

RESPONSES TO THE PLAN 6 WEEK PUBLIC CONSULTATION APRIL TO JUNE 2014

RESPONSES REQUIRING PLAN ACTION

The yellow highlighted "Code" indicates that the responder is an Organisation. All other codes are individual residents. All comments relating to spelling or grammar errors have been noted and The Plan amended accordingly. All page numbers and references refer to the pre-submission version of the Neighbourhood Plan.

Page No.	Para	Code	Comment	Action by SG	Plan Amended
FOREWORD					
1 - INTRODUCTION					
		PR24	Suggestion: I expect the matters I have referred to have already been raised, but if not then they may be of use in your review of the document prior to submission. Also, given the likely attention span of some residents, perhaps the document could be prefaced with a 'highlights' page of 10 'bullet's, describing what the plan will bring to the community. This may help to get the reader attention and at least let them know what they are being asked to vote for, without reading the small print.	The objectives and benefits to the community of producing a Neighbourhood Plan are covered in the Introduction and Vision Statement & Core Objectives sections. We believe that introducing them as an additional preface would place them out of context..	No Action
		PR67	The present printed format for the Neighbourhood Plan is okay but the images, photos and maps are poorly printed. Either we sent them low resolution images or their equipment is not capable of printing high resolution images	Noted - solutions being investigated	Yes
2	1.5	PR30	"Arun DC will make these decisions on behalf of the people of Angmering". They still will - plan will influence.	Para 1.5 amended	Yes
3	1.9	PR30	".....problems and concerns the plan could address?" Amend to:problems and concerns should be address?"	Para 1.9 amended	Yes
3	1.11-12	PR30	Highlighted - confusing. Does this need to be said?	No Change	

3	1.12	PR48	In the quote it should also be about protecting existing employment. Almost inevitably if an employment site is given planning permission for housing the jobs will go. I think it is worth reminding ourselves that VHB, Manor Nursery and Chandlers provide LOCAL jobs.	No Change: This section is an introduction. Details are covered later in the plan	No Action
3	1.13-16	PR1 - SDNPA	It would be worth mentioning that from 1 April 2012 SDNPA provides the full planning service in the SDNP part of Arun District (Development Management and Planning Enforcement as well as planning policy).	Para 1.13 amended	Yes
3	1.15-16	PR30	".....National Park <u>Local</u> Plan....." ? Development	The current consultation document calls it "South Downs National Park - Local Plan" - This covers all aspects including Development - No Change	No Action
4		PR30	Figure 1.2 Neighbourhood Plan area. This is wrong! The plan covers the whole Parish - it may be that the contents of the NP only deal with this area, need to be precise.	The current consultation document calls it "South Downs National Park - Local Plan" - This covers all aspects including Development - No Change	No Action
4		PR48	Who decided the "Neighbourhood Plan" should cover a smaller area than the whole Parish?	As above	No Action
5	1.19	PR30	".....policy context <u>as related</u> to Angmering" Delete underlined and replace with "for"	Para 1.19 amended	Yes
5	1.20	PR30	Development plan section again	No Action	
5	1.20	PR1 - SDNPA	this should clarify that the Arun plan will provide planning policy for the part of the district not within SDNP.	Para 1.20 amended	Yes
5	1.25	PR1 - SDNPA	the neighbourhood plan should be screened to establish whether significant effects are likely and hence if SEA is required.	ADC has confirmed no SEA is required	No Action
5	1.25	PR30	Not so I thought!	ADC has confirmed no SEA is required	No Action

5	1.26	PR1 - SDNPA	It is important to bear in mind that the NPPF does encourage the re-use of land that has been previously developed (brownfield land) but this is provided that it is not land of high environmental value. The effects of bringing forward each brownfield site (against a 'do nothing' approach) should be considered against social, economic and environmental objectives. Brownfield sites should only be given preference if the sustainability merits of them being allocated is greater than Greenfield alternatives. The Plan will need to be supported by any evidence which demonstrates how alternative Greenfield sites have been assessed: what is the relative suitability and deliverability of these sites compared with brownfield alternatives.	The Housing Group identified and assessed every Greenfield site in the Parish. The Parish Housing Land Availability Assessment (PHLAA) is the output from this exercise and is available in the Neighbourhood Plan Evidence Base on the Parish Council Website. The PHLAA has been referenced in paragraph 11.4	No Action
5	1.26-27	PR48	The term "brownfield site" is old fashioned and can I suggest contaminated site. The modern term is "previously developed site". Unfortunately it is being used to justify changing potentially viable employment sites to houses. This inevitably increases numbers of workers while reducing local jobs.	Brownfield is the accepted term used by the NPPF and ADC Local Plan.	No Action
5		PR67	The Plan preparation Process - this should include the village wide survey with a 42% response rate	This is the high level overview and too much detail at this point	No Action
5		PR67	Sustainability Appraisal - ADC have confirmed this is not required - so bullet 1.25 should be amended	Agreed	Yes
5		PR67	Sustainability Appraisal - bullet 1.26 At least maintain biodiversity, soil, water, air, climatic factors ... - include comma between biodiversity and soil	Agreed	Yes
6	1.29	PR30	Page numbers.	Noted	
SECTION 1: A VISION FOR ANGMERING					
2 - ABOUT ANGMERING					
Angmering's History					
	2.2	PR19	Additional wording: And not required	Comment	No Action
9	2.5	PR48 And elsewhere please use English spellings "metres" and not "meters".	Amended	Yes

9	2.7	PR30	"Prior to the Norman Invasion in <u>1066</u> there were two manors recorded in the <u>Domesday Survey</u>" Doesn't read right. Domesday Survey was 1086.	Amended	Yes
10	2.11	PR30	"..... <u>is</u> derived <u>and</u> shows Delete underlined and add comma after survey	No Action	
10	2.13	PR30	What does traditionally mean here?	No Action	
10	2.16	PR30	I thought the Butchers was in Arundel Road	Para 2.16 is correct. The original Butchers Shop was in the High Street then moved to the location of the Slaughterhouse.	No Action
10	2.16	PR11	Angmering sits at the foot of the South Downs. It's geological make-up means that it is prone to surface and ground water flooding	See 2.20	No Action
10	2.17	PR11	Until the middle of the 19th century, most of Angmering's shops; such as butchers, bakers, general provisions, saddler, coal merchants, drapers, shoemaker, etc were to be found in the High Street: pictured right, (approximately 100 years ago) or Arundel Road the main reason being the regular flooding with a pond where the Green is today.	See 2/16	No Action
11	2.18	PR30	Bold u in up	Amended	Yes
11	2.18	PR11	The pond was mainly fed by the stream called "Black Ditch" (known locally by some as Patching Stream) which runs from Patching Pond through the village centre and Ham Manor estate before winding west into the River Arun. Considerably larger under flood conditions, a rowing boat often needed to ferry people from one side to the other.	No Change due to Authors wording Preference	NO
11	2.19	PR30	No full stop at end of para	Amended	Yes
11	2.19	PR11	In the mid-19th Century, the stream was routed via a culvert under the village centre with the flooding reduced the pond was filled in and The Green formed and gradually over the last century virtually all the village shops migrated to The Square, to the extent that there were no longer any shops in the High Street or Arundel Road except those adjoining The Square at the foot of Stubbs Hill and Church Hill.	No Change due to Authors wording Preference	NO
11	2.20	PR11	Even now every few years, after heavy rainetc.	No Change due to Authors wording Preference	NO
11	2.21	PR48	This needs to include:- "The area upstream, along water lane to weavers hill and Dappers lane also floods.	No Change due to Authors wording Preference	NO

