

UBNP: Pre-Submission Plan Schedule of Comments Received – Individuals

Ref	Comment Made	Steering Group Comment on Representation to Policy
General		
1	Yes to the plan, not ideal but helpful "damage limitation"	Thank you and noted
2	Yes to Plan, Deacons Way is getting very difficult to drive down without scratching cars. All bushes growing out from centre reservation. There are also a lot of dead elms (from suckers)	Thank you and noted
3	Para No 2.4 Last line – Beeding – not Breeding Para No 7.59 Seems to suggest that school buildings are owned by district – actually owned by County Council	Thank you and noted
4	Upper Beeding is a country village, it is beautiful, once you start taking away these areas there is no stopping. Suggested Modification : Control the population that enters the Country. I have human right too. I should be allowed to be heard. Please don't take this beautiful village that has been my home for over 40 years away from me. No I won't vote for this plan I oppose it This village is a busting point as I said it's crumbling and in need of maintenance	Thank you and noted Regulating the immigration numbers to the UK is not in the remit of the NP
5	I wish to object to the plans to build new homes in Upper Beeding, but a recent flyer though the door and the parish council website do not make clear at all how best to do this. The flyer does not give the web address and when I found the Parish Website through google, and eventually found the form titled consultation response, it asks me to comment on a numbered paper of which I don't know the number and then asks what modifications I want. Well I want them to modify the number of new houses from 100 to Zero.	Thank you and noted. The number of houses was not 100
6	YES to Plan	Thank you and noted
54	Yes to Plan	Thank you and noted
55	Yes to Plan	Thank you and noted

Vision

No Responses Received

Objectives

66	<p>OBJECTIVE 5: There is a very urgent need accommodate downsizers and free up larger homes for families Suggested Modification: This should have a priority. YES to Plan</p>	Thank you and noted
69	<p>OBJECTIVE 1: I feel this is very important Suggested Modification: No housing on flood plain. Beeding is a flint village. No new house without flint Suggested Modification: Flint supports the look of the village. Only a small bit on each new house will help this. OBJECTIVE 5: More assisted rent housing. Less large houses, Suggested Modification: More 2 bed housing for young families. OBJECTIVE 6: This is very important. Paths and cycle paths needed OBJECTIVE 8: We do not need a lot of houses at the Cement Works.</p>	Thank you and noted. These comments are shown in the detail of the NP
73	<p>OBJECTIVE 6: Would like to see a proper footpath linking Dawn Crescent to the Bridge. Makes a lovely walk by the river for people who can't go too far. Can't be used in the Winter. Even better if it went as far as Dacre Gardens.</p>	Thank you and noted
7	<p>Reasons against approval (coverage of whole area) 1. The proximity of South Downs National Park; a full view of Truleigh Hill from the village is afforded only across 'land east of Pound Lane', plus the immediate rural access to the Downs for walkers and riders. 2. Housing on 'Little Paddocks', would conflict with the National Park policy of complete disapproval of new built- up areas in views from inside of the Park. 3. The adjacency of the Flood Plain and the liability of parts of the land to flooding.</p>	<p>Thank you and noted. SDNP have laid down specific requirements in their response to the NP which covers your points and will be a requirement on any development.</p> <p>Any development will have to meet EA and Southern Water requirements</p>

	<p>4. The poor, long access road through the village that already causes congestion.</p> <p>5. The inadequate infrastructure (overloading of the school, drainage, sewage etc.)</p> <p>6. Pound House cottage, as listed building to be left untouched by modern development.</p> <p>NB. see previous submissions, dating back to 1975 for details</p>	<p>WSCC have stated that the roads will meet the extra demand placed by more cars.</p> <p>Any requirements to meet additional school places will be planned and Southern Water have stated that they will make plans to address flooding and sewerage Pound Cottage would not be harmed.</p>
8	<p>Reasons against approval (coverage of whole area)</p> <p>1. The proximity of South Downs National Park; a full view of Truleigh Hill from the village is afforded only across 'land east of Pound Lane', plus the immediate rural access to the Downs for walkers and riders.</p> <p>2. Housing on 'Little Paddocks', would conflict with the National Park policy of complete disapproval of new built- up areas in views from inside of the Park.</p> <p>3. The adjacency of the Flood Plain and the liability of parts of the plan to flooding.</p> <p>4. The poor, long access road through the village that already causes congestion.</p> <p>5. The inadequate infrastructure (overloading of the school, drainage, sewage etc.)</p> <p>6. Pound House cottage, as listed building to be left untouched by modern development.</p> <p>NB. see previous submissions, dating back to 1975 for details</p>	<p>Thank you and noted. SDNP have laid down specific requirements in their response to the NP which covers your points and will be a requirement on any development.</p> <p>Any development will have to meet EA and Southern Water requirements WSCC have stated that the roads will meet the extra demand placed by more cars.</p> <p>Any requirements to meet additional school places will be planned and Southern Water have stated that they will make plans to address flooding and sewerage Pound Cottage would not be harmed.</p>
9	<p>Sounds positive</p>	<p>Thank you and noted</p>
10	<p>I oppose the building of 100 houses at the bottom of Pound Lane/Smugglers Lane very strongly. You could be talking about at least another 200 cars in the village, could the local school and play groups withstand a huge increase in children, let alone the medical centre.</p> <p>We don't really have the amenities i.e. shops to cater for that amount of people. Also just in the construction of these properties, the only real in and out road is Pound Lane/Hyde Lane, how could the village take huge lorries going up and down these roads, also there are a lot of children that cross the road going to and from school by Nisa that would be in danger.</p>	<p>Thank you and noted. There is no plan to build 100 houses as you state. WSCC state that the roads can take additional cars.</p> <p>Any development and use of lorries will have to follow strict rules on safety.</p>

	<p>Any flat/house construction also needs to be more for the local community; my daughter is 32 years old and still lives with me, as the likelihood of her getting on the housing ladder is zero at the moment. Proper affordable housing needs to be for people in Beeding first, before outsiders can come in. I think a lot just come in so their children can go to Steyning Grammar School.</p>	<p>We want more Affordable Housing and Sheltered Housing on these sites.</p>
11	<p>The village is too small to cater for the extra homes you are suggesting, the roads are in a poor state, as are the pavements, trees are over grown, the school is a danger zone already with parking and large classes with mixed ages, the shops are the same as cars park on pavements as the Carpark is too small. As for the Health Centre that is over stretched as people from nearby villages are using Steyning. Suggested Modification: Spend this money on fixing Upper Beeding, don't over stretch it so that it's bursting at the seam. Upper Beeding is already run down. Bramber is mentioned as part of this plan, but there are no suggestions to build there. Why? There is a field behind Bramber Carpark, Why has this not been considered? After all we are all I this together. People matter this is our home. □No I won't vote for this plan I oppose it This village is a busting point as I said it's crumbling and in need of maintenance</p>	<p>Thank you and noted.</p> <p>Bramber is not included as it is a different Parish and comes under Bramber PC.</p>
68	<p>I have just returned from a walk along Smugglers Lane and have read the poster 100 homes to be built. Land at Smugglers and land East of Pound Lane is all flood plain and is flooded regularly. I know because I live backing onto Smugglers Lane. The last time end of May Flash Flood. The water poured down Underhill Road rounding the corner into Downsland Close. The road was completely flooded, so deep it came over the top of my neighbour's wheels of her car. It was like a waterfall and gushed over into Smugglers Lane. We have one shop, no Post Office, no Bank. We have to wait to see a Doctor. Buses run one an hour if you are lucky. I use public transport. More traffic on the roads Pound Lane, Hyde Lane etc. very dangerous. The village won't be able to cope with it all and it will be spoilt. Suggested Modifications: If more houses are built the builders would have to replace all the drains in the village as people get sewage in their gardens when it is heavy raining.</p>	<p>Thank you and noted.</p> <p>The plan is not for 100 homes in this area but for 70. Southern Water have stated that they will make plans to address flooding and sewerage</p> <p>Doctor's surgery should improve with new surgery opening in Storrington</p>

	YES to Plan	
74	Pleased to know SDNP and Green Spaces to be protected YES to Plan	Thank you and noted
Policy 2 - Housing Allocations		
12	Please see attached photos as evidence to existing drainage issues I would not vote for this plan as access, drainage and infrastructure (schools + healthcare) are not sufficient to support it.	Thank you and noted Southern Water have stated that they will make plans to address flooding and sewerage
13	Sites 1/2/3 - do not have infrastructure in place. Remove from plan. Non agreement to plan based on above.	Thank you and noted
14	Sites 1/2/3 - do not have infrastructure in place. Remove from plan. Non agreement to plan based on above.	Thank you and noted
7	Reasons against approval (coverage of whole area) 1. The proximity of South Downs National Park; a full view of Truleigh Hill from the village is afforded only across 'land east of Pound Lane', plus the immediate rural access to the Downs for walkers and riders. 2. Housing on 'Little Paddocks', would conflict with the National Park policy of complete disapproval of new built- up areas in views from inside of the Park. 3. The adjacency of the Flood Plain and the liability of parts of the land to flooding. 4. The poor, long access road through the village that already causes congestion. 5. The inadequate infrastructure (overloading of the school, drainage, sewage etc.) 6. Pound House cottage, as listed building to be left untouched by modern development. NB. see previous submissions, dating back to 1975 for details	Thank you and noted. SDNP have laid down specific requirements in their response to the NP which covers your points and will be a requirement on any development. Any development will have to meet EA and Southern Water requirements WSCC have stated that the roads will meet the extra demand placed by more cars. Any requirements to meet additional school places will be planned and Southern Water have stated that they will make plans to address flooding and sewerage Pound Cottage would not be harmed.
8	Reasons against approval (coverage of whole area) 1. The proximity of South Downs National Park; a full view of Truleigh Hill from the village is afforded only across 'land east of Pound Lane', plus the immediate rural access to the Downs for walkers and riders.	Thank you and noted. SDNP have laid down specific requirements in their response to the NP which covers your points and will be a requirement on any development. Any development will have to meet EA and Southern Water requirements

	<p>2. Housing on 'Little Paddocks', would conflict with the National Park policy of complete disapproval of new built- up areas in views from inside of the Park.</p> <p>3. The adjacency of the Flood Plain and the liability of parts of the land to flooding.</p> <p>4. The poor, long access road through the village that already causes congestion.</p> <p>5. The inadequate infrastructure (overloading of the school, drainage, sewage etc.)</p> <p>6. Pound House cottage, as listed building to be left untouched by modern development.</p> <p>NB. see previous submissions, dating back to 1975 for details</p>	<p>WSCC have stated that the roads will meet the extra demand placed by more cars.</p> <p>Any requirements to meet additional school places will be planned and Southern Water have stated that they will make plans to address flooding and sewerage</p> <p>Pound Cottage would not be harmed.</p>
<p>15</p>	<p>Site 1 - the listed cottage makes access too difficult. Also large wildlife pond to the Eastern Boundary.</p> <p>Suggestion - Strike from Plan</p> <p>Site 2 and 3 - these were rejected by Horsham District Council planning - October 2015</p> <p>Suggestion - strike from plan</p> <p>Non agreement to plan - because the 3 sites are in a poor access, poor drainage and poor sewage. Far too close to existing property</p>	<p>Thank you and noted. SDNP have laid down specific requirements in their response to the NP which covers your points and will be a requirement on any development.</p> <p>Any development will have to meet EA and Southern Water requirements</p> <p>WSCC have stated that the roads will meet the extra demand placed by more cars.</p> <p>Any requirements to meet additional school places will be planned and Southern Water have stated that they will make plans to address flooding and sewerage</p> <p>Pound Cottage would not be harmed.</p>
<p>16</p>	<p>Site 1 - any development would be far too close to houses in Smugglers Lane and Grade 2 Listed Cottage. Access would be an absolute nightmare.</p> <p>Suggestion - remove from plan</p> <p>Site 2 and 3 - these were rejected by Horsham District Council planning - October 2015</p> <p>Suggestion - remove from plan</p> <p>Non agreement to plan because these 3 sites should not ever be considered because the present sewage infrastructure cannot cope, road/traffic/parking issues, insufficient amenities, detrimental effect on the environment. Outside built up area.</p>	<p>Thank you and noted. SDNP have laid down specific requirements in their response to the NP which covers your points and will be a requirement on any development.</p> <p>Any development will have to meet EA and Southern Water requirements</p> <p>WSCC have stated that the roads will meet the extra demand placed by more cars.</p> <p>Any requirements to meet additional school places will be planned and Southern Water have stated that they will make plans to address flooding and sewerage</p> <p>Pound Cottage would not be harmed. The current Built Up Area Boundary can be changed</p>

