a junction at Plumpton is less of a risk.</p>
	<p>I am completely in favour of the proposal and feel the steering group have represented the local community in a fair and respectful way.</p>
	<p>I feel the Plumpton parish planning committee have done an exceptional job in preparing such a well balanced proposal.</p> <p>They have clearly listened to those who are most likely to be affected by the inevitable changes within the village having taken in to consideration all aspects of the surrounding countryside, the potential impact on wildlife and green spaces.</p> <p>Many congratulations to all involved - Needless to say we will unhesitatingly vote for this plan to proceed.</p>
	<p>Warmly support the plan. If we have to have a minimum of 50 houses the locations proposed, the size of the developments and the types of houses seem spot on.</p>
	<p>I approve of the plan because housing development is focused on north and south sites and will maintain the linear structure of the village.</p> <p>I also support maintaining the rural nature of the village and the continued lack of street lights.</p>
	<p>I have reviewed the Neighbourhood plan and think that this is a really good, well thought out document - thank you for all those people that have contributed to it.</p>

I am just writing to confirm our full support to the current proposals in the Neighbourhood plan

I am pleased the group has listened to residents and produced a plan with smaller scale developments spread out through the village. This will help the village retain its character and manage the increase in traffic, etc. The identification of protected green spaces is also a major part of protecting the village from unsustainable development in the future.

I am totally against any building on the racecourse as we were assured that BR were allowed to put their offices there whilst the work was going on the railway ie gates. Now LDC want to give them the OK to build a housing estate. This is totally unacceptable as we don't have the infrastructure. There is also no access road.

As a former resident of Plumpton Green I have followed the housing development with great interest. I would support this plan and feel that the addition of the racecourse site is a better option than the previous one which included development on the flood plain by use of the land south of Riddens Lane. Furthermore the promise of additional parking for the Station would help relieve and growing issue.

Seems reasonable

I would definitely support the most recent Plan as I believe the building of houses on land south of Riddens Lane would not be viable due to flooding. In addition, this is a lovely area for walkers and for wildlife which is very much worth preserving if at all possible. I am a former resident and have been following these issues with great interest.

Very pleased to see the addition of the Racecourse site which I think will benefit the village by way of additional parking at the Station. Also, it means that the land south of Riddens Lane will purely become a reserve site thereby allowing for the possibility of retaining this lovely piece of rural countryside for the wildlife and use by local residents and others.

As happy as can be with the plan particularly as it gives a possible release for the land south of Riddens Lane to be preserved. The plan appears to have taken on the views of the vast majority of local residents and I agree with the outcome. I would most definitely like to see improved parking in the village and by including the Racecourse site this appears to be a good possibility.

The plan supports the preservation of the village shape by not intruding into the countryside making Plumpton wider. The proposed sites would be better accessed from main roads than a development east to west. Any development however will need the support of much improved infrastructure to water, sewage, drainage etc. I am particularly delighted to observe the protected green areas so intrinsic to the character of our rural setting.

One of my biggest concern would be the loss of green space, I recognise the need for affordable housing but with it comes increased traffic and noise pollution. Although I haven't been here long I can see there is a sense of community however this can feel a little isolating if you are new to the village. I have noticed that there doesn't appear to be a lot for young people to do and if they are to be encouraged to stay then some focus should be placed on their needs. I do enjoy the night sky and wouldn't want to see this changed but worry about older residence and whether they spend more time indoors alone for fear of travelling the unlit roads. Plumpton is a beautiful place to live and wouldn't want to see it change too much but I accept that some changes will be made and change is not always a bad thing

I am in support of the plan, it is especially important to maintain green spaces, farmland, and the quiet residential nature of the village. Maintaining the community with investment in the church and activities for young people is also vital. I agree that some improvements to the pavement would be beneficial and perhaps the occasional street light strategically placed away from residential dwellings would be positive.

We fully support the proposals put forward with regard to the areas of land selected for the development. The adoption of these proposals maintains the village longitudinal character and I believe would minimise the impact on present village occupants.

The additional traffic concerns of the village as a whole as a result of 50+ new properties within Plumpton Green we believe have been minimised by this proposal.

We were pleased to see that the plan identifies present green spaces within the village, and that these areas are to be protected against future development.

Each of the proposed sites specify properties from 1-4 bedrooms but does not identify potential usage of these properties, we would like consideration to be given to allocation of these new properties as retirement style home for those who presently live in the village who wish to downsize but remain in the village. Thus freeing up larger properties for families.

The new development in North Barnes Lane have rather brightly coloured roof tiles which do not blend in with the existing properties in Plumpton Green and as residents who walk regularly on the South Downs they are very visible and in my opinion a blot on the landscape. The majority of properties in Plumpton Green have slate or dark coloured tiles. Can this be taken into consideration when deciding designs for the new properties.

Finally we would like to congratulate the Neighbourhood Planning Committee on their proposal.

I am fully supportive of the draft plan. The general consensus from the village was to keep the developments linear, this was an overwhelming message from the population. it is abundantly clear that this will have far less impact on traffic (construction and otherwise)the existing residents, wildlife and precious green space. I am hopeful that by having multiple smaller developments that this will also stagger the developments and have less impact on the community.