11	2.23	PR30	Not any more	Para 2.23 amended to state planning approval for housing development on VHB site was given on 8th May 2014, a week after the Pre-submission Plan was released for Public Consultation.	Yes
11	2.25	PR30	16th Century / 18th Century / 14th Century all underlined. Comment - English needs tightening.	Amended	Yes
11	2.25	PR8	Amend to read "16th to 18th" Century houses and cottages	Wording amended	Yes
11	2.27	PR8	This should more accurately read "Angmering currently has 76 Listed Buildings and Structures"	Amended	Yes
12	2.28	PR67 the remainder are all Grade II The remainder of what?	Amended	Yes
12	2.29	PR67	repeat of bullet 8 above	Agreed	Yes
12	2.29	PR30	".....20th Century ..." Change to sayis listed and was erected in 1920	Para 2.29 amended	Yes
12	2.30	PR31	2nd para - sets not set	Wording amended to say 'originally set ...'	Yes
12	2.30	PR1 - SDNPA	Please note the South Downs management Plan (2008) has been superseded by the adopted Partnership Management Plan in 2013. 2.32 should say 'partnership'. It is worth including in this section references in ADC's Publication Version of the Local Plan (Reg 19) Feb 2014 e.g. para 7.1.6 and 7.5.4 (Policy LAN DM1) which deals with the setting of SDNP in Arun's LPA area.	Para 2.31 and 2.32: Updated as suggested by SDNP	Yes
12	2.30	PR48	Last sentence in italics: Surely this can be used to preclude development between Roundstone lane and the A280 "bypass" and north of the closes north of Chantryfield.	Comment - Agreed and noted	No Action
12	2.31	PR31	Repetition of 'as well'	Para 2.31 amended	Yes
3 - ANGMERING TODAY					
Housing					

14	3.12	PR48	This is a fundamental statement but Arun DC in recent planning decisions seem to be ignoring it.	Comment - Agreed	No Action
14		PR51	It is agreed that any new developments should provide a greater proportion of smaller houses to redress the imbalance caused by Bramley Green, however these should be made in keeping with village as a whole, i.e.. Lower density, as this is one of the treasured features of the village - a feeling of space, not congestion [SEE HD3 p45 and HD9 p50].	Agreed No Change	No Action
Community, Leisure and Wellbeing					No Action
14		PR51	Smaller affordable housing to encourage younger buyers is also likely to affect schools. The additional provision since Bramley Green are barely, if at all, adequate, and realistically any large development should trigger a new school in south east Angmering. This also has the benefit of creating local employment (especially if VHB or other employers leave/and may reduce cross-Angmering commuter for school from Bramley Green/South Angmering, thereby aiding transport issues.	Comment	No Action
14	3.19	PR48	The two sentences ought to be one.	Para 3.19 amended	Yes
14		PR67	comment opposite bullet 3.14 - the first para of the comment duplicates the start of the second - they should be merged, and delete the end of the first para. "The 2001 Census shows the average age for Angmering Ward was 44.5%, a full 14 years older than for Bramley Green" "The average age for Bramley Green.....	It is to be made clear that these are actual extracts and quotes, and therefore must stay as they are - nothing has been changed to indicate these are actual quotes	
15		PR1 - SDNPA	Para top of page 15 right hand column, first sentence doesn't make sense	This is a quote, therefore cannot be changed.	No Action

15	3.20-22	PR68 - WSCC	Please note, the assessment of education requirements in the Arun Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) was based on a previous assumption of 490 dwellings for the proposed strategic housing allocation. The Arun IDP is currently under review and based on the proposed strategic allocation of 600 new homes, additional primary school capacity for approximately 18 pupils per year of age (126) would be required. Additional secondary school capacity for approximately 90 pupils would also be required.	Arun IDP information updated with latest figures provided by WSCC as follows: The Arun IDP is currently under review based on the emerging ADC Local Plan proposed strategic allocation of 600 new homes in Angmering. Depending on the rate at which new dwellings are built and the type of houses that come forward, there will be a need for: · Extra primary school capacity for up to 126 pupils. Approximately 18 pupils a year. · Approx. 90 additional secondary school places. (Source: "West Sussex County Council response to Angmering Pre-Submission Neighbourhood Plan - June 2014")	Yes
15	3.20	PR67	should include 'pre-school'	agreed -reword - ...secondary school, 2 primary schools and pre-schools	Yes
15	3.21	PR67	What report?	Add IDP	Yes
15	3.22	PR67	Navigus says this should be in policy CLW4 - I think it should also stay here - so replicate into CLW4	Agreed	Yes
15	3.22	PR48	Besides the obvious location benefits it provides the opportunity of a School and increases choice and reduces travel for many. There should be no further extension of St Margaret's School.	Current Surveys have agreed with this comment	No Action
15	3.26	PR67	is the Angmering School Playing field open to the public? If not we should say so	disagree - no amendment	No Action
15	3.26	PR6	Don't mention football pitches at Station Road.	no use of or access to these for the life of the plan	No Action