17	<p>Upper Beeding cannot take another 100 houses on Pound Lane and Smugglers Lane. The roads in Upper Beeding already flood quite badly in some place, with sewage water coming up from drains. The drainage system cannot handle the water now. The building of more houses can only make this worse. Also finding parking spaces is extremely bad and a volume of traffic will only get worse. The extra houses in Smugglers Lane will also affect the wonderful wildlife we have in this area. Facilities such as the local school and doctor's surgery are already struggling. Non agreement to plan based on the above.</p>	<p>Thank you and noted. The plan does not want to build 100 houses in Pound Lane only 70. SDNP have laid down specific requirements in their response to the NP which covers your points and will be a requirement on any development. Any development will have to meet EA and Southern Water requirements WSCC have stated that the roads will meet the extra demand placed by more cars. Any requirements to meet additional school places will be planned and Southern Water have stated that they will make plans to address flooding and sewerage</p>
18	<p>100 new houses = potentially 200 cars or more = increase in accidents and traffic congestion. The Village does not have the infrastructure to support this new development. New access roads in and out of the Village. Non agreement to plan based on the above.</p>	<p>Thank you and noted. The plan does not want to build 100 houses in Pound Lane only 70. SDNP have laid down specific requirements in their response to the NP which covers your points and will be a requirement on any development. Any development will have to meet EA and Southern Water requirements WSCC have stated that the roads will meet the extra demand placed by more cars.</p>
19	<p>Sites 2 and 3 - rejected in October 2015, by HDC for reasons of traffic, sewer network, surface water drainage and land susceptible to flooding and outside built up area. Suggestion - remove from plan. Site 1 - also rejected in October 2015. For reasons of location, scale and proximity to the Grade 2 listed building. Suggestion - Remove from plan. Non agreement to plan because in my opinion, nothing has changed since October 2015. The listed building is still there, the area still floods, the roads are still congested and the sewage is still unacceptable. We need to protect the character and qualities of our village. There are other areas within Upper Beeding, Small Dole and Edburton, where small number of units can be built, maintaining our beautiful village and fulfilling our duty of providing more housing.</p>	<p>Thank you and noted. SDNP have laid down specific requirements in their response to the NP which covers your points and will be a requirement on any development. Any development will have to meet EA and Southern Water requirements WSCC have stated that the roads will meet the extra demand placed by more cars. Any requirements to meet additional school places will be planned and Southern Water have stated that they will make plans to address flooding and sewerage Pound Cottage would not be harmed.</p>
9	<p>Helpful but traffic concerns may need attention.</p>	<p>Thank you and noted. WSCC has stated that the roads will be able to manage the additional cars.</p>

<p>20</p>	<p>Sites 2 & 3 were rejected in October 2015 for several reasons: traffic, sewage, surface water drainage, land susceptible to flooding and outside built up area. REMOVE FROM PLAN Site 1 was also rejected in Oct. 2015 for several reasons: location, scale, proximity to Grade 2 listed building. REMOVE FROM PLAN NO TO PLAN Nothing has changed since Oct. 2015, in particular the fields still flood, access road to sites 2, 3 & 1 is narrow and congested and we need to protect the character and qualities of our village. There are other areas locally where fewer number of units can be built and in so doing maintain our villages character</p>	<p>Thank you and noted. SDNP have laid down specific requirements in their response to the NP which covers your points and will be a requirement on any development. Any development will have to meet EA and Southern Water requirements WSCC have stated that the roads will meet the extra demand placed by more cars. Any requirements to meet additional school places will be planned and Southern Water have stated that they will make plans to address flooding and sewerage Pound Cottage would not be harmed.</p>
<p>21</p>	<p>Local schools are already at capacity & there is no point allowing a NP to be put forward with an allocation of houses that the local infrastructure cannot support. Has there been any consultation with the schools, surgeries (Dr), sewage/utility companies as to impact this increase in housing will have. Suggested Modification: 1. Significantly reduce the number of housing in order for OB to be kept as 'sustainable'. There is mention that there is not enough land to fulfil the original target. Surely this is proof enough our village cannot accommodate this size of development. 2. The Cement Works could fulfil our housing obligation and within its development its own infrastructure could be created. No to Plan: The push to find land to fulfil our housing obligation within that has an infrastructure that is already stretched when a site like the cement works is a more viable possibility, will impact us all and not in a good way. Is the housing demand that great? A 3 bedroom dwelling was given planning and construction started in May 2016. It is now derelict with no sign of work being undertaken since Fe, 2018</p>	<p>Thank you and noted. Any development will have to meet EA and Southern Water requirements WSCC have stated that the roads will meet the extra demand placed by more cars. Doctor's surgery and schools will be assessed in any new development. The Cement Works is within the SDNPA and therefore we can only make recommendations to them of our requirements and be part of their Area Action Plan.</p>
<p>22</p>	<p>The amenities in the village such as doctors, primary school, youth facilities, and green areas for recreation are all oversubscribed. Adding more people will only add to the problems. Suggested Modification: Green recreation ground, and sporting facilities to the village, needs to be increased, we are already under what we should have for the population of the village. I would extend</p>	<p>Thank you and noted. Any new developments will have to plan for extra school places / access to Doctors. The plan does attempt to identify Green Spaces and allocate additional recreation space in the Pound Lane Development and improve gym, cycling and footpaths in the village.</p>

	<p>the doctors surgery and primary school in Upper Beeding, as well as school numbers at Steyning Grammar School</p> <p>No to Plan: Upper Beeding is a lovely village, building a lot more houses will take away the village feel, if we wanted to live in a more built up area we would move to either Steyning or Shoreham. The facilities we have are already under strain, I don't see anything that will improve them, they will just move closer to breaking point. Pound Lane and Hyde Lane will become more dangerous, leading to driver frustration, and increased risk for pedestrians.</p>	<p>WSCC have stated that our current roads will accommodate additional traffic.</p>
<p>23</p>	<p>There are not enough spaces in the local schools to support 100 more homes on the sites identified in policies 2 & 3. The sewer systems on pound lane are very old and block on a regular basis. They cannot support any further homes. Parked cars and the narrow width of Hyde Lane make it very challenging/blind driving out of the village via Pound Lane and vice versa. More homes on Pound Lane would result in increased traffic, a higher risk of accidents and consequently a danger to the public. Smugglers Lane and the lane to the North of it floods after any substantial rainfall. It becomes unpassable on foot. It is unfair and irrational to build on areas that are known to flood. Smugglers Lane is popular dog walking spot and building around it would ruin this for the local residents of Upper Beeding. There is not enough space in local doctor's surgeries to support hundreds more people. The Upper Beeding surgery is only open 2-3 hours each day.</p> <p>Suggested Modification: Do not build more houses on Pound Lane.</p> <p>NO to Plan</p>	<p>Thank you and noted.</p> <p>Any development will have to meet EA and Southern Water requirements</p> <p>WSCC have stated that the roads will meet the extra demand placed by more cars. Doctor's surgery and schools will be assessed in any new development.</p>
<p>24</p>	<p>UB PC objected to Rydon's application DC/14/1744 and DC/14/1745 on 01/10/14 to developing 65 houses on the 2 fields beyond Smugglers Lane. HDC refused permission.</p> <p>Furthermore, in 2016 the UB PC 'Housing and Development Focus Team Document' report also rejects those sites. Why is this any different?</p> <p>Suggested Modification: Do not build more houses on Pound Lane.</p> <p>The sewage infrastructure on pound lane is very old and block on a regular basis. They cannot support any further homes.</p> <p>UB PC were previously not satisfied that sufficient consideration had been given to the disposal of sewage, given that the foul drainage</p>	<p>Thank you and noted.</p> <p>The previous Planning Applications were for a lot more houses. We are seeking less and asking for more Affordable and Sheltered Housing. We also sought that these developments worked with the NP Team to ensure they met more of the requirements of the Parish and not those of some outside company. They didn't so we could not support.</p>

disposal system in the vicinity is already known to be overstretched beyond capacity. What has changed?

Suggested Modification: Consult the local community properly before making ridiculous housing suggestions that will impact day to day lives of existing residents.

The only access routes between the site and the village, and onto the main transport network, are via Hyde Lane and Saltings Way, both of which are narrow and already over-utilised. More homes on Pound Lane would result in increased traffic, a higher risk of accidents and consequently a danger to the public.

Suggested Modification: Build elsewhere where appropriate routes already exist or can be improved.

Smugglers Lane and the lane to the North of it floods after any substantial rainfall, as does the field.

UB PC were previously not satisfied that sufficient consideration has been given to the disposal of surface water at a site adjacent to the flood plain of the river Adur, and already known to be significantly prone to flooding. What has changed?

Suggested Modification: Build somewhere else which isn't on a flood risk area...?

Smugglers Lane is popular dog walking spot and building around it would ruin this for the local residents of Upper Beeding, as well as visitors to the area.

Suggested Modification: Build somewhere else.

There are not enough spaces at the local doctor surgery and school to support more families. The Upper Beeding surgery is only open part time hours and the school is oversubscribed already.

Suggested Modification: Another school and doctor surgery (or expansion to existing) would need to be built to support this many houses. I already can't go to my own village doctors, which is ridiculous, and I would like my own unborn child to be able to go to the school 5 minutes from my house, rather than new residents. 70 more families would potentially not allow this, and mean I have to take my child to a school and doctors nowhere near where I live.

SDNP have laid down specific requirements in their response to the NP which covers how any development must be planned and viewed from the SDNP. In addition care must be given to accommodate any existing wild life,

Any development will have to meet EA and Southern Water requirements

WSCC have stated that the roads will meet the extra demand placed by more cars.

Any requirements to meet additional school places will be planned and Southern Water have stated that they will make plans to address flooding and sewerage

Doctor's surgery and schools will be assessed in any new development.

	<p>There are a number of species considered rare or endangered within a kilometre radius from the proposed site, as listed by the biodiversity report from the previous application of 2014. I have witnessed stag beetles, newts, owls and geese during dog walks around smugglers lane.</p> <p>Suggested Modification: Expert scrutiny of the ecology and wildlife needs to be carried out prior to ANY application being considered. NO TO PLAN This area has already been rejected twice before, as noted in detail above, stop trying to build on it!! Leave Pound Lane alone.</p>	
25	<p>Site 1, would have a significant impact on the grade 2 listed building causing harm to the setting of this property, contrary to the council planning framework</p> <p>Suggested Recommendation: This item should be removed from Upper Beeding Neighbourhood plan</p> <p>Site 2.23 has previously been rejected by H.D.C in October 2015 and the reasons for rejections still apply in this instance.</p> <p>Suggested Recommendation: This item should also be removed from Upper Beeding Neighbourhood plan</p> <p>There is no demand for a large scale development of this type on this site, while it may accommodate this, the local amenities e.g. surgery, schools are already being stretched to beyond their limits with nothing in place to address this.</p> <p>No to NP: The above sites are outside the built up area boundary and are absolutely an unsuitable proposal.</p>	<p>Thank you and noted.</p> <p>The previous Planning Applications were for a lot more houses. We are seeking less and asking for more Affordable and Sheltered Housing. We also sought that these developments worked with the NP Team to ensure they met more of the requirements of the Parish and not those of some outside company. They didn't so we could not support.</p>
26	<p>Objections to development on Sites 1, 2, 3 and 8</p> <p>Suggested Recommendations: The proposed sites are too big, especially Site 2 (Land East of Pound Lane). The village is too small to cope with the increased traffic and population as there is very little infrastructure. The surrounding wildlife will be negatively impacted by loss of habitat and increased human population. The risk of flooding to these Sites and elsewhere will be high as these areas, in particular Site 2, currently act as flood plains and drainage. The village has no need of new houses and this plan is being dictated by remote authorities. There is no evidence that this has been resisted. If the Sites have to be built</p>	<p>Thank you and noted.</p> <p>The HNA has indicated a need for additional housing. Wildlife and Green Spaces have to be maintained and views from SDNP not disadvantaged by poor developments. SDNPA have insisted that all developments must meet their requirements.</p> <p>Southern Water and the EA have responded to these sites and identified that water and flooding can be managed effectively</p>

	<p>here at all then they must be on a smaller scale for fewer new houses and fewer people. NO to Plan: The village is being asked to build far more homes than it needs or can cope with.</p>	
27	<p>Objections to development on Sites 1, 2, 3 and 8 Suggested Recommendations: The proposed sites are too big, especially Site 2 (Land East of Pound Lane). The village is too small to cope with the increased traffic and population as there is very little infrastructure. The surrounding wildlife will be negatively impacted by loss of habitat and increased human population. The risk of flooding to these Sites and elsewhere will be high as these areas, in particular Site 2, currently act as flood plains and drainage. The village has no need of new houses and this plan is being dictated by remote authorities. There is no evidence that this has been resisted. If the Sites have to be built here at all then they must be on a smaller scale for fewer new houses and fewer people. NO to Plan: The village is being asked to build far more homes than it needs or can cope with.</p>	<p>Thank you and noted. The HNA has indicated a need for additional housing. Wildlife and Green Spaces have to be maintained and views from SDNP not disadvantaged by poor developments. SDNPA have insisted that all developments must meet their requirements. Southern Water and the EA have responded to these sites and identified that water and flooding can be managed effectively</p>
28	<p>Site 5 Oxcroft Farm, Small Dole.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improves the southern access to the hamlet • Continuation of the logical development of Small Dole, rather than unwanted backland development • Good access, without winding past already built dwellings • Few neighbouring properties affected <p>I only support this proposal if it is accepted as an alternative instead of the development of land to the south of New Hall Lane (so-called "Wates" site) and of the land known as Highdown Nursery (respectively, Sites J and S of the Henfield NP).The respective parish councils of Upper Beeding and of Henfield have agreed a memorandum of understanding which states "To work together on issues and projects of interest and concern to those living or working in the settlement of Small Dole to ensure a coherent and consistent approach to Small Dole in both Council's Neighbourhood Plan." The site development proposals are clearly of interest and concern to the community of Small Dole as a whole. The Oxcroft Farm (south end) site for a small housing</p>	<p>Thank you and noted. Henfield and UB PCs are working together to try and ensure no large scale developments are provided in Small Dole. The possibility of 2 small scale developments either end of the village is possibly the preferred solution.</p>