	<p>After careful study on the reports in regard to water levels, traffic, sewage and services again this is the best solution available to us as a village.</p> <p>Suggested Modification: I have no suggestions for modifications, I believe the steering group have taken on board everyone's concerns and delivered the best possible solution under the circumstances presented to them</p>
Suggested modification	<p>The entrance to the racecourse is much too narrow and will not allow two vehicles to pass plus a [illegible] rather large problems when on racedays.</p> <p>Widen the lane next to racecourse buildings to a two lane by cutting back the large bank alongside the racecourse buildings. A footpath will have to be built to allow walkers to be safe when car drivers use this part of the racecourse.</p>
	<p>I support the proposals in the draft plan.</p> <p>I think is a pragmatic response to an impossible situation and would also bring benefits in terms of improved parking at the station and a supply of affordable housing, and ensure the village remains a vibrant community and keeps control its own destiny rather than falling prey to LDC and developers.</p>
	<p>I agree with the plan. A huge amount of work has obviously gone into the preparation and I congratulate all concerned .</p>
	<p>I'm really pleased that the village decided to create its own Neighbourhood Plan. This has allowed the village to have a say in how its community develops. I'm not comfortable having more houses built in Plumpton Green and it seems like more than 'a small amount of housing development has taken place over the last 30 years' as stated on page 9 of the plan document. However, I accept that the village needs to take a share of the housing development needed in the district. I think the proposed Neighbourhood Plan strikes the balance between housing need and maintaining the rural character of the village (although I would like to see the final numbers on the chosen sites at the bottom end of the ranges given). The Neighbourhood Plan process has given residents every chance to express their views with surveys and consultation events and regular website updates. I think the plan is a good representation of the majority view of residents. This is important if the village is to be at ease with planned development and important for the plan to be supported at a referendum. Some residents will inevitably be unhappy but this is probably and sadly unavoidable. On a personal level I am pleased that the covenant protecting the Site: LGS6 Fields on Little Inholmes Farm to the north of West Gate has been recognised and indeed that the land has been designated as a protected green space. The natural beauty of this land is so important to our enjoyment of our everyday life and I'm sure of many other people. I'd like to thank the people on the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group for their efforts in coming up with a plan that I can support.</p>
	<p>I am in favour Of the plan</p>
	<p>This is a very well thought through document, having taken on a potentially very wide set of disparate views and distilled them into what makes and will keep the essence of our village intact while allowing it to change, as it must.</p>
	<p>I fully support the Plumpton Parish Neighbourhood Plan.</p>

After having read this Draft Plan, we both agree that this appears to be the best option for the village residents and business people.
There are no modifications that we can think of and would encourage acceptance of this Draft.

I fully support the plan, in particular the decision not to favour the land at Little Inholmes Farm to the north of Westgate for development, particularly in the context of the existing section 106 agreement. I also fully support the proposal to designate this land as protected green space in view of the attractiveness of the landscape and the large number of existing houses that would be affected by any development here. I feel strongly that in order to retain the character of a village, any development should be a number of small groups of houses rather than a larger scale housing estate.

I would like to confirm my full support for a well considered and balanced proposal which has clearly taken in to consideration the views of the majority of the village.

It is very important not to build too many new properties in one single location within this village which has been a notable factor in the plan - The proposed sites, I feel, will blend in to the village in a sympathetic way.

I also applaud the recognition and importance of the green fields that are allocated to be protected from future development and the covenants that have been respected.

I am very much in favour of the plan as it is based on a linear north to south axis which I believe will be best for the topography of the village, the infrastructure of the village, especially traffic, and the preservation of the green site areas which are such an important part of this lovely community.

I am happy with the Neighbourhood Plan as it stands.

I am happy with the plan

I disagree with the NP proposal to put houses above the police house on the both sides of Station Road. These are lovely fields that everyone enjoys when they come into the village. Additionally any housing here means that those new residents will have to drive to the station, shop, pub and church - thus increasing congestion. I've grown in Plumpton Green and attended the local school - and I'd love to have a house here - but it would have to be in the centre of the village - and I know many people who feel the same.

SITES: Selection of more centrally placed sites in the centre of Plumpton Green - there are sites like this in the centre of the village - but have been ignored. PARKING: Find appropriate parking to meet demand. STATION: Ensure the station is properly maintained, active and reliable

It's not something the general population wants - and it isn't appropriately placed for a village of this size.

-
- 2.1 Policy 2. I would approve of the housing development that has been put forward apart from the following. Policy 2.1 the access to this site would have to be from the main gates at the level crossing running along with the railway line to the site, NOT from the existing Ashurst access route which is used for the racecourse car park. Policy 2.6 as a reserve site yes but if required to increase the numbers for the plan a reduction in the number of units say to 8, so to reduce the westward push of development.
- 2.6 Policy 2.1 Access to this site on racecourse land following the railway line to the site from the level crossing. Policy 2.6 To reduce the number of units by half and to reduce the land use for building so restricts the westward push of development
-