15	3.27	PR 3	Would you consider reference to Friday Club (St Margaret's Parish Church) and Dell Club (Angmering Baptist Church) where the churches use their own facilities in order to provide a non-profit leisure service to the youth? I think this contribution to community wellbeing should be recognised in the plan as well as the youth bus, and perhaps form part of joined-up thinking regarding provision of a youth centre - to include all the people currently providing services to the youth of the area.	Para 3.27 amended. Policy CLW1 is looking to provide just such a facility to be used in this way.	Yes
15	3.27	PR6	No mention of Scouts	Referring in particular to youth clubs. No Action	No Action
15	3.27	PR55	"The only youth facility in the village" I don't think this is correct. What about church youth groups? What about the skate park?	Para 3.27 amended	Yes
15	3.27	PR31	And financed by voluntary contributions	Para 3.27 amended to include grants	Yes
15		PR27- StMargaret's School	Currently 143 children attend St. Margaret's School who live outside the village. Priority is given in our admissions policy to children who live in the village over families with a Christian Faith background living outside the village. There are insufficient children living in the village to fill St. Margaret's School. St Margaret's school has ample amounts of land available for extending existing provision from a published number of 70 to 90 which would have the effect of reducing class sizes and maintaining the viability of a good village primary school which has so much to offer	Comment noted	
16	3.32	PR22	There seems to be an anomaly regarding the allotment waiting list. 3.1.3 (?) suggests 42 waiting whilst 7.1.4 (?) says 6 people are currently on the waiting list.	Paras 3.32 & 7.14 amended to read "with at least 10 people on the waiting list at any one time" following latest update (21st May) from the Chairman Angmering Allotment Association.	Yes
16	3.32	PR67 130 plots with 42 people on the	Agreed	Yes
16	3.36	PR31	Does not make sense	Agreed - deleted	Yes
16	3.36	PR67	This provides new development no problem in allocating suitable local land for allotments. - we need new allotments regardless of new development	As Above	Yes

16	3.38	PR1 - SDNPA	this cannot be done through the Neighbourhood Plan itself - not planning legislation.	ADC has supplied the process for APC to register the list of Assets of Community Value listed in Appendix E	No Action
Employment and Retail					
17	3.39	PR48	With this expressed concern it seems wrong to advocate building dwellings on the Chandlers site. With a non residentialthere seems a better chance of getting some parking on that site.	Landowner has stated intention to use for residential development	No Action
17	3.42	PR48	motor trade and garden centres are the two employers we seem at risk of losing through residential re-development. General the plan policy for employment and retail should be to increase local jobs.	Motor Trade re-located to a site within Angmering with an increase in jobs.	No Action
17	3.47	PR31	Section 3.47 of the Plan states that ".....opportunities to provide additional parkingin the village centre" will be sought. However, section 9.22 clearly states that there is already insufficient parking in the village centre and, by a process of elimination, it would appear the Chandlers' site is the only space available.	Agreed. See also Page 70 para 9.22	
Traffic & Movement					
			In regard to traffic management, I'm not sure I agree with some of the conclusions in the draft document. I live, and have lived, in North Drive for 27 years. I'm probably one of the longest residents in this road. I've lived with traffic in this part of the World for some significant time and can tell you that without the existing traffic management in Angmering that I'm sure where we live would be significantly worse than it currently is. To conclude the current management systems don't work is too final. I do accept however things could do with improving.		
			I'm not convinced that "dualing" the A259 between Station Rd and the Angmering by-pass (East of "Haskins") on its <i>own</i> or as the <i>prime</i> measure is the final solution to our traffic problems.		
			The key to resolving traffic problems is traffic flow management. Our problems stem directly from the transient flow of traffic from the historical (and continued) growth of Littlehampton and the inhabitants thereof needs to get to the A24 to head North or for traffic to head East (in the morning and clearly the opposite in the evening) and the poor management of it.		

17	PR25	<p>When Bramley Green was built it was something of a falsehood marvel that Angmering would get a by-pass which would go some way to resolving the ever increasing traffic problem. Trouble was, and WSCC knew this, the by-pass was built on the wrong side of Angmering (because of the previously alluded transient traffic need) and so our problems in Angmering were never going to diminish.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">AGREE</p> <p>For Angmering to be a trouble free traffic zone, the by-pass should have always been built in the Black Ditch corridor with a new junction built on the A27 and if there is ever consideration of a further relief road for Angmering (and it has to be said for benefit of all those folk wanting to get north/south from/to Rustington and Littlehampton), then this is where the by-pass should be sited</p> <p>In its current form, the existing by-pass will always fail to deliver what the residents of Angmering really want, not only because it's on the wrong side of Angmering but also because of the poor flow management off the by-pass. Why? Because those that use the by-pass cannot get off onto the A259 quick enough... the waiting time to come off the by-pass onto the A259 (at the "Chips-away" roundabout) is glacial. Therefore, drivers use Angmering as a cut through. To put that right, you need a serious traffic management system not only at the "Chips-away" roundabout, but also more enforcement and traffic calming (not less) within Angmering.</p> <p>As a resident of North Drive, I would also press for an "Access only" and "No Motor Vehicles – Except for Access" at the north end of north of North Drive because if you witness the end of the day rush-hour in this road you will see it can become a "rat-run".</p> <p>There would be no need for such signs at the south end of North Drive because transient traffic isn't a problem at the beginning of the day</p>
17+	PR51	<p>In relation to transport, A259 improvements only serve to help those by-passing Angmering and not Angmering itself as Angmering traffic would still have to join/exit onto this road. I would therefore propose that any large developments exit off Roundstone Lane have entry/exit only onto the A280 or have an exit onto the A280 and Roundstone Lane but are not permitted to turn north onto Roundstone Lane.</p>
18	PR51	<p>Has raised cobbling (in keeping with the historical feel of Angmering) been considered as a way of slowing traffic through the village?</p>

To Community Action Plan

18		PR31	Roads - change of tense. E.g. 3.52 implies no longer important	Para 3.52 amended from "was" to "is"	Yes
	3.56	PR6	Suggest this para starts 'however, increasingly traffic continues'	Add the word 'increasingly' after ... village roads ... village roads increasingly as a rat run	Yes
19	3.57	PR55	"an exit should be made onto the A280". I agree, There could <u>also</u> be an entrance for northbound traffic. Suitable traffic calming within the housing area would prevent this becoming a rat-run.	To Community Action Plan	
19	3.58	PR 5	One issue which you seem to have identified perfectly, is that the system of traffic calming installed just outside the Village does not work. As one of the four or five properties sandwiched between the chicanes (pinch points) of Mill Road & the Village Hall, we find ourselves having to run the gauntlet, on a daily basis, of drivers (particularly those heading south) who seem to have developed a "Red Mist Syndrome" and, who on passing the Village Hall, heading south towards Littlehampton, put their foot down, and seem to want to reach ridiculous speeds, blasting their way through to assert their right of way on the next chicane. Having lived most of our lives with daily experience of the M25/M1 and other major routes, we find the behaviour of some drivers appalling. The pavement (there is only one as you round the bend) is so narrow, that it is sometimes not possible for pedestrians to pass in opposite directions without someone stepping into the road. Elderly people and children going to school are 'on offer' at rush-hour times. Uncut roadside vegetation exacerbates the problem. We were aware of the traffic calming measures, before we bought. But, we were a little surprised to find that far from calming, the system is positively an incitement to bad driving habits. We are situated right next to the chicane closest to Mill Road. Every morning, and evening, at busy times we have to put up with car horns, and at times abusive language, as drivers give no quarter to 'the opposition' (another road user coming the other way). We have personally been on the receiving end of abusive gestures, just for having the audacity of slowing down (whilst indicating) to turn into our own driveway! SUGGESTION: Some Concealed Entrance signs on the southbound carriageway, might be useful.		
19	3.60	PR1 - SDNPA	this reads as planning policy rather than a spatial portrait.		
19	3.62	PR48	There are a wide range of views about buses. A particular concern is buses operating on unsuitable residential roads (road less than 6m wide)	To Community Action Plan	