	<p>development is an alternative to the Wates and Highdown Nursery sites and in my view is preferable for reasons stated above. Clearly no one (except some developers) would want to see Small Dole swamped with a volume of unnecessary new housing unsustainable for the hamlet, exceeding the housing need of our local community, and resulting in damage to the landscape and character of the area. The only fair way to handle this is for the planning groups from both Henfield and Upper Beeding to consider all the options now available for Small Dole, and not for each group to be making decisions for the hamlet in isolation and divided along parish lines. Such collaboration regarding Small Dole is what I would expect from the aforementioned memorandum of understanding between the two parish councils.</p>
<p>56</p>	<p>The last application relating to this site from 2014-15 was refused by HDC on 27/010/2015 on the grounds of unsuitability (2 counts). This was a justifiable decision due to it being less sustainable and outside of the built up area of UB. Neither of these reasons has changed since then and so why repeat the inclusion of this land as part of the UB NP? Remove the site East of Pound Lane from the UB NP on the basis of unsustainability and unsuitability. The HDC Housing Strategy 2011-2031 clearly states that new developments should be based on proven demand and not just to satisfy supply targets. i.e. the 'AECOM Housing Need Assessment' page 9, item 0.3 / 16. A clear example of the limited demand are the newer houses (nos 81-87) on Pound Lane, some that took more than two years to sell. Therefore there is not the demand for a huge volume of further houses in this area. Remove the site East of Pound Lane from the UB NP. If more than 50 new houses were built and without a proven demand (as per my comment above), then they could remain unoccupied for several years and potentially never sell. This could attract squatters, theft and damage to those unoccupied properties and increased crime in our area. This would not only have a huge detrimental impact on the village and particularly neighbours of the site such as my family (Emery Lodge) but would strongly deter new purchases of those empty</p> <p>Thank you and noted. The previous Planning Applications were for a lot more houses. We are seeking less and asking for more Affordable and Sheltered Housing. We also sought that these developments worked with the NP Team to ensure they met more of the requirements of the Parish and not those of some outside company. They didn't so we could not support. Smaller Affordable Homes are what is needed</p>

	<p>properties. This would exacerbate the problem to an intolerable degree. Remove the site East of Pound Lane from the UB NP. An application for 9 new houses at the top of Pound Lane was refused by HDC in I believe, 2017. This should clearly indicate that a development on the land east of Pound Lane on a scale potentially 5-fold of that would be perverse. Remove the site East of Pound Lane from the UB NP. NO to Plan: My comments in the table above lay down why. i.e. this is a totally unsuitable site for development on such a scale as is UB as a whole if outside of the existing built up area.</p>	
<p>57</p>	<p>The last application relating to this site from 2014-15 was refused by HDC only 18 months ago on the grounds of unsuitability. Policy 3 contradicts the Vision for the Upper Beeding Parish which is "To improve the quality of life for those who live in the Villages of Upper Beeding..." As Simon Birstingl (Chair of the Parish Council) previously stated "There are very concerned residents who will suffer the consequences of this development while the landowner and developer reap the benefits." The reasons have not changed, and the sites remain unsuitable. Remove the site East of Pound Lane from the UB NP on the basis of unsustainability and unsuitability. The HDC Housing Strategy 2011-2031 clearly states that new developments should be based on proven demand and not just to satisfy supply targets. The house on Smugglers Lane (no. 1 Smugglers Lane) was on the market under 2 years ago and didn't sell; it is now back on the market since 20th March 2018 and remains unsold. Another house along the Driftway remains unsold since being put on the market on 11th April 2018. Demand is not proven in this area. Remove the site East of Pound Lane and Little Paddocks from the UB NP. The sites are only being put forward again not due to suitability, but because there are no alternatives AT THE CURRENT TIME. This is not a good enough reason to include them on the Plan.</p>	<p>Thank you and noted.</p> <p>The previous Planning Applications were for a lot more houses. We are seeking less and asking for more Affordable and Sheltered Housing. We also sought that these developments worked with the NP Team to ensure they met more of the requirements of the Parish and not those of some outside company. They didn't so we could not support. The HNA identified a future demand of 213 homes over the next 13 years whereas we are only recommending around 109 houses over the whole Parish.</p>

	<p>Remove the site East of Pound Lane and Little Paddocks from the UB NP. The sites are outside the built up area boundary, where development is considered less sustainable and unacceptable. Remove the site East of Pound Lane and Little Paddocks from the UB NP. Remove the site East of Pound Lane and Little Paddocks from the UB NP. The infrastructure is woefully inadequate. Access to these sites is via a footpath (2767 – the “road” north of Smugglers Lane is NOT a road). There are enough traffic problems via Hyde Lane currently, therefore traffic detours via 2 conservation areas (The Towers and Beeding high street) which is never taken into consideration. Remove the site East of Pound Lane and Little Paddocks from the UB NP. No to Plan: Prior refusal by Horsham District Council. The conditions and reasons have not changed. Sites remain unsuitable</p>	<p>WSCC recommend that the current roads will be adequate for any additional traffic generated.</p>
<p>60</p>	<p>70 houses east of Pound Lane UB do not have the infrastructure in place to commit to these houses: The medical centre is largely in Steyning, which is a bus journey. Employment issues, not much in the local area, often have to go further afield. Not much to do for teenagers. If the potential owners have cars (and its usually 2 cars at least to a house) then the main access road in is Hyde Lane. Hyde Lane experiences a lot of problems with cars. It is extremely busy road. There is parking on one side leaving a width space for one car at a time. This causes issues with cars at either side of the road speeding up (over the 20mph limit) in order to get to the end of the road first...as well as stand off's. This system causes a lot of arguments (road rage) with cars ending up driving on the grass banks. It is only a matter of time before a serious accident occurs!</p>	<p>Thank you and noted.</p> <p>The previous Planning Applications were for a lot more houses. We are seeking less and asking for more Affordable and Sheltered Housing. We also sought that these developments worked with the NP Team to ensure they met more of the requirements of the Parish and not those of some outside company. They didn't so we could not support. The HNA identified a future demand of 213 homes over the next 13 years whereas we are only recommending around 109 houses over the whole Parish. WSCC recommend that the current roads will be adequate for any additional traffic generated.</p>

	<p>This is a village and should remain a village. A new estate would change that, change the structure of the village and also the look of it. The village is on the boundary of south downs national park and should remain a small environment in order for it to remain a village.</p> <p>Suggested Modification: Either do not build the houses down Pound Lane or if you have to, then another access road is needed from the road to Small dole.</p> <p>Have more doctors at the Upper Beeding Surgery.</p> <p>NO to Plan: Because the infrastructure isn't in place. Access to the houses would be an issue. This is a village environment, the housing development plans would change this both aesthetically and in structure.</p>	
<p>62</p>	<p>Suggested Modification : Access Improvements must be made to the road access from off the High St. into Pound Lane Pound Lane SA483</p> <p>Suggested Modification: Access as above</p> <p>Yes to Plan: Parking in High St. will have to be restricted before it becomes a complete bottleneck. Buses find it increasingly difficult to pass through.</p>	<p>Thank you and noted.</p> <p>We are aware of local concern to the access off the High St. to Pound Lane and have and will continue to push for some way to alleviate this problem both with Developers and WSCC</p>
<p>64</p>	<p>Site 1 Proximity to Listed building and insufficient road infrastructure.</p> <p>Suggested Modification: Remove from Plan</p> <p>Site 2 & 3: lack of demand for housing in this part of the village, outside village boundary, road infrastructure insufficient, traffic issues are significant, rejected by HDC Planning in 2015</p> <p>Suggested Modification: remove from Plan.</p> <p>NO to Plan: Sites unsuitable for above reasons.</p>	<p>Thank you and noted.</p> <p>We feel we have covered your points raised in previous comments above</p>
<p>65</p>	<p>Site 1 too close to listed building, local road infrastructure will not cope</p> <p>Suggested Modification: Remove proposal from NP</p> <p>Sites 2 & 3: Both sites rejected on good grounds by HDC Planning in 2015. Lack of demand for housing in this part of the village, outside village boundary, local infrastructure and amenities cannot cope with additional housing and traffic issues will be significant.</p> <p>Suggested Modification: Remove from NP</p> <p>No to Plan: All sites are unsuitable due to the fact that they are outside the built up area and contradict the HDC planning decision. Also the</p>	<p>Thank you and noted.</p> <p>We feel we have covered your points raised in previous comments above</p>

	impact on infrastructure will be significant in an already busy area(Pound Lane and Hyde Road)	
67	<p>I am writing to comment on the proposed development on land to the east of Pound Lane. When the previous sets of plans were submitted to the local population of a development to the East of Pound Lane, the Plan was rejected on the basis of the amount of traffic which would be using Pound Lane. By extending Smugglers Lane from a point on the Henfield Road through to Pound Lane will not help the situation. In fact it will make the problem very much worse.</p> <p>Suggested Modification: With all the entrances into Pound lane of a narrow one carriageway category the amount of vehicles will double along with the numerous HGV lorries which use Pound Lane. Also there is the flood plains aspect. For that reason above I can see no solution to the problems</p> <p>NO to Plan.</p>	<p>Thank you and noted.</p> <p>We feel we have covered your points raised in previous comments above</p>
68	<p>I have just returned from a walk along Smugglers Lane and have read the poster 100 homes to be built. Land at Smugglers and land East of Pound Lane is all flood plain and is flooded regularly. I know because I live backing onto Smugglers Lane. The last time end of May Flash Flood. The water poured down Underhill Road rounding the corner into Downsland Close. The road was completely flooded, so deep it came over the top of my neighbour's wheels of her car. It was like a waterfall and gushed over into Smugglers Lane. We have one shop, no Post Office, no Bank. We have to wait to see a Doctor. Buses run one an hour if you are lucky. I use public transport. More traffic on the roads Pound Lane, Hyde Lane etc. very dangerous. The village won't be able to cope with it all and it will be spoilt.</p> <p>Suggested Modifications: If more houses are built the builders would have to replace all the drains in the village as people get sewage in their gardens when it is heavy raining.</p> <p>YES to Plan</p>	<p>Thank you and noted.</p> <p>The plan is not for 100 homes in this area but for 70. Southern Water have stated that they will make plans to address flooding and sewerage</p> <p>Doctor's surgery should improve with new surgery opening in Storrington</p>
70	<p>Site 2 & 3 rejected by HDC Planning in October 2015</p> <p>Suggested Modification: Remove from Plan</p> <p>The residents are in unanimous agreement of no demand for housing in this area of the village</p>	<p>Thank you and noted.</p> <p>We feel we have covered your points raised in previous comments above</p>

	<p>Suggested Modification: Remove from Plan Site 1 too near to listed cottage see DC/14/A45 HDC Planning Framework</p> <p>Suggested modification: Remove from Plan NO to Plan: The above 3 sites are totally unsuitable for reasons of amenities outside built up area, road sewerage infrastructure.</p>	
71	<p>Site 2 & 3 rejected by HDC Planning Oct.2015 Suggested Modification: Remove from Plan The residents are in unanimous agreement of no demand for housing in this area of the village</p> <p>Suggested Modification: Remove from Plan Site 1 too near to listed cottage see DC/14/A45 HDC Planning Framework</p> <p>Suggested modification: Remove from Plan NO to Plan: The above 3 sites are totally unsuitable for reasons of amenities outside built up area, road sewerage infrastructure.</p>	<p>Thank you and noted. We feel we have covered your points raised in previous comments above</p>
72	<p>Site 2 & 3 rejected by HDC Planning Oct.2015 Suggested Modification: Remove from Plan The residents are in unanimous agreement of no demand for housing in this area of the village</p> <p>Suggested Modification: Remove from Plan Site 1 too near to listed cottage see DC/14/A45 HDC Planning Framework</p> <p>Suggested modification: Remove from Plan NO to Plan: The above 3 sites are totally unsuitable for reasons of amenities outside built up area, road sewerage infrastructure</p>	<p>Thank you and noted. We feel we have covered your points raised in previous comments above</p>
73	<p>Site 1: Think a small development of affordable homes would be good in Smugglers Lane, not very good as it now is.</p>	<p>Thank you and noted.</p>
75	<p>I thought sites 2 & 3 had been turned down by HDC before Suggested Modification: Remove from the Plan. There is no need for more housing in that area</p> <p>Suggested Modification: Remove from the Plan. The access is totally wrong. Another 100 homes would mean at least 200 cars. Hyde lane & Pound Lane are already bad enough and cannot take more. The school wouldn't cope or the Doctors.</p>	<p>Thank you and noted. We feel we have covered your points raised in previous comments above</p>

	<p>Suggested Modifications: Remove from Plan, please don't spoil our village anymore; I'm all for progress but not this..</p> <p>NO to Plan: Beeding has enough housing.</p>	
76	<p>Site 2&3 previously rejected by HDC in Oct.2015. Reasons for objection still apply</p> <p>Suggested Modification: Should be removed from UBNP</p> <p>There is no demand for large scale development that a site of this scale would potentially accommodate. Local essential amenities i.e. Primary School, Surgery, are already acutely stretched. It is incumbent upon UBPC to confirm the above facilities would not be impacted upon adversely.</p> <p>Site 1. This would impact adversely on the Grade 2 listed cottage causing harm to the setting contrary to HD Planning Framework.</p> <p>Suggested Modification: Should be removed from UBNP</p> <p>NO to Plan: The above sites listed are totally unsuitable and are outside the built up area.</p>	<p>The previous Planning Applications were for a lot more houses. We are seeking less and asking for more Affordable and Sheltered Housing. We also sought that these developments worked with the NP Team to ensure they met more of the requirements of the Parish and not those of some outside company. They didn't so we could not support.</p> <p>SDNP have laid down specific requirements in their response to the NP which covers how any development must be planned and viewed from the SDNP. In addition care must be given to accommodate any existing wild life,</p> <p>Any development will have to meet EA and Southern Water requirements</p> <p>WSCC have stated that the roads will meet the extra demand placed by more cars.</p> <p>Any requirements to meet additional school places will be planned and Southern Water have stated that they will make plans to address flooding and sewerage</p>
77	<p>Land on Flood Plain. Road will not take more traffic</p> <p>Suggested Modifications: Cancel Proposals</p> <p>School already at pupil limit ruin of countryside</p> <p>Suggested Modification: Cancel Proposal</p> <p>NO to Plan: I would not vote on 2 and 3 for the above reasons.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments</p> <p>We feel we have covered your comments in other responses</p>
78	<p>The last application relating to this site from 2014-15 was refused by HDC only 18 months ago on the grounds of unsuitability.</p> <p>Policy 3 contradicts the Vision for the Upper Beeding Parish which is "To improve the quality of life for those who live in the Villages of Upper Beeding..."</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments.</p> <p>The previous Planning Applications were for a lot more houses. We are seeking less and asking for more Affordable and Sheltered Housing. We also sought that these developments worked with the NP Team to ensure they met more of the requirements of the Parish and not those of some outside company. They didn't so we could not support.</p>

As Simon Birstingl (Chair of the Parish Council) previously stated "There are very concerned residents who will suffer the consequences of this development while the landowner and developer reap the benefits." The reasons have not changed, and the sites remain unsuitable.

