

Regulation 14 representations

Ref.	Name of body/ 'Resident'	Representation	Response by Responsible Body	Amendment to Plan
1	WSCC Asset Management and Estates (as a landowner)	<p>Policy BILL13: Local Green Spaces</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jubilee Fields(1) • Adversane Green(14) • Bypass Path (15) <p>Concern that these are owned by WSCC Estates on behalf of Highways Department. Land is required for potential future highways work and as such is not suitable to be designated as LGS.</p>	<p>Consider EITHER (A):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jubilee Fields – remove the part of the site that is owned by WSCC and redefine the boundary to encompass that land owned by BPC. [N.B. see point in ref #34 regarding development on Jubilee Fields]. • Adversane Green – Remove the plot of land owned by WSCC as above. <p>OR (B):</p> <p>Retain all sites as they are, quoting NPPF para 146 “Certain other forms of development are also not inappropriate in the Green Belt provided they preserve its openness and do not conflict with the purposes of including land within it”, which includes “local transport infrastructure which can demonstrate a requirement for a Green Belt location”.</p>	<p>Assuming (A): no change required to the plan itself. Update the LGS report to add in additional detail on ownership and reference to NPPF 146</p>
2	Resident	<p>1.Concerned about lack of housing allocations and not taking opportunity to shape where development goes.</p> <p>2.Objective 6: LGS sites do not extend to sites that might be valued in the future. Could we include an aspiration for a country park at the woodlands south of the railway?</p>	<p>1.SG has decided not to pre-empt Local Plan by allocating housing. Policy BILL1 sets out where development would not be appropriate.</p> <p>2.Future sites are beyond scope of LGS. Large wooded areas not generally appropriate for LGS designation. The area of woodland in question, however, is</p>	<p>1.No amendment required.</p> <p>2.No amendment required.</p>

Ref.	Name of body/ 'Resident'	Representation	Response by Responsible Body	Amendment to Plan
		3.Little mention of industrial development – is there scope to try and move businesses from the existing Station Road estate to elsewhere, to reduce lorry movements in that part of town.	designated as ancient woodland and therefore safeguarded. 3.This idea was discussed at length by the SG. The movement of businesses from one estate to another was felt to be outside the scope of the NDP. An action (17) has been included to explore this with individual businesses.	3.No amendment required.
3	WSCC Rights of Way Team	Supports the Plan – “pleased to note the various section which relate to the Public Rights of Way network and wider consideration to improving links around the area.”	Noted.	No amendment required.
4	Resident	<p>Policy BILL14:Multi-value sustainable drainage systems</p> <p>1. Suggests the Billingshurst Surface Water Management Plan is referenced here.</p> <p>2. Clause (c) – Can this clause be strengthened to ensure that agreed maintenance agreements are enforced? Also can it extend beyond SuDS to include the ditches, ordinary watercourses and ponds into which developers drain their surface water?</p>	<p>1.Verify if this document exists and whether it provides helpful background evidence for the neighbourhood plan.</p> <p>2.Enforcement is not within the gift of the planning system. We could strengthen clause (c) to require development to be supported by a drainage management plan.</p>	<p>1.Reference document in list of evidence is relevant.</p> <p>2.Include additional community action to work with relevant partners to enforce drainage management agreements. Potential text for clause (c): “Development proposals should be supported by a drainage scheme maintenance plan which demonstrates a schedule of activities, access points, outfalls and any biodiversity considerations.</p>

Ref.	Name of body/ 'Resident'	Representation	Response by Responsible Body	Amendment to Plan
		3. Provides useful photographic evidence of surface water flooding?	3. Noted as helpful.	<p>The maintenance plan should also include an indication of the adopting or maintaining authority or organisation and may require inclusion within a register of drainage features”.</p> <p>3. Include photos in this section of the plan as illustrative examples of flooding locally.</p>
5	Natural England	No specific comments; general guidance enclosed	Noted.	No amendment required.
6	Resident	Concerned about the lack of school places in light of the amount of housing planned for the area.	Planning for school places is the responsibility of the local education authority (WSCC). The NP includes an Aim to work with partners to ensure adequate education (and health) infrastructure is in place.	No amendment required.
7	Southern Water	<p>1. BILL1: Built-up area boundary - current wording could create barrier to statutory utility providers from delivering essential infrastructure required to serve existing and planned development. Suggests changing the 'and' to 'or' in Part B clauses.</p> <p>2. BILL13: Local green spaces – current wording could create barrier to statutory utility providers from delivering essential infrastructure required to serve existing and planned development. Suggest add: “or it can be demonstrated that very special circumstances exist, for example where it is</p>	<p>1. Agree.</p> <p>2. Agree.</p>	<p>1. Amend Part B of Policy BILL1 as suggested.</p> <p>2. Amend Part B of Policy BILL14 as suggested.</p>