20	3.63	PR48	Arundel is also an important local railway station for the community. It has a useful service to Horsham & Crawley and a better service to London from Angmering	Might add there is no bus to Arundel Station to make this easier and feasible.	No Action
20	3.66-3.71	PR14	Footpaths and Pavements: SUGGESTION: In Mayflower Park there is a "Public Footpath". Please will you for safety sake put a cycle lane beside it as it is, its dangerous, as bikes seem to think they have the right to fly through, regardless of people walking their dogs etc.	To Community Action Plan	
20	3.66-67	PR48	Footways and Footpaths must be enhanced.		
20	3.68	PR1 - SDNPA	doesn't entirely relate to the issue in 3.66 which is narrower in focus. Pavements may not have been introduced in all parts of the CA because of the impact on character as well as any width restrictions.	Correct. 3.66 specifically raises the issues of commuter on-street parking at Angmering Station under "Public Transport". 3.68 under "Footpaths and Pavements" makes the point that there are missing links but it is recognised that the Conservation Area will have its own issues.	No Action
21	3.71	PR48	We have lost a number of footpaths in recent times resulting in longer and potentially dangerous routes.	Agreed Comment	
Environment and Heritage					
22	Key	PR48	See note for page 23 regarding flooding. Besides groundwater emergence it should mention run-off from the land. Under B Roads is Arundel Road still designated as B2225?	No Action	
			In regard to water management I see little or no consideration of this topic. Year on year we hear that fresh water is a dwindling resource, yet year on year we find more houses are being developed. Most if not all the water we consume in Angmering comes from the South Downs' aquifer. This means we are reliant solely on rainfall. If it doesn't rain, our water will run out because we all draw upon the aquifer.		

22		PR25	<p>We are familiar with “hose-pipe bans”... but why should we be? More houses without further water provision will inevitably lead to continuous water rationing, and who wants that as a way of life? This really is a case of “you can’t get a quart out of a pint pot”. If you want “hose pipe-bans” to become an ever-present factor of life in Angmering, then build more houses.</p> <p>Whatever the future of planning in this part of Sussex, serious and deep thinking must be given to the absolute basic need of life – water.</p>	To Community Action Plan	
22	3.72	PR31	Developments - plural. MAY go? Intended? As implies "legal" obligation	Para 3.72 amended	Yes
22		PR1 - SDNPA	Conservation and Heritage : not just setting but within CA too - an area of special architectural or historic interest, where it is desirable to preserve or enhance the character.	"Conservation and Heritage" section re-worded	Yes
22/23	3.73	PR55	"spatial challenges". This is a very technical term which warrants explanation.	"Spatial" removed. Not required.	Yes
22	3.73	PR6	The word (colour) needs to be replaced by an actual colour and the housing areas on figure 3.2 need to be shown in this colour	Actioned	Yes
22	3.73-5	PR1 - SDNPA	missing name of colour	At the time of the release of the Pre-submission Plan ADC Full Council had not voted on the emerging Arun Local Plan Strategic Housing Locations. These have now been identified and colour has been inserted.	Yes
22	3.73-5	PR67	and legend for 'Local Gaps ...' replace [colour] with correct colour	Agreed	Yes
23	Fig3.2	PR48	From a flood risk perspective it would help if this included other sources of flooding from Arun DC's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment. This would illustrate just how bad the risk is in the neighbourhood plan area.	No Action	
24	3.76	PR1 - SDNPA	source is South Downs Integrated Landscape Character Assessment.	Para 3.76 amended	Yes
24	3.76	PR67	there are also other core views - I suggest adding to the end of the para - 'and west, with views to Selsey and the Isle of Wight'.	this is mentioned later in the plan so leave as is	No Action

24	fig 3.3	PR1 - SDNPA	suggest it says <i>examples of key views</i> - it is not exhaustive - there are other views not identified which will also be of value.	Fig 3.3 amended to say "Examples of Key Viewpoints highlighting"	updated
25	3.82	PR1 - SDNPA	As Highdown Hill is mentioned worth referring to the species rich chalk grassland in this area which requires active management. Within the part of Angmering outside the National Park the slightly acidic soils support woodland copses that surround assarts and interlock with open arable fields e.g. Poling Furzefields and Grooms Copse.	Para 3.82 amended	updated
25	3.84	PR48	The quote in italics. Sure this means that there should not be development north and east of the developed part of Angmering.	Agree	No Action
25	3.85	PR48	If no further development takes place there will be no need to screen.	Agree	No Action
25	3.85	PR1 - SDNPA	"Screening development is not always appropriate and in some cases is not an effective method of making unacceptable development more acceptable in the landscape. Inappropriate design should be resisted wherever possible whilst screening proposals should contribute to landscape character and be seamless with it"	Para 3.85 amended	Yes
25	3.85	PR1 - SDNPA	its not that screening to the NE is inappropriate, it needs to be done sensitively in a way that is consistent with landscape character. Suggest speaking to SDNPA's Landscape Officer about what would be most effective.	Para 3.85 amended following advice from SDNPA Landscape Officer.	Yes
26	fig 3.6	PR48	Change title to "Flood Zone Map for Angmering"	Amended	Yes
26	fig 3.7	PR48	Change title to "Risk of Flooding from the land"	Amended	Yes
26	fig 3.?	PR48	Add new figure with title "Risk of groundwater flooding" extracted from Arun's SFRA and call it fig 3.7a.	Amended but map in Appendix B	Yes
26	3.89	PR48	for completeness add "(fig 3.6)" after text.	Wording and Map amended	Yes
26	3.90	PR48	ditto add "(fig 3.7 & 3.7a) after text.	Not required	No Action
26	3.92	PR31	Which two criteria?	Clarified by combining paragraphs 3.91 and 3.92	Yes
26	3.92	PR1 - SDNPA	Which two criteria?		Yes