Remove the site East of Pound Lane from the UB NP on the basis of unsustainability and unsuitability.

The HDC Housing Strategy 2011-2031 clearly states that new developments should be based on proven demand and not just to satisfy supply targets. The house on Smugglers Lane (no. 1 Smugglers Lane) was on the market under 2 years ago and didn't sell; it is now back on the market since 20th March 2018 and remains unsold.

Another house along the Driftway remains unsold since being put on the market on 11th April 2018.

Demand is not proven in this area.

Remove the site East of Pound Lane and Little Paddocks from the UB NP.

The sites are only being put forward again not due to suitability, but because there are no alternatives AT THE CURRENT TIME.

This is not a good enough reason to include them on the Plan.

Remove the site East of Pound Lane and Little Paddocks from the UB NP.

The sites are outside the built up area boundary, where development is considered less sustainable and unacceptable.

Remove the site East of Pound Lane and Little Paddocks from the UB NP.

Remove the site East of Pound Lane and Little Paddocks from the UB NP.

The infrastructure is woefully inadequate.

Access to these sites is via a footpath (2767 – the "road" north of Smugglers Lane is NOT a road). There are enough traffic problems via Hyde Lane currently, therefore traffic detours via 2 conservation areas (The Towers and Beeding high street) which is never taken into consideration.

Remove the site East of Pound Lane and Little Paddocks from the UB NP.

SDNP have laid down specific requirements in their response to the NP which covers how any development must be planned and viewed from the SDNP. In addition care must be given to accommodate any existing wild life,

Any development will have to meet EA and Southern Water requirements

WSCC have stated that the roads will meet the extra demand placed by more cars.

Any requirements to meet additional school places will be planned and Southern Water have stated that they will make plans to address flooding and sewerage

	No to Plan: Prior refusal by Horsham District Council. The conditions and reasons have not changed. Sites remain unsuitable	
80	<p>Pound Lane is a un adopted road. Residents will have to cover the cost of any damage to this road.</p> <p>I also believe that the evidence provided that extra housing is needed in this area is insufficient. I want to save the SDNP</p> <p>Suggested Modifications: I don't suggest any modifications as I don't agree with the plans.</p> <p>NO to Plan: I simply don't think there is demand in this rural area for housing. We have no rail links and property is already selling at reduced prices due to lack of demand.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment.</p> <p>Our HNA indicates a need for 213 homes but we are only recommending 109 for the whole Parish.</p> <p>SDNP have laid down specific requirements in their response to the NP which covers how any development must be planned and viewed from the SDNP. In addition care must be given to accommodate any existing wild life,</p>
81	<p>The roads are unable to cope with increased traffic. Infrastructure is near capacity.</p> <p>Desperately want to save our Green Space.</p> <p>The housing prices are currently all reduced and property is difficult to sell.</p> <p>How would introducing nearly 100 new houses help this.</p> <p>Suggested Modification: I strongly oppose the development of this are and propose no modification to the plans as I simply do not agree with them.</p> <p>NO to Plan: I don't think there is enough demand in this rural setting. No rail links, you would need a car to live here but there is not enough parking available for these houses.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment.</p> <p>WSCC have indicated that our roads will meet any extra demand put on them.</p> <p>The plan is not for 100 homes in the Pound Lane area but around 70.</p>
Policy 3 – Land East of Pound Lane Upper Beeding		
29	<p>I find the total number of new houses proposed that will be accessed using Pound Lane too high. Traffic problems have been underestimated. The upper range for units is 157 which I estimate will generate at least 200 additional cars. I also find that there is insufficient attention given to the additional infrastructure needed to accommodate so many additional residents e.g. School places, sewage capacity, and capacity at Steyning Health Centre. I also feel there is inadequate consideration given to the flooding which already occurs in existing properties around this area e.g. in The Driftway, Church Lane etc.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment.</p> <p>WSCC have indicated that our roads will meet any extra demand put on them.</p> <p>The plan is not for 100 homes in the Pound Lane area but around 70.</p> <p>SDNP have laid down specific requirements in their response to the NP which covers how any development must be planned and viewed from the SDNP. In addition care must be given to accommodate any existing wild life,</p>

	<p>Suggested Modification: I feel that only a maximum of 50 one or two bed units should be provided in this area, ideally provided for rent through a Community Land Trust so they can be assured to be affordable in perpetuity.</p>	
30	<p>Any development to the north of Upper Beeding, i.e. Land East of Pound Lane is totally unacceptable until the issue of access through Hyde Lane is addressed. Parking in Hyde Lane, Hyde Square, and the southern part of Pound Lane make this proposed site unsuitable for development. This part of the village is at a dead end of streets and is already an issue for residents who have to contend with Hyde Lane on a daily basis.</p> <p>The infrastructure of this area, particularly drainage, is already well below what would be considered normal acceptability with bubbling in the toilets after a rainstorm or wet period. Although the proposed dwellings may not be directly on the flood plain the land does act as a soak away to protect existing dwellings.</p> <p>The Upper Beeding school is close to capacity and a development of the size proposed would exacerbate the issue.</p> <p>The development of 50 to 150 dwellings on one site in the area would seem to go against the policy of spreading the burden of new dwellings across the district rather than have a large development. 150 houses at an average 2.4 people per dwelling is 360 people – a small village in its own right.</p> <p>This piece of land has already been recently rejected for the building of approximately 60 dwellings, partly because of the visual impact from the South Downs National Park. The proposed new development would have equal, or worse, visual impact.</p> <p>I am disappointed that the UBPC seems to be working against the wishes of local residents on this matter.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. We have commented above on similar comments raised</p>
31	<p>Land east of Pound Lane, I understand that the housing need, but I am still concerned about building on this land, for all the reasons you set out mainly. The proximity of the flood plan, visibility of South Downs National Park etc. the proposed public open space will probably be too wet to use. Hyde Lane cannot take increased traffic.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. We feel we have covered these in the points raised above.</p>

	Suggested - remove from plan	
7	<p>Reasons against approval (coverage of whole area)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proximity of South Downs National Park; a full view of Truleigh Hill from the village is afforded only across 'land east of Pound Lane', plus the immediate rural access to the Downs for walkers and riders. 2. Housing on 'Little Paddocks', would conflict with the National Park policy of complete disapproval of new built- up areas in views from inside of the Park. 3. The adjacency of the Flood Plain and the liability of parts of the land to flooding. 4. The poor, long access road through the village that already causes congestion. 5. The inadequate infrastructure (overloading of the school, drainage, sewage etc.) 6. Pound House cottage, as listed building to be left untouched by modern development. <p>NB. see previous submissions, dating back to 1975 for details</p>	<p>Thank you and noted. SDNP have laid down specific requirements in their response to the NP which covers your points and will be a requirement on any development. Any development will have to meet EA and Southern Water requirements</p> <p>WSCC have stated that the roads will meet the extra demand placed by more cars.</p> <p>Any requirements to meet additional school places will be planned and Southern Water have stated that they will make plans to address flooding and sewerage</p> <p>Pound Cottage would not be harmed.</p>
8	<p>Reasons against approval (coverage of whole area)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proximity of South Downs National Park; a full view of Truleigh Hill from the village is afforded only across 'land east of Pound Lane', plus the immediate rural access to the Downs for walkers and riders. 2. Housing on 'Little Paddocks', would conflict with the National Park policy of complete disapproval of new built- up areas in views from inside of the Park. 3. The adjacency of the Flood Plain and the liability of parts of the land to flooding. 4. The poor, long access road through the village that already causes congestion. 5. The inadequate infrastructure (overloading of the school, drainage, sewage etc.) 6. Pound House cottage, as listed building to be left untouched by modern development. <p>NB. see previous submissions, dating back to 1975 for details</p>	<p>Thank you and noted. SDNP have laid down specific requirements in their response to the NP which covers your points and will be a requirement on any development. Any development will have to meet EA and Southern Water requirements</p> <p>WSCC have stated that the roads will meet the extra demand placed by more cars.</p> <p>Any requirements to meet additional school places will be planned and Southern Water have stated that they will make plans to address flooding and sewerage</p> <p>Pound Cottage would not be harmed.</p>

32	<p><i>Local infrastructure will not support additional housing. Schools are over- subscribed. It is already difficult to make an appointment to see a doctor. Traffic at peak times, on Pound Lane is already heavy. Further congestion will impact on the safety of children and the elderly.</i></p> <p><i>This is a well documented Flood Risk area. Existing residents have difficulty/expense obtaining insurance. Flood plains are there to protect settlements. Building on them puts more pressure on the area, therefore, more houses, would be at risk of being flooded.</i></p> <p><i>Non agreement to plan based on the above.</i></p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. We feel we have covered these in the points raised above.</p>
33	<p>Local infrastructure is already under pressure. Further development will impact on schools (currently over- subscribed) and Health Centre services (ever longer waits for appointments). I don't believe these will support planned housing.</p> <p>Traffic on Pound Lane, is currently heavy at peak times. Further congestions poses increase risk to children and the elderly.</p> <p>There is a well-documented, historical Flood Risk in this area. Existing residents pay high insurance premiums. *Building on or adjacent to Flood plain will clearly increase risk.</p> <p>Non agreement to plan based on the above.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. We feel we have covered these in the points raised above.</p>
21	<p>Local schools are already at capacity & there is no point allowing a NP to be put forward with an allocation of houses that the local infrastructure cannot support. Has there been any consultation with the schools, surgeries (Dr), sewage/utility companies as to impact this increase in housing will have.</p> <p>Sites are outside the BUAB</p> <p>Suggested Modification: 1. Significantly reduce the number of housing in order for OB to be kept as "sustainable". There is mention that there is not enough land to fulfil the original target. Surely this is proof enough our village cannot accommodate this size of development.</p> <p>2. The Cement Works could fulfil or housing obligation and within its development its own infrastructure could be created.</p> <p>No to Plan: The push to find land to fulfil our housing obligation within that has an infrastructure that is already stretched when a site like the</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. We feel we have covered these in the points raised above.</p>

	<p>cement works is a more viable possibility, will impact us all and not in a good way. Is the housing demand that great? A 3 bedroom dwelling was given planning and construction started in May 2016. It is now derelict with no sign of work being undertaken since Feb, 2018</p>	
34	<p>My comments cover the three separate sites 1) Strip of Land Smugglers Lane, 2) Land east of Pound Lane 3) Little Paddocks. This is a flood zone 3 and for the better part of the winter months is under water. Accesses to the sites are via a single track road or footpath which is already falling apart and cannot withstand the impact of another 87 plus cars (assuming most houses will have more than 1 car this figure will Double). Nothing in the plan about the extra traffic coming into the village which needs to go through the village pass the school crossing as there is no access otherwise! The existing infrastructure for example roads, schools, doctors, sewerage works etc. cannot cope now let alone with another 87 plus houses. Tankers are often in the village pumping out the sewerage The site is outside the built-up area boundary and within a countryside location and therefore should not be built on. Suggested Modification :No Houses to be allocated here No to Plan: Previous applications have been all been rejected, there have been no changes so surely the same criteria that HDC used for Rydons refusal still stands.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. We feel we have covered these in the points raised above.</p>
35	<p>This area is totally unsuitable for development as it will increase the traffic flow in Pound Lane immensely Additionally, the sewer system has problems now in coping with the volume so the extra volume from these houses will result in severe problems. It is on the flood plain and the homes will be at real risk of flooding as will the existing homes due to the run off from these extra properties. We live in a village location and the additional houses will destroy our local area. Without additional school places the children will be forced to find places elsewhere. Suggested Modification: Do not build on this area.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. We feel we have covered these in the points raised above.</p>