Ref.	Name of body/ 'Resident'	Representation	Response by Responsible Body	Amendment to Plan
		<p>essential to meet specific necessary utility infrastructure needs and no feasible alternative site is available.”</p> <p>3. Recommend additional policy to support provision of utilities infrastructure as required: “New and improved utility infrastructure will be encouraged and supported in order to meet the identified needs of the community subject to other policies in the plan.”</p>	<p>3. The SG has no objection to including such a policy.</p>	<p>3.Potential wording: The Neighbourhood Plan intends to ensure that new development is integrated into and well connected to the local infrastructure network – including communications, transportation and utilities - and for adequate utilities and infrastructure to be in place.</p> <p>Policy: “New and improved utility infrastructure will be encouraged and supported in order to meet the identified needs of the community subject to other policies in the plan” or “</p> <p>“All necessary community, transportation and utilities infrastructure must be provided for new developments, and will be secured if necessary by Section 106 Agreements linked to planning permissions.”</p>
8	Waverley Borough Council	No comment as no housing being allocated.	Noted.	No amendment required.

Ref.	Name of body/ 'Resident'	Representation	Response by Responsible Body	Amendment to Plan
9	Resident	<p>1.Supports need for adequate car parking at new homes.</p> <p>2.Concerned that 3x Village Greens are not designated as Local Green Spaces.</p>	<p>1.Noticed.</p> <p>2.Village Greens are already afforded protection and therefore LGS would not offer anything additional.</p>	No amendments required.
10	Surrey County Council	No comments.	Noted.	No amendments required.
11	Resident	Raises concerns about lack of traffic calming through the village and lack of enforcement of traffic speeds.	The Plan includes an Aim to consider part-pedestrianisation of the High Street and policies to encourage safe foot/cycle within the village and centre. Enforcement is beyond the scope of the NP.	No amendments required.
12	Resident	Can reference be made to the newly published WSCC Cycling Design Guide?	Agree.	Make reference within Policy BILL10 and include in evidence list.
13	Resident	<p>1.Concerned about impact of additional housing on already overstretched infrastructure.</p> <p>2.Little mention of industrial development – is there scope to try and move businesses from the existing Station Road estate to elsewhere, to reduce lorry movements in that part of town.</p>	<p>1.The NP does not allocate housing, as it does not wish to pre-empt the new Local Plan. Policy BILL1 sets out where development would not be appropriate.</p> <p>2. This idea was discussed at length by the SG. The movement of businesses from one estate to another was felt to be outside the scope of the NDP. An action (17) has been included to explore this with individual businesses</p>	No amendments required.
14	Resident	Supports the provision for cycling and walking in the village centre. Would be keen to see support for 'home zones', including for instance, traffic	Traffic calming and parking restrictions are outside the scope of the NP. However, the Plan includes an aim to explore part-pedestrianising the village centre.	Include in Section 11, Action 16, “to explore other measures that would discourage cars from the village centre.”

Ref.	Name of body/ 'Resident'	Representation	Response by Responsible Body	Amendment to Plan
		calming, reduced parking hours in village centre, which would help to reduce traffic.		
15	Resident	Policy BILL13: Local green spaces – would like to nominate the grassed area with tree in front of house numbers 42, 44, 46, 48, 50 and 52 in Broomfield Drive to be formally designated as a Local Green Space in the Neighbourhood Plan. This attractive green is frequently used by children who like to play under the tree. It is also used by residents of Broomfield Drive for communal events and is viewed as an important open natural area between the houses.	There are many similar areas of grassed areas located within housing areas across the parish. Generally speaking, these were designed into the housing areas when they were developed. The SG consider such spaces to comprises largely verges or other small piece of land on or adjacent to the highway and not demonstrably special with regards the NPPF criteria.	No amendments required.
16	No contact details	Would like to see additional supporting information in the plan to express the extent of flooding as a problem.	Noted although unclear what the source of the information provided is.	Review the evidence and include anything further of relevance.
17	Gladman	1.BILL1: Built up area boundary – objects to the use of BUABs to restrict development that might otherwise be sustainable. Suggests policy should be more flexible. This would also negate the need for Aim 1.	1.The purpose of the BUAB is to direct development to the most appropriate location, in line with Policy 3 of the HDPF. The NP has redefined the boundary to include allocated sites. Policy 4 of the HDPF suggests that sites can be allocated outside the BUAB, where that adjoin it. As the NP does not seek to allocate housing, in order not to pre-empt the growth strategy of the emerging Local Plan, it is justified in focussing development within the settlement boundaries.	1. No amendments required.