26	3.93	PR48	Rewrite text - Suggestion "The area in red on figure 3.7 identifies the risk of flooding from the land as medium to high. There is no higher category. The blue dots show areas where historic flooding has been reported. The area in blue on figure 3.7a shows the groundwater emergence zone which is again the highest risk category.	wording replaced as suggested. Clarity and detail in Ground water emergence map to be added as an appendix and referenced from this section	Yes
26	3.93	PR67	high shown on "Flood Zone Map" to the right (fig 3.7)	Agreed	Yes
26	3.94	PR1 - SDNPA	this reads as a policy.	Maybe, but is just a comment	No Action
27		PR48	Remove "Urban" from "Sustainable Urban Drainage System" since drainage should be sustainable everywhere and change acronym Suds	No Change, this is an accepted acronym	No Action
27	3.99	PR1 - SDNPA	not all suds will be effective for dealing with groundwater - may be a channel has to be created to divert groundwater away.	Para 3.99 amended to reference swales	Yes
27	3.105	PR38- Environment Agency	We note that para 3.105 refers to an Environment Agency project to address flooding within Parish boundaries and to improve flood defences. The project is known as the "Angmering Flood Alleviation Scheme" and the Parish Council have been involved in meetings. The project is still at an early stage but it is worth highlighting that any outputs will likely require some external funding before construction. Therefore this may be something your NP may choose to support.	Have inserted the Environment Agency project name "Angmering Flood Alleviation Scheme" into the relevant paragraph. To The Community Action Plan.	Updated
28	3.107	PR36	remove this para and amend 3.106 to read the Plan area some of which are shown	Para 3.107 removed	Yes
28	3.107	PR67	irrelevant	Agreed, remove	Yes
30		PR67	top right first para re Ham Manor, etc - Dwellings are typically low density with verges Open feel Does not make sense	Agree, remove Open feel	Yes
30	3.11	PR8	Spelling error:- should read "Lansdowne Road Area"	Para 3.110 amended	Yes
30	3.11	PR48	North & South Angmering. Suggest last sentence should read:- Characterised by open plan front gardens and a mixture of 2, 3 and 4 bedroomed detached and semi-detached houses and bungalows"	Wording changed as suggested	Yes
		PR22	My house is listed grade II but not mentioned - Manor Farm House, Ecclesden Lane also my neighbours house "Manor Barn"	Checked and these are not listed buildings	No Action

30		PR8	The Dell: Much of this is incorrect. The only non-detached houses in Badgers Walk are a pair of semi-detached houses, and they have a garage in a compound behind. The writers are probably referring to Lime Grove which is in the centre of The Dell and which is comprised of terrace houses without vehicular access to their fronts. However, all of these have garages in compounds to their rears or close-by	Correction made as suggested	Yes
4 - VISION STATEMENT AND PLAN OBJECTIVES					
32		PR67	The Vision Statement should start this section, not be after bullet 4.2 - is this really all our vision? I think the two paragraphs after the highlighted vision are also part of the vision statement.	This has been done in same format as other plans that have been passed by Examiner	No Action
32		PR8	Heading:- "4" has been omitted from the heading title.	Heading amended	Yes
32	4.12	PR1 - SDNPA	objective seems to mirror policy HD1	We wish the wording to remain as is.	No Action
	4.12	PR6	Suggest add separate bullet point referring to educational needs	These are generic headings that map to the Plan's Policy groupings. Schools refers to a specific policy that is covered under health and wellbeing.	No Action
33	4.12	PR67	the core objective for additional homes, is that they are based on demonstrated demand - this line should read - Additional homes based on demonstrated demand	Not agreed. Extra wording could be used in the wrong context, therefore no action.	
33	4.14	PR48	Why does ArunDC not take note of this.	Comment	No Action
34	4.15	PR48	This is fundamental but does not seem to be reflected in recent Arun Planning decisions.	Comment	No Action
34	4.16	PR48	If the community does not want large scale development why should there be a policy for 100+ dwellings.	Obligated to follow Planning Policy	No Action
34	4.19	PR48	This is absolutely clear.	Comment Agreed	no action
34		PR67	red highlighted box for Health & Wellbeing - Deliver provision of education, health and open space, leisure and play provision areas	Agreed	Yes
35	4.22	PR55	I would stress the importance of additional parking near the shops in the village centre.	Agreed	No Action
35		PR48	There was feedback from the SE of Angmering about the need for a local primary school location.	Agreed	No Action

35		PR48	Table bottom of page: This provides compelling evidence not to build houses on the Chandlers site, VHB and Manor Nursery.	VHB are relocating out of Area. Manor Nursery no application agreed	No Action
35		PR31	Employment: Replace uses - insert outlets or placements/opportunities.	Uses' is recognised word	No Action
36		PR48	Table bottom of page: Need in village is for, say, half of the parking spaces to be 30 minutes only and robustly enforced.	To Community Action Plan	
37		PR48	Bottom of table: Flooding issues should be dealt with in advance of development. New development should be safely located.	Due Planning Policy this is not possible	No Action
37	5.3	PR67	first bullet - 'taken as a whole' - as a whole of what? This does not make sense.	Not agreed	No Action
38		PR67	Throughout the policies, I thought we had agreed to replace houses with dwellings? What is a flat classed as - not a house.	Agreed	Yes
		PR69 - MHollywood	The Vision section can be left 'wordy' but still reduced.	We have already decided to try to reduce a small amount but feel we would be foolish to go too mad as we could be in danger of losing what we have to say.	Yes
			Generic and opinionated comments should be removed and only the pertinent and important items left in the policy pages.	Many of these were made by Parishioners and we feel should be left in	No Action
SECTION 2 - NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN POLICIES					
		PR67	None of the Core objectives throughout the policies we have the objectives table and then the Core Objective - surely we should have the core objective first.	Agreed. This follows format of passed plans	No Action
		PR67	are identified as such - we have left this out of this version	Agreed	Yes
5 - INTRODUCTION TO PLAN POLICIES					
P41	5.3	PR48	It does not seem to make sense. Suggest:- Remove "..taken as a whole" and "or" from before "specific policies"	Para 5.3 re-worded	Yes
6 - HOUSING					