<p>22</p>	<p>Living in The Driftway, at the lower end, we already suffer from flooding in winter; both our house and garage have suffered water damage. Building houses will mean that water that would have been absorbed in that land will now run off to increase pressure on the rest of the surrounding area. The lower end of The Driftway is already on a flood plain, building more houses in the area will mean many more houses are likely to be included in the flood plain.</p> <p>Access via Hyde Lane and Pound Lane is already overused, causing traffic issues due to narrow access and cars being parked in dangerous locations. Adding 150 cars will make the access impossible especially at peak times and will lead to increased risk for those crossing Pound Lane, especially youngsters going to school.</p> <p>Suggested Modification: Take the land east of Pound Lane out of the neighbourhood development plan</p> <p>No to Plan: Upper Beeding is a lovely village, building a lot more houses will take away the village feel, if we wanted to live in a more built up area we would move to either Steyning or Shoreham. The facilities we have are already under strain, I don't see anything that will improve them, they will just move closer to breaking point. Pound Lane and Hyde Lane will become more dangerous, leading to driver frustration, and increased risk for pedestrians.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. We feel we have covered these in the points raised above.</p>
<p>36</p>	<p>With the congestion in Pound Lane getting worse by the day we find it unbelievable that anyone could even consider putting this policy in the Plan.</p> <p>Suggested Modification: If houses of this quantity need to be built then they should be adjacent to and have direct access to a main road and not be based on access through already over used village roads.</p> <p>NO to Plan for above reasons.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. We feel we have covered these in the points raised above.</p>
<p>23</p>	<p>There are not enough spaces in the local schools to support 100 more homes on the sites identified in policies 2 & 3. The sewer systems on pound lane are very old and block on a regular basis. They cannot support any further homes. Parked cars and the narrow width of Hyde Lane make it very challenging/blind driving out of the village via Pound Lane and vice versa. More homes on Pound Lane would result in increased traffic, a higher risk of accidents and consequently a danger</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. We feel we have covered these in the points raised above.</p>

	<p>to the public. Smugglers Lane and the lane to the North of it floods after any substantial rainfall. It becomes unpassable on foot. It is unfair and irrational to build on areas that are known to flood. Smugglers Lane is popular dog walking spot and building around it would ruin this for the local residents of Upper Beeding. There is not enough space in local doctor's surgeries to support hundreds more people. The Upper Beeding surgery is only open 2-3 hours each day.</p> <p>Suggested Modification: Do not build more houses on Pound Lane. NO to Plan</p>	
<p>37</p>	<p>The current road access links via Pound Lane is not sufficient for the current level of traffic already trying to access and leave the village every day, particularly around school times and morning/evening. A bottle neck of traffic is ever present at the roundabout end of Pound Lane because of this. This needs addressing before any development can take place. Traffic is now also trying to avoid this bottle neck by cutting through Saltings Way and along Deacons Way or Pepperscomb Lane, creating a dangerous rat run. It won't be long before a child gets knocked down by a car speeding through.</p> <p>Suggested Modification: Completely separate access route needs to be created to allow traffic to enter the top of Pound Lane via Henfield Road. Traffic calming measures need implementing around the village to slow traffic down. Bottle neck at round about end of Pound Lane needs to be alleviated. Address the current traffic situation before adding an increase in traffic.</p> <p>The school can only just support the existing community as it is, it will not be able to support an additional development.</p> <p>Suggested Modification: A larger school will be required to cope with a larger intake.</p> <p>Pound Lane will not be able to cope with the development traffic, i.e. large lorries and site traffic during the development process.</p> <p>Suggested Modification: Alternative access route to be created before any work begins</p> <p>Is this land on a flood plain? Building on a flood plain is not a suitable site.</p> <p>Suggested Modification: Find alternative site.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. We feel we have covered these in the points raised above.</p>

	<p>The sewage treatment has previously struggled with the existing size of the community as it is, this will require addressing if another development is to be added to it. Suggested Modification: Address the existing sewerage situation prior to development. NO to Plan.</p>	
<p>38</p>	<p>The proposed idea to build houses here contradicts the Parish Council views as expressed in you submission to HDC on the 01/10/2014 to the proposal to build 65 houses (ref: DC/14/1744 and DC/14/1755). The PC stated 7 reasons for objecting amongst which were that it was agricultural, there was an issue of access, an issue with flooding, insufficient consideration for health and education and issues over bio-diversity. Perhaps the PC would like to publish this along with the 2016 'Housing and Development Focus Team Document' report (page 22) that also rejects the site(s) proposed for the reasons stated by HDC in their decision notice. I also refer you to the HDC reasons for rejecting them (dated 20/10/2015) and the decisions notice (posted on the website 27/10/2015). The reasons are there but I draw your attention to this: 'The development is not essential to its countryside location and does not support the needs of agriculture or forestry. It is, therefore, contrary to Policies CP1 and CP5 of the Core Strategy (2007), Policies 2, 3 and 4 of the Horsham District Planning Framework and Paragraphs 7 and 64 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012).'</p> <p>In the 'Upper Beeding Parish Neighbourhood Plan 2018-2033' report on page 46 section 7.25 the PC notes the above HDC decision but then seems to forget that amongst the problems noted in this were those alluded to in the objection raised by the PC itself and many, many others.</p> <p>I accept that the PC makes reference to what has to be done on p47 but with perhaps around ~20% more houses being proposed, does the PC truly believe that these issues will magically disappear? I also note that the PC acknowledges that its proposals are not in line with Policy 4 of the HDPF.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. The previous Planning Applications were for a lot more houses. We are seeking less and asking for more Affordable and Sheltered Housing. We also sought that these developments worked with the NP Team to ensure they met more of the requirements of the Parish and not those of some outside company. They didn't so we could not support.</p> <p>SDNP have laid down specific requirements in their response to the NP which covers how any development must be planned and viewed from the SDNP. In addition care must be given to accommodate any existing wild life,</p> <p>Any development will have to meet EA and Southern Water requirements WSCC have stated that the roads will meet the extra demand placed by more cars. Any requirements to meet additional school places will be planned and Southern Water has stated that they will make plans to address flooding and sewerage. Work is still ongoing with SDNPA to develop the Cement Works and we are involved with the Area Action Plan that SDNP are developing,</p>

	<p>Perhaps you can explain to the village how you will resolve these problems.</p> <p>Suggested Modification: Beeding Cement Works: can WSCC provide any form of funding. It's a brownfield site and surely must be on interest given the space?</p> <p>There is no change to the access and to the issues highlighted in the past and therefore my comment is that it should not be permitted.</p> <p>NO to Policy 3: I presume you mean the proposals set out in (3). There are some interesting ideas but in my view there are too many unresolved issues and a number of inconsistencies.</p>	
24	<p>UB PC objected to Rydon's application DC/14/1744 and DC/14/1745 on 01/10/14 to developing 65 houses on the 2 fields beyond Smugglers Lane. HDC refused permission.</p> <p>Furthermore, in 2016 the UB PC 'Housing and Development Focus Team Document' report also rejects those sites. Why is this any different?</p> <p>Suggested Modification: Do not build more houses on Pound Lane. The sewage infrastructure on pound lane is very old and block on a regular basis. They cannot support any further homes.</p> <p>UB PC were previously not satisfied that sufficient consideration had been given to the disposal of sewage, given that the foul drainage disposal system in the vicinity is already known to be overstretched beyond capacity. What has changed?</p> <p>Suggested Modification: Consult the local community properly before making ridiculous housing suggestions that will impact day to day lives of existing residents.</p> <p>The only access routes between the site and the village, and onto the main transport network, is via Hyde Lane and Saltings Way, both of which are narrow and already over-utilised. More homes on Pound Lane would result in increased traffic, a higher risk of accidents and consequently a danger to the public.</p> <p>Suggested Modification: Build elsewhere where appropriate routes already exist or can be improved.</p> <p>Smugglers Lane and the lane to the North of it floods after any substantial rainfall, as does the field.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments.</p> <p>The previous Planning Applications were for a lot more houses. We are seeking less and asking for more Affordable and Sheltered Housing. We also sought that these developments worked with the NP Team to ensure they met more of the requirements of the Parish and not those of some outside company. They didn't so we could not support.</p> <p>SDNP have laid down specific requirements in their response to the NP which covers how any development must be planned and viewed from the SDNP. In addition care must be given to accommodate any existing wild life,</p> <p>Any development will have to meet EA and Southern Water requirements</p> <p>WSCC have stated that the roads will meet the extra demand placed by more cars.</p> <p>Any requirements to meet additional school places will be planned and Southern Water has stated that they will make plans to address flooding and sewerage.</p>

	<p>UB PC were previously not satisfied that sufficient consideration has been given to the disposal of surface water at a site adjacent to the flood plain of the river Adur, and already known to be significantly prone to flooding. What has changed? Suggested Modification: Build somewhere else which isn't on a flood risk area...?</p> <p>Smugglers Lane is popular dog walking spot and building around it would ruin this for the local residents of Upper Beeding, as well as visitors to the area. Suggested Modification: Build somewhere else.</p> <p>There are not enough spaces at the local doctor surgery and school to support more families. The Upper Beeding surgery is only open part time hours and the school is oversubscribed already. Suggested Modification: Another school and doctor surgery (or expansion to existing) would need to be built to support this many houses. I already can't go to my own village doctors, which is ridiculous, and I would like my own unborn child to be able to go to the school 5 minutes from my house, rather than new residents. 70 more families would potentially not allow this, and mean I have to take my child to a school and doctors nowhere near where I live.</p> <p>There are a number of species considered rare or endangered within a kilometre radius from the proposed site, as listed by the biodiversity report from the previous application of 2014. I have witnessed stag beetles, newts, owls and geese during dog walks around smugglers lane. Suggested Modification: Expert scrutiny of the ecology and wildlife needs to be carried out prior to ANY application being considered. NO TO PLAN This area has already been rejected twice before, as noted in detail above, stop trying to build on it!! Leave Pound Lane alone.</p>	
<p>39</p>	<p>The proposed idea to build houses here contradicts the PC views as expressed in your submission to HDC on 01/10/2014 to the proposal to build 64 houses (ref: DC14 /1744 and DC14/1755). The PC stated 7 reasons for objecting amongst which it was agricultural, there was an issue of access, an issue with flooding, insufficient consideration for</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. The previous Planning Applications were for a lot more houses. We are seeking less and asking for more Affordable and Sheltered Housing. We also sought that these developments worked with the NP Team to ensure they met</p>

	<p>health and education and issues over bio-diversity. Perhaps the PC would like to publish this along with the Housing and Development Focus Team Document (page 22) that also rejects the sites for reasons stated by HDC in their decision notice.</p> <p>I refer you to the HDC reasons for rejecting them dated (22/10/2015) and the decisions notice (posted on the website 27/10/2015). The reasons are there but I draw your attention to this: The development is not essential to its countryside location and does not support the needs of agricultural and forestry. It is therefore contrary to policies CP1 and CP5 of the Core Strategy (2007), Policies 2, 3 and 4 of the Horsham District Planning Framework and Paragraphs 7 and 64 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012). In the 'Upper Beeding Neighbourhood Plan 2018 – 2033' report on page 46 section 7.25 the PC notes the above HDC decision but then seems to forget that amongst the problems noted in this were those alluded to in the objection raised by the PC itself and many, many others.</p> <p>I accept that the PC makes reference to what has to be done on P47 but with perhaps 20% more houses being proposed, does the PC truly believe that these issues will magically disappear. I also note that the proposals are not in line with Policy 4 of HDPF. Perhaps you will explain to the village how you will resolve these problems.</p> <p>Suggested Modification: Beeding Cement Works: can WSCC provide any form of funding. It's a brownfield site and surely must be on interest given the space?</p> <p>There is no change to the access and to the issues highlighted in the past and therefore my comment is that it should not be permitted.</p> <p>NO to Policy 3: I presume you mean the proposals set out in (3). There are some interesting ideas but in my view there are too many unresolved issues and a number of inconsistencies.</p>	<p>more of the requirements of the Parish and not those of some outside company. They didn't so we could not support.</p> <p>SDNP have laid down specific requirements in their response to the NP which covers how any development must be planned and viewed from the SDNP. In addition care must be given to accommodate any existing wild life,</p> <p>Any development will have to meet EA and Southern Water requirements WSCC have stated that the roads will meet the extra demand placed by more cars. Any requirements to meet additional school places will be planned and Southern Water has stated that they will make plans to address flooding and sewerage. Work is still ongoing with SDNPA to develop the Cement Works and we are involved with the Area Action Plan that SDNP are developing,</p>
40	<p>I believe that these areas are unsuitable for the number of dwellings proposed due to inadequate access for vehicles via Hyde Lane and Pound Lane, already pinch points. Increased vehicle movements during construction, and afterwards during occupation of the dwellings, will have an undue impact on the environment of this rural area.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. The previous Planning Applications were for a lot more houses. We are seeking less and asking for more Affordable and Sheltered Housing. We also sought that these developments worked with the NP Team to ensure they met</p>