Ref.	Name of body/ 'Resident'	Representation	Response by Responsible Body	Amendment to Plan
		<p>2. BILL13: Local green spaces – suggests that some of the LGSs nominated are 'extensive tracts of land' and therefore unsuitable.</p> <p>3. BILL15: Views to and from St Mary's Church – considers that protecting all views to and from the church is too restrictive. Recommend identifying the most iconic views to and from the church.</p>	<p>2. There is no given upper limit to what constitutes an 'extensive tract of land'. Indeed, there are examples of plans designating sites of 29ha as LGSs.</p> <p>3. The church, within the Conservation Area, is a listed building and The Design Statement for the Parish of Billingshurst sets out that protecting views of the spire is important. Agree, however, that identifying specific 'exemplary' viewpoints would be helpful (as also set out by Historic England).</p>	<p>2. No amendments required.</p> <p>3. Amend the policy to protect views 'to' the Church not from it. Possibly identify specific viewpoints of the church to preserve.</p>
18	Resident	Comments generally supporting the approach of the neighbourhood plan.	Noted.	No amendments required.
19	Resident	Supports the Plan, in particular the call for (part) pedestrianisation of the High Street and public realm improvements. Concern that financial services are not mentioned as being an important asset to attract to the village.	Noted, some of the comments are beyond the scope of a NP.	No amendments required.
20	Stantec on behalf of Aspen Corporate Services Limited	<p>1. Policy BILL1: Built up area boundary – concerned that clause B(i) does not provide sufficient detail as to what constitutes 'appropriate uses in the countryside'.</p> <p>2. Promotes the merits of allocating land at Oakhurst Lane.</p>	<p>1. The NP conforms to the HDPF and the NPPF (2019), both of which include further detail on this.</p> <p>2. The NP is not seeking to allocate sites.</p>	<p>1. Include NPPF Paras 83a and 84 in the conformity reference.</p> <p>2. No amendments required.</p>
21	Resident	<p>Main planning concerns:</p> <p>1. Concerned about lack of protection of green space/ woods to the south of A272/East of Billingshurst.</p>	<p>1. Some of the woods mentioned are designated as 'ancient woodland'. The NP directs development to within the BUAB.</p>	<p>1. No amendments required.</p>

Ref.	Name of body/ 'Resident'	Representation	Response by Responsible Body	Amendment to Plan
		<p>2. Why has the BUAB been amended to include allocated housing currently outside the existing BUAB?</p> <p>3. Concerns about lack of supporting infrastructure – health, schools etc.</p>	<p>2.Areas included within the Built-up Area Boundary must conform to relevant local and national policy to ensure the most appropriate use of land. Outside the boundary only uses appropriate to a countryside location are acceptable. The BUAB should include existing commitments and new development adjacent to the boundary. This includes sites allocated for development in the HDPF.</p> <p>3.The NP includes an Aim to work with partners to ensure adequate education (and health) infrastructure is in place.</p>	<p>2.No amendments required.</p> <p>3.No amendments required.</p>
22	Resident	<p>1. Concerned that 2011 data is out of date.</p> <p>2. Reference to Billingshurst being a 'Larger Village' is disingenuous</p> <p>3. Extending the BUAB</p>	<p>1. This is noted but ultimately it does not dictate the direction of the Plan. Council tax receipts will only tell you the number of properties, not any other data about the population.</p> <p>2. Larger Village is the classification in the settlement hierarchy of the HDPF and is not our classification.</p> <p>3. The point is noted. However, this is the requirement of the planning system and does not materially change the way that growth is dealt with. The planning system is not the cause, it is</p>	<p>1. No amendments required</p> <p>2. No amendments required</p> <p>3. No amendments required</p>