Comment:		PR45	The biggest concern (I have and many others) is the number of dwellings that developers want to add to Angmering and from that point of view I don't think the plan strongly objects to the numbers, i.e. it mentions "minimum of 100 dwellings" more than once .	Comment	
42		PR48	Why have an objective/policy for 100+ new dwellings when community does not want it?	Planning Policy	No Action
43		PR48	Figure 6.1 makes it clear that the current planning applications between Roundstone Lane and the A280 "by-pass" are outside the built up boundary.	Agreed	No Action
43	6.5	PR30	Arrow pointing to second bullet point - Comment: HD1 policy statement. Comment: heading for HD2 narrative on why 100	Explained in site specific policies	No Action
			We are pleased to see that the proposed allocations identified in Policy HD2 (Bramley Green South the Field, Mayflower and Chandlers Site) have been directed to the areas at the lowest probability of flooding and that they are all located within Flood Zone 1, defined as having a low probability of flooding from rivers or sea.	We note the comment. However the village centre including western edge of the Chandlers site does have a history of flooding as described in the Plan and is shown in Environment Agency maps used in the Plan (see Figures 3.6 and 3.7) as being at risk both from flooding from the Black Ditch and from the land. This is also covered in Policy HA3: 1st bullet: "This site will be designed to reduce the risk of flash flooding to new and existing properties"	No Action

44	HD2	PR38- Environment Agency	We also support the use of brownfield sites. However please note that land contamination may be present as a result of the previous uses as a builders storage yard, cement works, and car body works. The area is located on a Principal Aquifer so is sensitive in terms of groundwater quality. Development of these sites may present opportunities for land remediation. It will be important to ensure that groundwater quality is protected. We recommend that this is made clear in the site assessment.	Have inserted the following wording as paragraph 11.18: "The historic uses of the site have the potential to cause contamination. The area is located on a Principal Aquifer so is sensitive in terms of groundwater quality. It is important to ensure that groundwater quality is protected. Development of these sites may also present opportunities for land remediation". The following bullet has been added to Policy HA1 and HA2: "The risks from any potential contamination on the site must be fully investigated in line with Environment Agency recommendations".	Updated
44	6.6	PR17	Define Affordable for "Affordable Housing"	Glossary of Terms created as Appendix H	Yes
44	fig 6.2	PR6	confusing, needs to be clarified. Also we need to know how the figures in columns 4, 5 and 6 were derived.	Agreed. Actioned	Yes

44	fig 6.2	PR48	The columns in the table are not consistent. The first four columns ought to add up to 100% and a statement ought to say for Angmering x% should be "market" and (100-x)% affordable. What does "affordable" mean. Does it mean cheap to buy or does it mean social rented houses?	The percentages do not have to add up by each column, and you have correctly identified that columns 4 and 5 add up to about 100. The first 3 columns you are happy with. Column 4 - this should add up to about 30%, as that is the percentage of affordable homes that ADC have stipulated, so this is our split for affordable. Column 5 - this is for market housing and makes up the 70%, on top of the 30%, making about 100%. column 6 is used, because developers/planners, as suggested by Navigus deal in ranges - this allows for different developments to have a little flexibility, and is the total of houses for Angmering only by bedroom number, across both affordable and market homes	No Action
44	fig 6.3	PR6	would suggest reason for low percentage of one bedroom dwellings in Angmering compare with Arun District is because most one bedroom dwellings are usually flat conversions or blocks of flats in places like Littlehampton and Bognor	Comment	No Action
45	6.11	PR24	Housing related policies have been well hashed over and I do not disagree with them in principle. However, the section does reflect a seemingly selective use of some data from outside sources. # 6.11, page 45, refers to the percentages of properties in Bramley Green and their numbers of bedrooms; which is fine, but surely there should be some balance by also showing the average for the rest of the village and then an overall figure for the whole parish?	See fig. 6.3 above	NO

45	6.12	PR6	This refers to Table 6.2 and I think it should be Table 6.4. Once again there is a problem in that here we refer to Table 6.2 but under the tables they are referred to as Figure 6.2. We need to be consistent. In Figure 6.4 there is an incredible difference between a one bedroom dwelling and a two bedroom dwelling. I think this is because the one bedroom dwellings tend, on the whole, to be flat conversions. The figures in figure 6.4 tend to convey completely the wrong picture.	Agreed. Actioned	Yes
45	6.12	PR48	It should be "table 6.4" in text and not "table 6.2"	Para 6.12 amended	Yes
45	6.12	PR48	with regard to affordability issues for first time buyers. These people are likely to have salaries <u>below</u> median. (in table)	No Action	
45	6.13	PR24	Paragraph 6.13, page 45, refers to the average total annual household income for Angmering and then implies somehow that the level is higher than the SHMA area median income, owing to well-paid residents of Bramley Green, without any substantiation. There must be many residents living in other areas of Angmering who also work outside the Parish and are well paid, are there any statistics? Added to this, it would be wrong to ignore the number of wealthy pensioners who live in other areas of the village and whose pensionable incomes may well have contributed to the higher average annual household income for the parish?	Figures not available do not support level of data	No Action
45	HD3	PR1 - SDNPA	first sentence - this is part of the explanation for the policy not policy itself. Should possibly suggest a proportion of lifetime homes rather than requiring this in every case.	We wish the wording to remain as is.	No Action
45	HD3	PR24	HD3 refers to the need for higher percentages of 2 and 3 bedroom units 'to make up for the parish deficit against the Arun district averages'. While I can see the need for more smaller properties the comparison may be misleading. I believe I saw somewhere in the SHMA (which perhaps could be given its full title) there is reference to the high number of single and two bedroom flats and maisonettes in Bognor and Littlehampton, which would skew any average, and make comparison by Angmering misleading. Better perhaps to leave the 'comparative' out? Just by the way in HD3 'second bullet', will the average user of the plan document know what is meant by 'Lifetime home standards'?	Policy HD3 corrected mistake. Should have read 1 and 2 bed. Supported by 2011 census figures which show far lower % of 1 and 2 bed dwellings in Angmering. Compared to Arun. See figure 6.3	Yes
	6.12	PR19shown in Table 6.2 should read 6.4.	Wording amended	Yes
45	6.14	PR6	in HD3 Housing Mix the Table is incorrect, it doesn't tie up with the figures in 6.2. The top and bottom figures have been interchanged.	Amended	Yes