	<p>Other local roads such as Hyde Street and Manor Road would become 'rat runs' during peak traffic times to bypass the already congested Hyde Lane and Pound Lane.</p> <p>Areas are liable to flooding; note rain in last weeks, development may have an impact on the already unstable water table of the area.</p> <p>Extra pressure on inadequate drainage, both surface and foul, gas supply, and portable water supply and electricity supplies for the area would ensue.</p> <p>Transport links are poor for the area, lack of access to medical care; schools etc. would be a long-term problem.</p> <p>Access to A27 from Upper Beeding is inadequate, especially if Cement Works proposal goes ahead, even more traffic on a rural road.</p> <p>Access to basic shopping needs, one store in the area, would mean further impact on the environment with extra vehicle journeys to supermarkets or home delivery</p> <p>Suggested Modifications: Minimum development with designs in keeping with older houses already in the area. Low build height with local materials to preserve views from The South Downs and to be in keeping with the historic significance of the area.</p> <p>YES to Plan.</p>	<p>more of the requirements of the Parish and not those of some outside company. They didn't so we could not support.</p> <p>SDNP have laid down specific requirements in their response to the NP which covers how any development must be planned and viewed from the SDNP. In addition care must be given to accommodate any existing wild life,</p> <p>Any development will have to meet EA and Southern Water requirements</p> <p>WSCC have stated that the roads will meet the extra demand placed by more cars.</p> <p>Any requirements to meet additional school places will be planned and Southern Water has stated that they will make plans to address flooding and sewerage.</p> <p>Work is still ongoing with SDNPA to develop the Cement Works and we are involved with the Area Action Plan that SDNP are developing,</p>
41	<p>Section 7.23 (Smugglers Lane, Pound lane & Little paddocks)</p> <p>1. Though listed as three separate sites, they would inevitably be developed as one. This would mean a potential for 157 of the projected 213 required new homes in a single development directly contradicting UBNP vision for "small clusters" as stated in section 5.1 and "sensitivity to the setting" referenced in section 6.3</p> <p>2. All reasons for previous rejections of development in these areas still stand - Inadequate road network, inadequate sewage, existing flood risk, increased flood risk, lack of school capacity, lack of healthcare capacity etc.</p> <p>3. No Clear assurance that Smugglers lane itself will remain vehicle free or that the wide tree/hedge boundary and wildlife will be protected.</p> <p>Suggested Modification: Several sites were not even reviewed by AECOM due to their position within SDNP. Yet some are adjacent to</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments.</p> <p>The NP states around 70 homes across all 3 sites.</p> <p>The previous Planning Applications were for a lot more houses. We are seeking less and asking for more Affordable and Sheltered Housing. We also sought that these developments worked with the NP Team to ensure they met more of the requirements of the Parish and not those of some outside company. They didn't so we could not support.</p> <p>SDNP have laid down specific requirements in their response to the NP which covers how any development must be planned and viewed from the SDNP. In addition care must be given to accommodate any existing wild life,</p> <p>Any development will have to meet EA and Southern Water requirements</p>

	<p>and between existing developments, and could support “small clusters” of careful development. Perhaps too much “consideration” is being given to SDNP even before full evaluations of these sites are conducted. NO to PLAN: With reference to policy 3 above. This would bring too much development to a single area of the village that is already under significant strain in all regards, and would result in a direct, negative impact to existing homeowners on all adjacent boundaries.</p>	<p>WSCC have stated that the roads will meet the extra demand placed by more cars.</p>
<p>42</p>	<p>The proposed idea to build houses here contradicts the PC views as expressed in your submission to HDC on 01/10/2014 to the proposal to build 64 houses (ref: DC14 /1744 and DC14/1755). The PC stated 7 reasons for objecting amongst which it was agricultural, there was an issue of access, an issue with flooding, insufficient consideration for health and education and issues over bio-diversity. Perhaps the PC would like to publish this along with the Housing and Development Focus Team Document (page 22) that also rejects the sites for reasons stated by HDC in their decision notice. I refer you to the HDC reasons for rejecting them dated (22/10/2015) and the decisions notice (posted on the website 27/10/2015). The reasons are there but I draw your attention to this: The development is not essential to its countryside location and does not support the needs of agricultural and forestry. It is therefore contrary to policies CP1 and CP5 of the Core Strategy (2007), Policies 2, 3 and 4 of the Horsham District Planning Framework and Paragraphs 7 and 64 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012). In the ‘Upper Beeding Neighbourhood Plan 2018 – 2033’ report on page 46 section 7.25 the PC notes the above HDC decision but then seems to forget that amongst the problems noted in this were those alluded to in the objection raised by the PC itself and many, many others. I accept that the PC makes reference to what has to be done on P47 but with perhaps 20% more houses being proposed, does the PC truly believe that these issues will magically disappear. I also note that the proposals are not in line with Policy 4 of HDPF. Perhaps you will explain to the village how you will resolve these problems.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. The previous Planning Applications were for a lot more houses. We are seeking less and asking for more Affordable and Sheltered Housing. We also sought that these developments worked with the NP Team to ensure they met more of the requirements of the Parish and not those of some outside company. They didn’t so we could not support. SDNP have laid down specific requirements in their response to the NP which covers how any development must be planned and viewed from the SDNP. In addition care must be given to accommodate any existing wild life, Any development will have to meet EA and Southern Water requirements WSCC have stated that the roads will meet the extra demand placed by more cars. Any requirements to meet additional school places will be planned and Southern Water have stated that they will make plans to address flooding and sewerage</p>

	<p>Suggested Modification: Beeding Cement Works: can WSCC provide any form of funding. It's a brownfield site and surely must be on interest given the space?</p> <p>There is no change to the access and to the issues highlighted in the past and therefore my comment is that it should not be permitted.</p> <p>NO to Policy 3: I presume you mean the proposals set out in (3). There are some interesting ideas but in my view there are too many unresolved issues and a number of inconsistencies.</p>	
43	<p>The Foreword to the NP specifically identifies the vision as "To improve the quality of life for those who live in the villages of Upper Beeding".</p> <p>Clauses 7.23-26 inclusive then directly contradict this vision. Suggesting that anywhere between 59 and 157 additional homes totalled across the three sites can be introduced on the outskirts of the village, bounded by the National Park and only accessible through an already over- trafficked narrow road (Hyde/Pound Lane) servicing an existing estate and supermarket demonstrates a blatant disregard for the current inhabitants of Hyde and Pound Lanes respectively and the impact on their "quality of life".</p> <p>The introduction of these homes would add to an already-overloaded infrastructure of Schools and Drainage too. The existing Primary School is already at capacity with little room for expansion other than developing the existing playing field with the obvious loss of amenity. Access to the School for drop off and collection is already over-burdened and it is not possible to alleviate this within the constrictions of the surrounding housing, even before additional pupils are introduced. The existing Primary School is already at capacity with little room for expansion other than developing the existing playing field with the obvious loss of amenity. Access to the School for drop off and collection is already over-burdened and it is not possible to alleviate this within the constrictions of the surrounding housing, even before additional pupils are introduced. These 3 sites should not be brought forward as part of the Neighbourhood Plan, being unsustainable quantum and position, incompatible with the existing infrastructure constraints and directly REDUCING the quality of life for those who live in the Pound and Hyde</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments.</p> <p>It is still the NP's vision to improve the quality of life. The NP states around 70 homes across all 3 sites.</p> <p>Any development will have to meet EA and Southern Water requirements</p> <p>WSCC have stated that the roads will meet the extra demand placed by more cars.</p> <p>Any requirements to meet additional school places will be planned and Southern Water has stated that they will make plans to address flooding and sewerage.</p>

	<p>Lane. The Water Authority have also already indicated that existing Drainage Infrastructure is at/beyond capacity, as has been proven when the pumping stations have failed and numerous tanker movements introduced to relieve the resulting chaos. All of these issues have already been emphasised and accepted during previous unsuccessful Planning Appeals on these sites and so for AECOM to suggest that such challenges could be overcome ignores factual evidence.</p> <p>Suggested Modification: These 3 sites should not be brought forward as part of the Neighbourhood Plan, being unsustainable quantum and position, incompatible with the existing infrastructure constraints and directly REDUCING the quality of life for those who live in the Pound and Hyde Lane</p> <p>NO to PLAN: The suggestion in Policy 3 directly contradicts the stated "Vision" of the Plan for existing inhabitants</p>	
<p>44</p>	<p>The proposed idea to build houses here contradicts the Parish Council views as expressed in your submission to HDC on the 01/10/2014 to the proposal to build 65 houses (ref: DC/14/1744 and DC/14/1755). The PC stated 7 reasons for objecting amongst which were that it was agricultural, there was an issue of access, an issue with flooding, insufficient consideration for health and education and issues over biodiversity.</p> <p>Perhaps the PC would like to publish this along with the 2016 'Housing and Development Focus Team Document' report (page 22) that also rejects the site(s) proposed for the reasons stated by HDC in their decision notice.</p> <p>I also refer you to the HDC reasons for rejecting them (dated 20/10/2015) and the decisions notice (posted on the website 27/10/2015). The reasons are there but I draw your attention to this: 'The development is not essential to its countryside location and does not support the needs of agriculture or forestry. It is, therefore, contrary to Policies CP1 and CP5 of the Core Strategy (2007), Policies 2, 3 and 4 of the Horsham District Planning Framework and Paragraphs 7 and 64 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012).'</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments.</p> <p>The previous Planning Applications were for a lot more houses. We are seeking less and asking for more Affordable and Sheltered Housing. We also sought that these developments worked with the NP Team to ensure they met more of the requirements of the Parish and not those of some outside company. They didn't so we could not support.</p> <p>SDNP have laid down specific requirements in their response to the NP which covers how any development must be planned and viewed from the SDNP. In addition care must be given to accommodate any existing wild life,</p> <p>Any development will have to meet EA and Southern Water requirements</p> <p>WSCC have stated that the roads will meet the extra demand placed by more cars.</p>

<p>In the 'Upper Beeding Parish Neighbourhood Plan 2018-2033' report on page 46 section 7.25 the PC notes the above HDC decision but then seems to forget that amongst the problems noted in this were those alluded to in the objection raised by the PC itself and many, many others.</p> <p>I accept that the PC makes reference to what has to be done on p47 but with perhaps around ~20% more houses being proposed, does the PC truly believe that these issues will magically disappear?</p> <p>I also note that the PC acknowledges that its proposals are not in line with Policy 4 of the HDPF.</p> <p>Perhaps you can explain to the village how you will resolve these problems.</p> <p>Suggested Modification: Beeding Cement Works: can WSCC provide any form of funding. It's a brownfield site and surely must be on interest given the space?</p> <p>There is no change to the access and to the issues highlighted in the past and therefore my comment is that it should not be permitted.</p> <p>NO to Policy 3: I presume you mean the proposals set out in (3). There are some interesting ideas but in my view there are too many unresolved issues and a number of inconsistencies</p>	<p>Any requirements to meet additional school places will be planned and Southern Water has stated that they will make plans to address flooding and sewerage.</p> <p>Work is still ongoing with SDNPA to develop the Cement Works and we are involved with the Area Action Plan that SDNP are developing,</p>
<p>45</p> <p>I believe that these areas are unsuitable for the number of dwellings proposed due to inadequate access for vehicles via Hyde Lane and Pound Lane, already pinch points. Increased vehicle movements during construction, and afterwards during occupation of the dwellings, will have an undue impact on the environment of this rural area.</p> <p>Other local roads such as Hyde Street and Manor Road would become 'rat runs' during peak traffic times to bypass the already congested Hyde Lane and Pound Lane.</p> <p>Areas are liable to flooding; note rain in last weeks, development may have an impact on the already unstable water table of the area.</p> <p>Extra pressure on inadequate drainage, both surface and foul, gas supply, and portable water supply and electricity supplies for the area would ensue.</p> <p>Transport links are poor for the area, lack of access to medical care; schools etc. would be a long-term problem.</p>	

	<p>Access to A27 from Upper Beeding is inadequate, especially if Cement Works proposal goes ahead, even more traffic on a rural road.</p> <p>Access to basic shopping needs, one store in the area, would mean further impact on the environment with extra vehicle journeys to supermarkets or home delivery</p> <p>Suggested Modifications: Minimum development with designs in keeping with older houses already in the area. Low build height with local materials to preserve views from The South Downs and to be in keeping with the historic significance of the area.</p> <p>YES to NP.</p>	
46	<p>Too many houses planned for this area.</p> <p>Pound Lane and Hyde Lane not wide enough to cope with increase in traffic – likely to have 1-2 cars per house – would make trying to get in and out of village intolerable.</p> <p>Area planned covers near to where migrating geese and other water birds regularly stay. Also an area for bats and owls - would lose or at least have their prey severely diminished by this development.</p> <p>What will happen to flood water current carried by drains in that area? – will it flood the development or overflow into other areas. Plans do not make clear what effect this will have on the water table. Will it affect the quality and quantity of water supply?</p> <p>Do not want to lose Smugglers Lane as a good bridle way /path.</p> <p>Suggested Modification: Much smaller development of up to 20 houses near to current road (Pound Lane) would have a less detrimental effect. Why has all building on SDNP been automatically ruled out?</p> <p>NO to NP. Whilst the majority of the plan has very good ideas, the housing plan for land to east of Pound Lane including the Smugglers Lane plot is not acceptable for the reasons outlined above.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. We have covered a number of these in our responses so far.</p> <p>We would work with SDNPA to ensure that no harm would come to any existing wild life. Any development will have to submit early outline designs to SDNPA before any detailed plans are submitted.</p> <p>Southern Water and the Environmental Agency would be involved with any flooding or water table issues and have responded in the Statutory Consultees Responses.</p> <p>Unfortunately SDNPA will not consider any developments on their land unless there are NO available other land options in the Parish.</p>
47	<p>Road network is currently very poor for current traffic, schools are only just coping. Flood area will become worse given EA intentions</p> <p>Suggested Modifications: Pound Lane to have double yellow lines throughout and enforced. Added drainage for road flooding Smugglers/Pound Lane Junction. Any housing granted should have a minimum of 4 parking places per house.</p>	<p>We feel we have covered your points raised in previous comments above</p>