Ref.	Name of body/ 'Resident'	Representation	Response by Responsible Body	Amendment to Plan
		<p>4. Brownfield first</p> <p>5. Loss of natural habitat and green spaces</p> <p>6. Brick deserts</p> <p>7. Community well-being compromised</p> <p>8. Parking</p>	<p>responding to a Central Government requirement to build more homes. The extension simply reflects sites that have planning permission or that have been built since the old BUAB was drawn. The NP cannot prevent any sites with planning permission from being built.</p> <p>4. This is noted. For future growth, BILL1 provides a framework for this.</p> <p>5. This is noted. BILL13 protects a number of green spaces</p> <p>6. This is noted. BILL14 seeks to ensure that development protects and enhances wildlife and biodiversity.</p> <p>7. This is noted. The NP is not explicitly proposing any significant scales of new development and seeks to improve movement for non-vehicular traffic through the movement routes in BILL10.</p> <p>8. This is an issue that the NP Steering Group looked at as part of the development of the Plan. An action has been identified in Section 11</p>	<p>4. No amendments required</p> <p>5. No amendments required</p> <p>6. No amendments required</p> <p>7. No amendments required</p> <p>8. No amendments required</p>

Ref.	Name of body/ 'Resident'	Representation	Response by Responsible Body	Amendment to Plan
		9. Strain on local infrastructure	<p>relating to improving car parking at the station.</p> <p>9. The point is noted. CIL is a non-negotiable payment from development, with the NP meaning that a larger share comes directly to the Parish Council to spend as it sees fit. The developer has no right of negotiation over this payment. Funding for schools, social care and health are all acknowledged to be issues but are not entirely about planning – if funding for these things is to come through the planning system then more development would need to be accepted. The issue of the graveyard is noted – the NP was unable to identify land in a suitable location for this with a willing landowner.</p>	9. No amendments required
23	Resident	<p>1. New housing</p> <p>2. Development in Adversane</p> <p>3. New businesses</p>	<p>1. The NP does not propose any significant new housing.</p> <p>2. Adversane is not a settlement where growth is proposed or where significant growth is sustainable.</p> <p>3. Policy BILL6 of the NP seeks to improve the vitality of the High Street.</p>	<p>1. No amendments required</p> <p>2. No amendments required</p> <p>3. No amendments required</p>

Ref.	Name of body/ 'Resident'	Representation	Response by Responsible Body	Amendment to Plan
			Section 7 of the Plan also has specific aims to provide more workspaces.	
24	CPA Property on behalf of Universal Trailers Ltd, Menzies Wood Farm	Promotion of land for employment allocation	For a number of reasons, including the impending review of the HDPF, the NP Steering Group took the decision not to allocate sites for development. This may be considered as part of an early review of the NP.	No amendments required
25	CPA Property on behalf of the owners of St Andrews Hill Farm	Promotion of land for employment and residential allocation	For a number of reasons, including the impending review of the HDPF, the NP Steering Group took the decision not to allocate sites for development. This may be considered as part of an early review of the NP.	No amendments required
26	CPA Property on behalf of the owners of land at Charles Wadey Builders Yard and McVeigh Parker Agricultural Supplies	Promotion of land for employment allocation	For a number of reasons, including the impending review of the HDPF, the NP Steering Group took the decision not to allocate sites for development. This may be considered as part of an early review of the NP.	No amendments required
27	Resident	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Description of transport links as 'excellent' 2. Widening roads and moving station 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Point is noted and agreed. Amend along with description 2. Point is noted although such things are very costly and would require significant amount of development to justify/fund them 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Delete 'excellent' and reflect narrative in paras 3.25-3.28. 2. No amendments required.