45 / 46	6.14	PR6	HD3 - Housing Mix: The figures in the 2nd column should be the same as the figures in the last column of fig 6.2 on page 44 under para 6.6	Table amended	Yes
46		PR48	Table at top of page. Shouldn't this be more skewed towards 1 and 2 bedroom properties?	Comment	No Action
46	HD4	PR24	In the first 'bullet' perhaps the residential qualification should be based solely on permanent residency? The flexibility of 10 out of 15 years will be something in the future that could be the basis for necessary dispute.	No Action	
			In the second 'bullet', I would suggest that the wording is open to wide interpretation and could be abused; 'to give or receive support...'. Just how will this be determined?	cannot make tighter	No Action
			The third 'bullet could be improved by the inclusion of full time employment rather than merely 'work' in the parish.	No Action	
46	HD4	PR30	ADC policy HSP3 - What about people from Parish who moved out because of affordability. - could be living with parents and now want to relocate.	No Action	
46	HD4	PR36	I do think that the policy wording should be put in a coloured box so that it is absolutely clear that they are policies. It is perhaps a little easy to miss this at the moment	No Action	
46	6.16	PR24	Perhaps it could be clarified what is meant by 'public realm'?	No Action	
46	6.17	PR6	D5 The Form of New Development, in bullet point 1, not sure that policies ER1 and ER2 are relevant	No Action	
46	HD5	PR9	I do not wish to see the land to the East of Roundstone Lane developed as Angmering has already grown enough over the last ten years and any more development then Angmering will loose it's village feel. Am happy for the land that is south of Bramley Green to be developed for residential use as it abuts current residential use.	Comment	No Action
47	HD5	PR1 - SDNPA	Change D5 to HD5: references to open space and landscape setting of National Park is welcomed.	Amended	Yes

47	HD5	PR19	The Form of New Development allows for the safe movement of pedestrians and vehicles, giving priority to pedestrians. Comment: Before Bramley Green was built a public footpath existed from the end of Honey Lane to the A259 with pedestrian right of way only now it goes through the estate, is crossed by roads in several places and pedestrians don't have priority. Suggestion: I feel at the very least there should be a zebra crossing in front of the Community Centre where the footpath crosses the road. I agree that the policies should encourage more walking in and around Angmering Village and give more priority to pedestrians.	Comment	No Action
47	HD5	PR36	Amend title of D5 to read - HD5: The Form of New Development	Amended	No Action
47	HD5	PR51	Should consider inclusion of tree preservation order as a pre-cursor to granting of planning permission to ensure suitable landscaping - see also HD8	"Trees" covered elsewhere in the document	No Action
47	HD6	PR1 - SDNPA	materials - the policy seems to relate largely to residential buildings within the built-up-area boundary. Should also set out requirements for any non-residential buildings.	We believe this is covered in the opening paragraph to the Policy, 6.15, which says " It is essential that new developments, whether it is for residential, commercial, or other purposes, seeks to make a positive contribution to the quality of the environment".	No Action
48	HD7	PR1 - SDNPA	first sentence - the effect could be positive and a reason to approve. It seems a little confusing called "Street scene" when it deals potentially with sites outside the BUAB where no discernible streetscene may exist. Could potentially be split out to deal with development within the BUAB and any development without. The approach to heights in the countryside seems somewhat prescriptive and negative - the key criterion should be whether proposals are consistent with conserving and enhancing the landscape character. If buildings are proposed which are taller than 2.5 storeys what criteria would they need to meet.	References to "street scene" changed to "built form" as requested. Policy HD7 : First sentence amended. Now reads "New developments must properly demonstrate how they have considered the impact of the proposed built form on their surroundings.	Yes
48	6.20	PR31 Border THE majority of road	Agreed	Yes

49		PR48	Table at top of page: This provides more reasons for not building to east and north of developed Angmering.	Comment	No Action
49	HD7	PR30	Last bullet point: ".....or <u>is outside the built up area boundary</u>" Which we have said is impossible!	Comment	No Action
49	HD8	PR30	3rd bullet point. "..... <u>must</u> retain" Can we say this - there may be all sorts of reasons why not.	No Action	
50	6.24	PR6	I don't think one 'develops' housing densities. Should this read '.... Should decide upon appropriate housing densities...'	No Action	
50	6.24	PR48	PPS3 reference should probably be to NPPF	Para 6.24 updated with wording recommended by ADC	Yes
			2nd bullet consistency with landscape character is key - lesser density than neighbourhood areas of residential development may not be justified or achievable - what if the density is already low.	If the density is already low, then this is covered by the 3rd bullet point	No Action

50	HD9	PR1 - SDNPA	3rd bullet it depends whether density is intrinsic to the quality and character of the townscape - increasing density outside recognised areas of particular townscape quality would normally be acceptable provided it does not lead to demonstrable harm, e.g. to residential amenity. The policy could lead to greater pressure on Greenfield sites.	Agreed. When Greenfield sites are designated for building, land needs to be used efficiently. This is especially true in Angmering where there is now limited land available for new development, a vast majority of which is Grade 1 agricultural land bordering the National Park. Currently the build form of Angmering, despite its recent expansion and close proximity to the National Park sits well in its landscape setting. The community believes that the density of new development needs to be balanced against the sustainability of a location based on infrastructure and landscape constraints as well as its proximity to services that do not require the use of a car. New development in Angmering tends to result in a higher proportion of 3 and 4+ bed dwellings. As a result, higher densities in locations visible from the National Park may result in roof patterns and heights e.g. 2.5 and 3 storeys that have an unacceptable impact on the landscape. This policy seeks to manage this.	No Action
50	HD9	PR67	first bullet Is provided in the Angmering Density Survey. Is the survey an appendix - I do not remember seeing it listed as such, but is surely important? We should reference where the survey results can be found.	Agreed - can be seen on the Parish Council Website	No Action
50	6.27	PR45	is not strong enough. We should be putting limits on development with numbers and may be clauses that require referral back to the Parish Council if developers try to pursue an increase in the restricted number of dwellings. The housing density points need to be much firmer and tighter.	Agreed	No Action
51	6.31	PR6	HD10 Parking for New Developments, in the Table it suggest that a one bedroom dwelling should have a total of 2 parking spaces plus a garage - this seems excessive	No Action	
51	HD10	PR30	3rd bullet point - How? 5th bullet point - is this big enough? 3m not wide enough.	Agreed by WSCC	No Action