	NO to PLAN. The increase in local housing for political reasons cannot be supported without substantial investment.	
48	<p>The Foreword to the NP specifically identifies the vision as "To improve the quality of life for those who live in the villages of Upper Beeding".</p> <p>Clauses 7.23-26 inclusive then directly contradict this vision. Suggesting that anywhere between 59 and 157 additional homes totalled across the three sites can be introduced on the outskirts of the village, bounded by the National Park and only accessible through an already over- trafficked narrow road (Hyde/Pound Lane) servicing an existing estate and supermarket demonstrates a blatant disregard for the current inhabitants of Hyde and Pound Lanes respectively and the impact on their "quality of life". The introduction of these homes would add to an already-overloaded infrastructure of Schools and Drainage too. The existing Primary School is already at capacity with little room for expansion other than developing the existing playing field with the obvious loss of amenity. Access to the School for drop off and collection is already over-burdened and it is not possible to alleviate this within the constrictions of the surrounding housing, even before additional pupils are introduced. The Water Authority have also already indicated that existing Drainage Infrastructure is at/beyond capacity, as has been proven when the pumping stations have failed and numerous tanker movements introduced to relieve the resulting chaos. Suggested Modifications: All of these issues have already been emphasised and accepted during previous unsuccessful Planning Appeals on these sites and so for AECOM to suggest that such challenges could be overcome ignores factual evidence. These 3 sites should not be brought forward as part of the Neighbourhood Plan, being unsustainable quantum and position, incompatible with the existing infrastructure constraints and directly REDUCING the quality of life for those who live in the Pound and Hyde Lane</p> <p>NO to Plan : The suggestion in Policy 3 directly contradicts the stated "Vision" of the Plan for existing inhabitants</p>	We feel we have covered your points raised in previous comments above
49	Disagree with this policy as a development of this size in one location is too large for the infrastructure for the village to accommodate. In	We feel we have covered your points raised in previous comments above

	<p>particular, limited road access and inadequate sewerage system and pipes.</p> <p>Suggested Modification: Ideally remove Policy 3 completely</p> <p>In addition, a similar proposal for the second and third areas of land was rejected previously by HDC. The second area of the land, "Land east of Pound Lane" was deemed 'Not Currently Developable' in the SHELAA. If this area is not appropriate to develop then the third area, "Little Paddocks" would not be appropriate to take forward for development (as identified in the draft policy). Suggested Modification: If Policy 3 remains, change the policy to only support development of around 15 houses on the "Strip of Land Smugglers Lane". Such a development would be much more in proportion to the size of the village and not require significant infrastructure development.</p> <p>NO to Plan: Without alterations to Policy 3, the plan could result in a new development in Upper Beeding village which is of such a size that it would change the character of the village, whilst significantly extending the built-up area. The infrastructure currently in place would not be able to cope with this significant new development.</p>	
50	<p>Strip of land, Smugglers Lane. Not suitable:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - lack of access & traffic congestion <p>Suggested Modification: Address issues or recommend not developable</p> <p>Land East of Pound Lane. Not suitable:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Application previously refused as outside built up area boundary and within countryside location. - Impact on Southdowns National Park - Flood risk - Adverse impact on countryside - Need to conserve and enhance our natural environment - Would be overdevelopment of a countryside location - Damage to wildlife habitats - Traffic congestion in Hyde Lane and Saltings Way - Already deemed 'not developable' in the SHELAA <p>Suggested Modification: Change recommendation to not developable</p>	<p>We feel we have covered your points raised in previous comments above</p>

	<p>As above</p> <p>Suggested Modification: Change recommendation to not developable</p> <p>NO to Plan: No, because I do not believe the Draft Neighbourhood Plan takes into account the needs or wishes of the community. It does not meet the requirement to conserve and enhance the natural environment.</p>	
51	<p>I do not agree with policy 3 as it is too big a development for a village this size that does not have adequate access. Large sections of Pound lane and Hyde Lane have on street parking which does not allow two way traffic. Other roads coming into the village are one way or also congested with on road parking, such as Saltings way and Church Lane.</p> <p>Suggested Modification: Find a location that you do not have to drive all the way through a village to get to.</p> <p>A similar proposal for the second and third areas of land was rejected previously by HDC. The second area of the land, "Land east of Pound Lane" was deemed 'Not Currently Developable' in the SHELAA. If this area is not appropriate to develop then the third area, "Little Paddocks" would not be appropriate to take forward for development (as identified in the draft policy).</p> <p>Suggested Modification: Ideally remove Policy 3 completely</p> <p>NO to Plan: If policy 3 was to go ahead it would have a huge negative impact on the village by putting a strain on the already overcrowded local roads and a school that has already run out of space. The school has already been required to half the size of the hard area of playground due to a new classroom for the expanding classes. If policy 3 was to go ahead then more classes would be required and no playground will be left for the children and this is just not acceptable..</p>	<p>We feel we have covered your points raised in previous comments above</p>
52	<p>The proposed idea to build houses here contradicts the Parish Council views as expressed in you submission to HDC on the 01/10/2014 to the proposal to build 65 houses (ref: DC/14/1744 and DC/14/1755). The PC stated 7 reasons for objecting amongst which were that it was agricultural, there was an issue of access, an issue with flooding,</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments.</p> <p>The previous Planning Applications were for a lot more houses. We are seeking less and asking for more Affordable and Sheltered Housing. We also sought that these developments worked with the NP Team to ensure they met</p>

insufficient consideration for health and education and issues over bio-diversity.
Perhaps the PC would like to publish this along with the 2016 'Housing and Development Focus Team Document' report (page 22) that also rejects the site(s) proposed for the reasons stated by HDC in their decision notice.
I also refer you to the HDC reasons for rejecting them (dated 20/10/2015) and the decisions notice (posted on the website 27/10/2015). The reasons are there but I draw your attention to this: 'The development is not essential to its countryside location and does not support the needs of agriculture or forestry. It is, therefore, contrary to Policies CP1 and CP5 of the Core Strategy (2007), Policies 2, 3 and 4 of the Horsham District Planning Framework and Paragraphs 7 and 64 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012).'

In the 'Upper Beeding Parish Neighbourhood Plan 2018-2033' report on page 46 section 7.25 the PC notes the above HDC decision but then seems to forget that amongst the problems noted in this were those alluded to in the objection raised by the PC itself and many, many others.

I accept that the PC makes reference to what has to be done on p47 but with perhaps around ~20% more houses being proposed, does the PC truly believe that these issues will magically disappear?

I also note that the PC acknowledges that its proposals are not in line with Policy 4 of the HDPF.

Perhaps you can explain to the village how you will resolve these problems.

Proposed building site is too close/visible from Beeding Hill and Windmill hill as stated by SDNP, as well as being outside the built up area boundary.

Parish Council concerned about sewage demands, education and health facilities.

The schools surrounding the proposed site are full enough as it is, as well as the health centre, without a huge increase in families. The increase in

more of the requirements of the Parish and not those of some outside company. They didn't so we could not support.

SDNP have laid down specific requirements in their response to the NP which covers how any development must be planned and viewed from the SDNP. In addition care must be given to accommodate any existing wild life,

Any development will have to meet EA and Southern Water requirements
WSCC have stated that the roads will meet the extra demand placed by more cars.
Any requirements to meet additional school places will be planned and Southern Water has stated that they will make plans to address flooding and sewerage.
Work is still ongoing with SDNPA to develop the Cement Works and we are involved with the Area Action Plan that SDNP are developing,

	<p>houses will create more pressure etc. on schools and doctor's surgeries nearby.</p> <p>Does this proposition not go against HDC's 'hierarchical approach of keeping developments within main settlement?</p> <p>Increases of traffic - most homes typically have a minimum of 2 cars per family. This building proposition would increase the amount of congestion as there's not enough road space nor roads near the proposed site already, thus potentially causing dangers, traffic and more road incidents/accidents and pollution as well as there being serious traffic problems.</p> <p>Flood plains – Suggested sites are flood plains that flood awfully, especially during winter. Would it not be better to build on areas that aren't flood plains? And on areas in which access with cars is easier, safer and better? Suggested Modifications: Beeding Cement Works: can WSCC provide any form of funding. It's a brownfield site and surely must be on interest given the space?</p> <p>There is no change to the access and to the issues highlighted in the past and therefore my comment is that it should not be permitted.</p> <p>NO to Policy 3: I presume you mean the proposals set out in (3). There are some interesting ideas but in my view there are too many unresolved issues and a number of inconsistencies.</p>	
<p>56</p>	<p>The last application relating to this site from 2014-15 was refused by HDC on 27/010/2015 on the grounds of unsuitability (2 counts). This was a justifiable decision due to it being less sustainable and outside of the built up area of UB. Neither of these reasons has changed since then and so why repeat the inclusion of this land as part of the UB NP?</p> <p>Remove the site East of Pound Lane from the UB NP on the basis of unsustainability and unsuitability.</p> <p>The HDC Housing Strategy 2011-2031 clearly states that new developments should be based on proven demand and not just to satisfy supply targets. i.e. the 'AECOM Housing Need Assessment' page 9, item 0.3 / 16. A clear example of the limited demand are the newer houses (nos 81-87) on Pound Lane, some that took more than two years</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments.</p> <p>The previous Planning Applications were for a lot more houses. We are seeking less and asking for more Affordable and Sheltered Housing. We also sought that these developments worked with the NP Team to ensure they met more of the requirements of the Parish and not those of some outside company. They didn't so we could not support.</p> <p>The HNA identifies the need for rented, affordable and sheltered homes.</p> <p>SDNP have laid down specific requirements in their response to the NP which covers how any development must be</p>

	<p>to sell. Therefore there is not the demand for a huge volume of further houses in this area. Remove the site East of Pound Lane from the UB NP. If more than 50 new houses were built and without a proven demand (as per my comment above), then they could remain unoccupied for several years and potentially never sell. This could attract squatters, theft and damage to those unoccupied properties and increased crime in our area. This would not only have a huge detrimental impact on the village and particularly neighbours of the site such as my family (Emery Lodge) but would strongly deter new purchases of those empty properties. This would exacerbate the problem to an intolerable degree. Remove the site East of Pound Lane from the UB NP. An application for 9 new houses at the top of Pound Lane was refused by HDC in I believe, 2017. This should clearly indicate that a development on the land east of Pound Lane on a scale potentially 5-fold of that would be perverse. Remove the site East of Pound Lane from the UB NP. NO to Plan: My comments in the table above lay down why. i.e. this is a totally unsuitable site for development on such a scale as is UB as a whole if outside of the existing built up area.</p>	<p>planned and viewed from the SDNP. In addition care must be given to accommodate any existing wild life, Any development will have to meet EA and Southern Water requirements WSCC have stated that the roads will meet the extra demand placed by more cars. Any requirements to meet additional school places will be planned and Southern Water has stated that they will make plans to address flooding and sewerage. Work is still ongoing with SDNPA to develop the Cement Works and we are involved with the Area Action Plan that SDNP are developing,</p>
57	<p>The last application relating to this site from 2014-15 was refused by HDC only 18 months ago on the grounds of unsuitability. Policy 3 contradicts the Vision for the Upper Beeding Parish which is "To improve the quality of life for those who live in the Villages of Upper Beeding..." As Simon Birstingl (Chair of the Parish Council) previously stated "There are very concerned residents who will suffer the consequences of this development while the landowner and developer reap the benefits." The reasons have not changed, and the sites remain unsuitable. Remove the site East of Pound Lane from the UB NP on the basis of unsustainability and unsuitability. The HDC Housing Strategy 2011-2031 clearly states that new developments should be based on proven demand and not just to satisfy supply targets. The house on Smugglers Lane (no. 1 Smugglers</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. The previous Planning Applications were for a lot more houses. We are seeking less and asking for more Affordable and Sheltered Housing. We also sought that these developments worked with the NP Team to ensure they met more of the requirements of the Parish and not those of some outside company. They didn't so we could not support. SDNP have laid down specific requirements in their response to the NP which covers how any development must be planned and viewed from the SDNP. In addition care must be given to accommodate any existing wild life,</p>

	<p>Lane) was on the market under 2 years ago and didn't sell; it is now back on the market since 20th March 2018 and remains unsold. Another house along the Driftway remains unsold since being put on the market on 11th April 2018. Demand is not proven in this area. Remove the site East of Pound Lane and Little Paddocks from the UB NP. The sites are only being put forward again not due to suitability, but because there are no alternatives AT THE CURRENT TIME. This is not a good enough reason to include them on the Plan. Remove the site East of Pound Lane and Little Paddocks from the UB NP. The sites are outside the built up area boundary, where development is considered less sustainable and unacceptable. Remove the site East of Pound Lane and Little Paddocks from the UB NP. Remove the site East of Pound Lane and Little Paddocks from the UB NP. The infrastructure is woefully inadequate. Access to these sites is via a footpath (2767 – the "road" north of Smugglers Lane is NOT a road). There are enough traffic problems via Hyde Lane currently, therefore traffic detours via 2 conservation areas (The Towers and Beeding high street) which are never taken into consideration. Remove the site East of Pound Lane and Little Paddocks from the UB NP. No to Plan: Prior refusal by Horsham District Council. The conditions and reasons have not changed. Sites remain unsuitable</p>	<p>Any development will have to meet EA and Southern Water requirements WSCC have stated that the roads will meet the extra demand placed by more cars. Any requirements to meet additional school places will be planned and Southern Water has stated that they will make plans to address flooding and sewerage. Work is still ongoing with SDNPA to develop the Cement Works and we are involved with the Area Action Plan that SDNP are developing,</p>
61	<p>Comment Reasons for refusal of DC/14/1744 & DC/14/1745 that are still applicable: 1. By reason of its location, scale and proximity to the Grade II Listed Pound House Cottage, the proposed development would harm the setting of the listed building. There are no overriding public benefits</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. The previous Planning Applications were for a lot more houses. We are seeking less and asking for more Affordable and Sheltered Housing. We also sought that these developments worked with the NP Team to ensure they met</p>

of the proposed development which would outweigh the harm to the setting of the listed building.