Ref.	Name of body/ 'Resident'	Representation	Response by Responsible Body	Amendment to Plan
		<p>3. Movement Route E should be extended and have consistent reference in the key.</p> <p>4. Aim 5 routes not marked on the Policies Map</p> <p>5. Lack of wildlife-friendly policies</p> <p>6. Land for self-build</p> <p>7. Fig 6.1 – play area in the grounds of the Women's Hall</p> <p>8. Appendix D weblink</p> <p>9. Section 7.5, reference to BILL11</p>	<p>3. Point is noted and agreed.</p> <p>4. Aims are distinct from policies and are not subject to consideration as part of any planning application – they are actually projects and none of these routes have been explicitly identified. Because they are not policies they should not be shown on the Policies Map.</p> <p>5. Noted. We could add in support for wildlife-friendly features in BILL14.</p> <p>6. This is noted. It was not an issue that was raised through the development of the NP and the imminent review of the HDPF is likely to address this.</p> <p>7. This could be added to Figure 6.1</p> <p>8. Noted. Will be amended</p> <p>9. Noted. Will be amended</p>	<p>3. Extend Movement Route E to the east?</p> <p>4. No amendments required.</p> <p>5. Add in a clause to BILL14?</p> <p>6. No amendments required.</p> <p>7. Amend Figure 6.1?</p> <p>8. Update Appendix D weblink</p> <p>9. Amend para 7.5 to say BILL10, not BILL11</p>
28	CPA Property on behalf of the owners of land	Promotion of land for employment allocation	For a number of reasons, including the impending review of the HDPF, the NP Steering Group took the decision not to allocate sites for development. This may be	No amendments required

Ref.	Name of body/ 'Resident'	Representation	Response by Responsible Body	Amendment to Plan
	and buildings at Hilland Farm		considered as part of an early review of the NP.	
29	West Sussex County Council	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Para 5.8 – reference to WSCC Parking Standards and Manual for Streets 2. Education provision – reference to WSCC School Places document 3. Para 7.5 – pedestrian safety and car parking 4. Policy BILL11A – compliance with NPPF 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noted and agreed 2. Noted and agreed 3. Noted. This section identifies issues and it would deflect from this if too much detail was provided about who should be involved in delivering the solutions. 4. Disagree – the NPPF does not say that an application can only be refused on parking where there would be a severe residual impact. It says that 'Development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe.' The loss of public car parks is a different matter. However, it is recognised that the wording could be made clearer. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Text to be added to para 5.8 regarding WSCC Parking Standards and Manual for Streets. 2. Text to be added to para 6.10 reflecting latest position. 3. No amendments required 4. Consider amending BILL11A to only make reference to 'public car parking spaces' as opposed to 'publicly accessible car parking'.

Ref.	Name of body/ 'Resident'	Representation	Response by Responsible Body	Amendment to Plan
		5. Policy BILL12A – compliance with NPPF	5. As above. It is considered that development without off-street parking would have such an impact and this is why the WSCC Parking Standards have certain requirements for parking provision. However, it is recognised that this is more likely for larger development and therefore the wording could reflect this.	5. Consider amending BILL12A to make reference to a 'significant increased need for parking'.
30	Rosier Business Park Ltd	Promotion of land for employment and residential allocation	For a number of reasons, including the impending review of the HDPF, the NP Steering Group took the decision not to allocate sites for development. This may be considered as part of an early review of the NP.	No amendments required
31	Duplicate of #36	N/a	N/a	N/a
32	Reside Developments	No comments	Noted	No amendments required
33	Horsham DC	Not all Local Green Spaces proposed may fulfil the criteria	Noted.	Consider whether there is a need for more evidence to justify each LGS.
34	Billingshurst Sports Recreation Assoc.	Provision of a 4G astro turf pitch at Jubilee Fields to support the growth of Billingshurst FC	Noted. This could be a specific requirement of BILL4Aiii. This raises a possible conflict between BILL4Aiii and the proposal for Jubilee Field to be a Local Green Space. Whilst the LGS designation wouldn't restrict the ability to 'modernise' on the same footprint, it would restrict any development on undeveloped space. This may not prevent a 4G pitch but	Add in reference to a 4G pitch in BILL4Aiii.

Ref.	Name of body/ 'Resident'	Representation	Response by Responsible Body	Amendment to Plan
			could prevent, for example, the provision of floodlighting columns and a maintenance hut.	
35	Historic England	<p>1. Notes elements of NP that should be held up as particularly good practice, including specific advice on energy efficiency retrofit in historic buildings and the provision for temporary use of vacant business premises in the town centre and the reuse of historic buildings in the village centre.</p> <p>2. Policy BILL7: Public realm and movement in Billingshurst village centre - could be enhanced for the sake of clarity as it would suggest in its present wording that demolition of buildings simply to widen pavements would be considered supportable.</p> <p>3. Policy BILL15: Views to and from St Marys Church – too restrictive. Suggest identifying those views of the church that are considered to contribute most strongly to its significance, to which the policy should apply.</p> <p>4. Aim 4: would like to see developed as a policy, as this would provide a leading example of policy to enable diversification of high streets that enable them to thrive as more flexible economic and social places.</p>	<p>1. Noted.</p> <p>2. Noted and agreed.</p> <p>3. Agreed.</p> <p>4. Might be able to incorporate support for 'mixed use – e.g. housing, retail, cultural, community, office, flexible work space' within policy BILL6.</p>	<p>1. No amendments required.</p> <p>2. Include additional text to specify that this would not be acceptable where a building might be demolished or significantly impacted.</p> <p>3. Identify specific viewpoints of the church to preserve and include within the policy and justification.</p> <p>4. Amend Policy BILL6?</p>