2. The boundary of the South Downs National Park (SDNP) is approximately 250 metres from the site, and the Park surrounds the site to the East and West.

3. Highways - Pound Lane is a LANE!, it is already becoming increasingly difficult to navigate Hyde Lane and Pound Lane due to parked vehicles.

4. Drainage - For us in Smugglers Lane it only takes a downpour of rain to cause a sewerage backlog, and it is a well-known fact that the village drainage and sewerage system is already beyond capacity.

5. Flood risk - During the DC/14/1744 and 1745 consultative period, I produced photographic evidence where flood water could be seen almost lapping the hedgerow at the East of the 'Strip of Land Smugglers Lane' and 'Land east of Pound Lane'. However, is the Council aware that it appears that a large pond / lake with an island has been developed on the land to the East of the 'Strip of Land Smugglers Lane' which nearly abuts the same hedgerow? I spotted this whilst out walking in early July which of course has been a very arid period. If there was flood water at such a height during very rainy periods, where will this flood water go if there is now a lake occupying this land? Suggested Modification: Removal of the following sites from the Neighbourhood Plan:

- Strip of Land, Smugglers Lane
- Land east of Pound Lane
- Little Paddocks

NO to PLAN: I do not agree with 'Strip of Land, Smugglers Lane', 'Land east of Pound Lane' or 'Little Paddocks' being included in the Neighbourhood plan Policies 2 and 3, for the reasons given above. This seems like another desperate attempt to squeeze housing into a location where it doesn't belong, and would only serve to benefit the land owners' pockets.

more of the requirements of the Parish and not those of some outside company. They didn't so we could not support.

SDNP have laid down specific requirements in their response to the NP which covers how any development must be planned and viewed from the SDNP. In addition care must be given to accommodate any existing wild life,

Any development will have to meet EA and Southern Water requirements

WSCC have stated that the roads will meet the extra demand placed by more cars.

Any requirements to meet additional school places will be planned and Southern Water has stated that they will make plans to address flooding and sewerage.

Work is still ongoing with SDNPA to develop the Cement Works and we are involved with the Area Action Plan that SDNP are developing,

<p>63</p>	<p>Land sits above an underground water course (visible in a well at 50 Pound lane) This will be contaminated during construction and after from road run off. The area is known to be the habitat of Long Eared Brown Bat Suggested Modification: None as they are protected by the law Any major building will adversely affect Pound House Cottage a Grade 2 listed building. Pound lane has a pinch point allowing single line traffic. Suggested Modification: Policy CH9 of WSCC Plan. The school in UB is already full. Any additional housing will cause a major problem. Similar with Health Centre Suggested Modification: needs more thought The land east of Pound lane is known to be prone to flooding Suggested Modification: Raise ground level but this will cause existing properties to flood. NO to Plan: I would not vote for this scheme because any development will be built on agricultural land contrary to HDC Plans which seek to protect the countryside. Pound Lane has only single way just north of junction with Smugglers Lane. The existing infrastructure of roads, sewers, schools, health centres etc. is unable to cope with major increase in housing.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. We have raised your concern about the well to Southern Water Care will be given to any existing listed buildings and maintaining wild life habitats.</p> <p>Doctor's surgery and schools will be assessed in any new development.</p>
<p>74</p>	<p>Agreed</p>	
<p>77</p>	<p>Land on Flood Plain. Road will not take more traffic Suggested Modifications: Cancel Proposals School already at pupil limit ruin of countryside Suggested Modification: Cancel Proposal NO to Plan: I would not vote on 2 and 3 for the above reasons.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments we feel we have covered these in the previous responses</p>
<p>78</p>	<p>The last application relating to this site from 2014-15 was refused by HDC only 18 months ago on the grounds of unsuitability. Policy 3 contradicts the Vision for the Upper Beeding Parish which is "To improve the quality of life for those who live in the Villages of Upper Beeding..."</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. The previous Planning Applications were for a lot more houses. We are seeking less and asking for more Affordable and Sheltered Housing. We also sought that these developments worked with the NP Team to ensure they met more of the requirements of the Parish and not those of some outside company. They didn't so we could not support.</p>

As Simon Birstingl (Chair of the Parish Council) previously stated "There are very concerned residents who will suffer the consequences of this development while the landowner and developer reap the benefits." The reasons have not changed, and the sites remain unsuitable. Remove the site East of Pound Lane from the UB NP on the basis of unsustainability and unsuitability.

The HDC Housing Strategy 2011-2031 clearly states that new developments should be based on proven demand and not just to satisfy supply targets. The house on Smugglers Lane (no. 1 Smugglers Lane) was on the market under 2 years ago and didn't sell; it is now back on the market since 20th March 2018 and remains unsold. Another house along the Driftway remains unsold since being put on the market on 11th April 2018.

Demand is not proven in this area.

Remove the site East of Pound Lane and Little Paddocks from the UB NP.

The sites are only being put forward again not due to suitability, but because there are no alternatives AT THE CURRENT TIME.

This is not a good enough reason to include them on the Plan.

Remove the site East of Pound Lane and Little Paddocks from the UB NP.

The sites are outside the built up area boundary, where development is considered less sustainable and unacceptable.

Remove the site East of Pound Lane and Little Paddocks from the UB NP.

Remove the site East of Pound Lane and Little Paddocks from the UB NP.

The infrastructure is woefully inadequate.

Access to these sites is via a footpath (2767 – the "road" north of Smugglers Lane is NOT a road). There are enough traffic problems via Hyde Lane currently, therefore traffic detours via 2 conservation areas (The Towers and Beeding high street) which are never taken into consideration.

Remove the site East of Pound Lane and Little Paddocks from the UB NP.

SDNP have laid down specific requirements in their response to the NP which covers how any development must be planned and viewed from the SDNP. In addition care must be given to accommodate any existing wild life,

Any development will have to meet EA and Southern Water requirements

WSCC have stated that the roads will meet the extra demand placed by more cars.

Any requirements to meet additional school places will be planned and Southern Water has stated that they will make plans to address flooding and sewerage.

Work is still ongoing with SDNPA to develop the Cement Works and we are involved with the Area Action Plan that SDNP are developing,

	No to Plan: Prior refusal by Horsham District Council. The conditions and reasons have not changed. Sites remain unsuitable	
79	<p>Firstly thank you to all those that have worked hard on this project. Unfortunately many people in the village that I have spoken to are still blissfully unaware of what they need to do. I believe that under Policy 3 Sites 2 and 3 should be removed from the plan. Firstly these sites have been subject to recent applications DC/14/1744 and DC/14/1745 for development and were turned down by HDC in October 2015. Given that there has been no mitigation in respect of the reasons for the Council's decision (please see the attached letters from Director of Planning), it would seem that including these sites brings a lack of credibility to the plan.</p> <p>The UB NDP Site Notes (copies attached) for sites 2 & 3 recommend no allocation for dwellings. This is contradicted in the plan. It would seem that any development of sites 2 & 3 would (because of size of these areas), result in a large number of dwellings. This, because of the potential revenue to the landowner and the requirement of some scale of economy by the developer to support the costs of infrastructure. This then puts too much strain on the infrastructure of the village. In particular the local school would not cope and has no current capability for expansion. This scale of development is not required and would render the village a town.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. The previous Planning Applications were for a lot more houses. We are seeking less and asking for more Affordable and Sheltered Housing. We also sought that these developments worked with the NP Team to ensure they met more of the requirements of the Parish and not those of some outside company. They didn't so we could not support.</p> <p>SDNP have laid down specific requirements in their response to the NP which covers how any development must be planned and viewed from the SDNP. In addition care must be given to accommodate any existing wild life, Any development will have to meet EA and Southern Water requirements</p> <p>WSSCC have stated that the roads will meet the extra demand placed by more cars.</p> <p>Any requirements to meet additional school places will be planned and Southern Water has stated that they will make plans to address flooding and sewerage.</p> <p>Work is still ongoing with SDNPA to develop the Cement Works and we are involved with the Area Action Plan that SDNP are developing,</p>
Policy 4 – Land at Southern End of Oxcroft Farm Small Dole		
53	Favourable if it prevents the development of the site behind New Hall Lane. Yes to the plan.	Thank you for your comments
Policy 5 – Land at Greenfields Henfield Road Upper Beeding		
2	This is feasible.	Thank you for your comments

73	Think Greenfields would be very suitable for affordable housing, busy but easiest access. YES to Plan	Thank you for your comments
Policy 6 – Riverside Caravan Park Upper Beeding		
31	Riverside Caravan Park, while shelter housing is needed, such residents need visits from care and medical staff. The access to the site from the High Street is dangerous. It is also on the Flood Plain. Suggested Modification - remove from plan	Thank you for your comments. Advice will be taken from the EA and HDC on any flooding issues and WSCC have not raised any issues on access.
9	Anyway to reduce parking, down main through road may be helpful.	Thank you for your comments
2	Seems to be OK	Thank you for your comments
47	When the EA stop maintaining the river banks and pumping stations. This is imminent. Suggested Modifications: Riverbank extensions as per Shoreham and permanent concrete culvert drainage	Thank you for your comments
73	Think more static homes at Riverside Caravan Park would be an excellent improvement. It has been updated and most of it looks very nice. Spoilt by the remaining section of old caravans. YES to Plan	Thank you for your comments
Policy 7 – Land at Valerie Manor Henfield Road Upper Beeding		
9	Open space areas need to be protected if possible Agreement to plan	Thank you for your comments. Any plans for this site will have to meet with SDNP requirements.
2	For Nursing Home and Houses?	Thank you for your comments. This is enlarging the existing home for additional care of dementia patients. Some accommodation may be provided for staff.
Policy 8 – Design Standards for New Development		
2	Each property to have a parking place. Must have one way driving through all the roads	Thank you for your comments. Our design statement does cover parking but any changes with road layout will be done with WSCC advice.

74	Pleased building will be in keeping with local area YES to Plan	Thank you for your comments
Policy 9 – Community Facilities		
No Responses Received		
Policy 10 – Employment Sites and Supporting Businesses		
2	Need to keep all businesses	Thank you for your comments
4	What employment opportunities? Building houses employ people until the building is completed. Suggested Modifications: I don't see more job opportunities I don't believe you. You can't muster up jobs without creating industry. No I won't vote for this plan I oppose it This village is a busting point as I said it's crumbling and in need of maintenance	Thank you for your comments Our plan will ensure that existing jobs are maintained and additional job opportunities will be provided by Policy 7
53	Page 53, Beeding Court IE should be Beeding Court Business Park	Thank you for your comments. This will be amended
Policy 11 – Local Green Spaces		
66	The Saltings Field itself is a Nature Reserve and must be used as such. Pheasant, mallard etc., all there – frogs, slow worms, grass snakes, many species of birds, occasional hedge hogs, Damsal & dragon Flies, grasses, butterflies and mouths Essential to manage as a Reserve in the proper manner for wildlife and perimeter edges properly reinstated. Suggested Modifications: Dogs should be kept on their leads within the Saltings Field Conservation Area. SXW Trust/RSPB needs to engage with surroundings and helping manage the Sauckiauf. YES to Plan	Thank you for your comments
74	Pleased to know SDNP and Green Spaces to be protected YES to Plan	Thank you for your comments
Non Statutory Community Aspirations		

31	<p>Cycle lane between Upper Beeding and Small Dole, use Smugglers Lane, it is flatter and more direct.</p> <p>Sites/buildings to be added to a non-designated list of local buildings and heritage assets: the old school building, Horton Hall, WW2 gun emplacement at the Rising Sun and are not already listed, but should be.</p> <p>I do not agree with the plan because I do not want to see the brooks built on.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments</p> <p>We will raise your point on buildings with the PC as this can be actioned by them</p>
54	<p>Cycle track required between UB village over Iron Bridge to Steyning for school children to cycle to Steyning Grammar</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments.</p> <p>This will be added to plan.</p>
59	<p>The outdoor gym facilities: The 2 most important pieces of equipment would be 1. Monkey bars and 2. Parallel bars for doing 'dips'. This equipment would take up very little space. Maybe the east side of the recreation ground would be suitable (between the basketball court and the garages/park entrance.)</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments.</p> <p>These have been passed onto the PC.</p>
Community Aspiration - Shoreham Cement Works		
74	<p>Look forward to Cement Works being developed as outlined in NP Flyer V2 June 18</p> <p>YES to Plan.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments.</p> <p>This is an aspiration but we are working with SDNPA on their Area Action Plan.</p>