Ref.	Name of body/ 'Resident'	Representation	Response by Responsible Body	Amendment to Plan
		5. Sustainability Appraisal – upgrade BILL8 assessment to ++ against heritage.	5. Agreed.	5. Amend SA as described.
36	Resident	Concerned about safety around schools (vis a vis roads and traffic). Puts forward various suggestions.	Some of the suggestions are planning related, for instance widening footpaths, and provision for this is made within Policy BILL10. Others are more relevant to the Non-Policy Actions.	Consider whether there is scope to include suggestions in the Non-Policy Actions Section 11.
37	Armstrong Rigg	<p>Representing a client in respect of Dunmoore's land north of Hilland Farm for a commercial scheme.</p> <p>1. Objective 4: suggest rewording to be more explicit about encouraging industrial activity away from the railway station.</p> <p>2. Issues for Billingshurst:</p> <p>a. Suggests including following wording against retail provision: "Where suitable in-centre sites are not available preference should be given to accessible sites well connected to the village centre."</p> <p>b. Suggests additional wording against workspace: "fit for purpose business space" and provision for moving businesses away from the station.</p> <p>c. Suggests additional text for housing to serve needs of aging population.</p>	<p>1. Objective 4 already includes the need to focus such activity in appropriate areas of the parish.</p> <p>2. Issues:</p> <p>a. The engagement process revealed strong support for concentrating retail provision in the village centre, rather than dispersing it throughout the village.</p> <p>b. Agree with addition of fit for purpose business space. As the plan is not allocating sites, including explicit wording about moving businesses away from the station area is an aspiration at this stage, but could be reviewed in the NP early review.</p> <p>c. Not felt to be necessary.</p>	<p>1. No amendments required.</p> <p>2. Issues:</p> <p>a. No amendments required.</p> <p>b. Include bold text here in issues.</p> <p>c. No amendments required.</p>

Ref.	Name of body/ 'Resident'	Representation	Response by Responsible Body	Amendment to Plan
		<p>3. Policy BILL1: Built up area boundary – map (and policies map and Figures 6.1 and 8.1) should be amended to include, within the amended BUAB, the extant permission for the Dunmoore site north of Hill Farm (DC/18/2122); various comments on the wording of the policy.</p> <p>4. Policy BILL2: Housing design and character – Clause B is overly prescriptive.</p> <p>5. Policy BILL6: Retaining and enhancing the vitality and viability of Billingshurst village centre – suggests additional wording to enable development to take place outside village centre, subject to sequential test.</p> <p>6. Policy BILL9: Tourism-related development and provision of tourist accommodation – suggestion to add additional clause for developments outside the BUAB.</p> <p>7. Figure 8.1: Key Movement Routes – should include the site with extant pp, Should also</p>	<p>3. Should site with extant permission be included?; agree to come of the suggestions provided.</p> <p>4. Disagree as policy encourages “where possible”. Clause (v) mentions parking solutions particularly favoured by local residents, as evidenced in the local engagement.</p> <p>5. Locals favoured focussing retail provision in the village centre. In any case, sequential test included at HDC level.</p> <p>6. Agree to adding that developments should be in “accessible sites, well connected to the village centre and the built-up area of Billingshurst”.</p> <p>7. Agree that future, committed routes, within allocated sites, could be included.</p>	<p>3. To include extant pp site?; amend ‘and’ to ‘or’ for Part B clauses; amend clause B(iii) to it represents the appropriate provision of tourist activities and facilities, <u>tourism facilities, accommodation, attractions and activities,</u> where it meets the requirements of Policy BILL9.</p> <p>4.No amendments required.</p> <p>5.No amendments required.</p> <p>6.Add wording to clause (iii). [also move wording about car parking to new clause].</p> <p>7.Amend map to include committed routes.</p>

Ref.	Name of body/ 'Resident'	Representation	Response by Responsible Body	Amendment to Plan
		indicate routes that are committed as part of development allocations, even if they have not yet been constructed.		
38	Resident	<p>Policy BILL10: Protection and Enhancement of Key Movement Routes</p> <p>Would like a new footpath to be developed place on the east side of Alicks hill from the top of Station road south to the Weald secondary school.</p>	This particular route was not raised during the engagement process. The Key Movement Routes policy is based on enhancing existing routes rather than providing new routes. This could be added as a non-policy action regarding identifying and securing new walking routes.	Consider whether this might be added as a Non-Policy Action.
39	Resident	Can more be done to improve safety for pedestrians near to schools, particularly Primary School in Station Road?	Section 8 of the Plan seeks to improve walking and cycling opportunities in the parish – specifically noting the issues at schools. Policy BILL10 identified the route in question as a key movement route, to attract investment and safety measures including greater access.	No amendments required to the policy, but a new Non-Policy Action to be added to Section 11 to work with partners to explore options for improved signage and safety options near to the schools specifically.
40	Hallam Land Management Limited	<p>Site details submitted (Brookhurst Green).</p> <p>1. Policy BILL4: Provision of Leisure and Recreation Facilities – welcomes policy.</p> <p>2. Policy BILL10: Protection and Enhancement of Key Movement Routes – suggests an additional key movement route.</p>	<p>1. Noted.</p> <p>2. The route identified would enable a connection to the site submitted. As the NP is not seeking to allocate sites and the site has yet to gain planning permission, it would be premature to identify this as a Key Movement Route. This can be reviewed as part of the early NP review.</p>	<p>1. No amendments required.</p> <p>2. No amendments required.</p>
41	Turley	Provides details of site being promoted at Land at Bridgewater Farm, Billingshurst.	Noted.	No amendments required.

Ref.	Name of body/ 'Resident'	Representation	Response by Responsible Body	Amendment to Plan
42	Judith Ashton Associates	Provides details of site being promoted at Marringdean Road Billingshurst. Queries whether the NP meets the Basic Conditions as it is not seeking to allocate sites, which it suggests is not a positive approach to plan making.	There is no obligation for NPs to allocate sites for housing. In agreement with HDC, the NP is seeking to undertake an early review to consider the implications of the emerging Local Plan, which is not at an advanced enough stage to provide strategic context for the NP.	No amendments required.
43	Dr J. L. Mulder	<p>1. Traffic concerns: would support schemes that minimise lorry movements along Stane Street. Concerned about pedestrian safety.</p> <p>2. Sets out ideas for developer contributions to be spent on.</p> <p>3. Need to consider climate change – can all developments include tree planting?</p>	<p>1. Traffic calming/ enforcement/ redirecting is not a planning matter. Policy BILL10 supports improvements to Key Movement Routes, including widening of pavements.</p> <p>2. Section 10 of the NP identifies an action for the Parish Council to set out a Spending Priority Schedule for developer contributions to be spent on.</p> <p>3. Policy BILL3 focuses on energy efficiency in design and supports proposals that maximise sustainability in their design. Tree planting could be encouraged within this.</p>	<p>1. No amendments required.</p> <p>2. Action to be carried out once the NP is made.</p> <p>3. Introduce an additional clause to support tree planting in new developments (potentially encouraging trees that are particularly climate change friendly).</p>
44	Henry Adams LLP	Submission of site for consideration during the early review of the NP.	Noted.	No amendments required.
45	Slinfold Parish Council	It may be worthwhile for the Parish Councils, should they so wish, to include a section to guard against C2 (residential institutions) developments as opposed to C3, residential. There is potential for C2 to be used to get around some NP and	Noted. The NP doesn't explicitly seek to address housing needs. Concern over development of C2 residential institutions was not an issue raised by the community	No amendments required.

Ref.	Name of body/ 'Resident'	Representation	Response by Responsible Body	Amendment to Plan
		<p>HDPF clauses as evidenced by the current proposals in Slinfold and Itchingfield.</p> <p>As NP's usually deal with housing the lack of a C2 section may be a hole that developers seek to exploit.</p>	<p>so it would not be appropriate to address in the Plan.</p>	