51	HD10	PR67	Where parking cannot be provided off-road in-curtledge: - 'off-road' does not make sense for this heading.	Navigus said to reword to use off-road.	No Action
51	HD10	PR68-WSCC	This policy aims to set minimum car parking standards for new residential development. Whilst it is agreed that parking should not add pressure to the highway network, in some cases this policy could lead to an oversupply particularly with parking provision for flats. The specification of garage spaces could in effect increase the number of spaces required, as they will be considered as allocated spaces. It is suggested that the policy is less prescriptive to ensure that there is more flexibility over how the spaces are provided. Please refer to the County Council's Guidance on Car Parking in Residential Developments and the Car Parking Demand Calculator.	The Arun Bramley Green Survey has shown that new development in Angmering can be expected to attract a higher number of cars per household than the average as residents tend to commute to work outside the district. The table in Policy HD10 has been amended to split out the car parking requirements for houses and flats.	Updated
51	HD10	PR68-WSCC	Please amend the minimum garage dimensions to 6m x 3m in accordance with the County Council's Local Design Guide	Amended	Yes
52	6.35	PR48	If I had control of writing this bit I would make the second bullet something like - "Increase in primary school places in more local locations with addition of secular provision"	This is WSCC Policy	No Action
53		PR30	3rd bullet point - Delete undertaking and replace with provides. 4th and 5th bullet points - the word "provides" added to the start of each section. Comment - does not read right.	Amended	Yes
53	HD11	PR8	Spelling error: should read "multi-phased"	HD11 amended	Yes
			From my point of view policy's HD 1-11 need tightening up as they read a little vague. You read them and sometimes don't actually know entirely what the bullet point wants you to do.	Advice sought. Unable to ascertain the vagueness.	
			Others are clear but I would question how the parish are going to police these items to the satisfaction of the plan.	Parish Council will need to set up procedures to police the plan.	
			Others have missed the opportunity to be robust enough to avoid the issues the summary part of the policy suggest are issues. As and when the neighbourhood plan is dissected at a site specific appeal the inspector would struggle to establish the plans specific intentions.	Amend where necessary	

		PR69 - MHollywood	The most important pages are 81-85 as this is where the developers will focus in the short term. This section needs more detail as it is unclear what we want to achieve on these sites. The wording also opens us up to having our own policy miss-quoted. Some figures say 'minimum of 100 new homes' (so if they can accommodate more efficiently will we allow 140?) and others 'up to 66 dwellings'.	A developer does not need to be spoon fed policy on everything. 'Having our own policy misquoted' - I am not sure what this means. As regards the minimum and maximum, it appears that he is confused. The ADC Local Plan requirement is for a minimum of 100 dwellings whereas the allocations are for a maximum figure. So other sites could come forward and, if appropriate, could serve to contribute towards an overall level of development in Angmering in excess of 100 dwellings. The limits on our allocations are reflective of appropriate densities.	
			One site is 22 DPH and the adjacent one 40 DPH? If the 22 DPH sites is deliberately low density is this because there is large open space areas as suggested in the SHLAA. A plan is needed to clarify the site areas quoted. If not national policy will eclipse this policy and we will get a national policy compliant scheme on the sites where the plan implies we want something more specific but doesn't make it clear.	Density Policy included	
7 - COMMUNITY LIESURE & WELLBEING					
General Comment	PR56	Can we update the terrible playground In Palmer Road?		To Community Action Plan	
General Comment	PR20	Schooling: No more housing without another primary school		Comment	No Action
54	PR48	Objectives at top: It would be nice to have an objective/policy on protecting and enhancing the public footpath network.		Covered Elsewhere	No Action
54	PR67	Red box - make same amendment as above		Agreed	Yes

55	7.8	PR9	A youth club would be a good idea but could it be used for other sections of the local community during school hours, not pre-school provision. I don't think that increasing St Margaret's school any more because I think it is larger enough and we do not want more people having to travel to the school even if it is on foot.	This was always our intention. 7.9 reworded to say: "APC Has identified a site on land that is available and deliverable at Palmer Road for the provision of a youth centre for use by all ages of young people in the evenings and other sections of the community during the day.	Actioned
55		PR67	Provision of open spaces.... - this section is missing the first para of CLW2 page 70 in v0.2 - the para states - responses in support of the plan showed that, as well as football pitches and cricket / stoolball provision, such facilities as tennis courts (to double for netball) seating and picnic benches would be a valued and appreciated provision on existing open spaces such as Mayflower Park, Fletcher's Field, Palmer Road Recreation Ground and Bramley Green and these should also be considered when providing new facilities.	Amended	Yes
56	7.14	PR22	There seems to be an anomaly regarding the allotment waiting list. 3.1.3 (?) suggests 42 waiting whilst 7.1.4 (?) says 6 people are currently on the waiting list.	Amended	Yes
56	CLW2	PR24	In relation to CLW2, page 56, will the policy prevent a developer's contribution being used for the provision of a play area or similar, but elsewhere in the district and outside the parish?	To Community Action Plan	
56	CLW2	PR67	These bullets seem to be in the wrong sequence of importance - I would suggest the first and second bullets swap order	Agreed	Yes
57	7.19	PR48	Is there evidence that the parish's residents need to be "better educated"?	AiRS finding	No Action
57	7.20	PR48	This provides NPPF support to increasing school choice. The need for a non secular school in the south east of Angmering.	To Community Action Plan	
57	7.20	PR68-WSCC	In the sentence above this paragraph, please remove reference to the Education Department and replace with West Sussex County Council	Amended	Yes
57		PR11	Comment: Priority should be a new school on Angmering School Complex, just don't accept further construction to existing schools.	Comment - WSCC Remit	No Action
57	CLW3	PR67	do we not need to include in this policy the provision of new allotments on Mayflower Way as a site for expansion?	Navigus advised no as is already listed at 7.15.	No Action

58	7.23	PR48	There has been a failure to recognise the accommodation impact of development.	Comment	No Action
58	7.23	PR67	and policy CLW4 - bullet 7.23 should be part of the policy as per Navigus comment, second bullet of policy CLW4 should be moved to the intro, as per Navigus comment	Actioned	Yes
58	7.25	PR67	Why are we extending "The Coppice"? Our villagers would want The Angmering Medical Centre extended	The Angmering Medical Centre is a satellite of "The Coppice" Medical Surgery, located in Rustington	No Action
			Please note: the 10 dwelling threshold for developer contributions towards education infrastructure in Arun reflects current practice. However, if Arun DC introduces the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) there would be scope to receive contributions from smaller developments.	Noted at the end of Policy CLW4. *It is noted that the introduction of the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) could give scope to receive contributions towards education infrastructure from developments of less than 10 new dwellings."	Yes
			In the first sentence please remove reference to the Education Authority and replace with West Sussex County Council	All references to "Education Authority" removed and replaced with "West Sussex County Council"	Yes

58	CLW4	PR68- WSCC	In the second bullet point, please delete the final sentence "This is the preferred' and replace with the following: 'And remains an option for the provision of additional primary school places'.	This comment actually relates to paragraph 3.22 on page 15 of the Pre-submission Plan not the 2nd bullet point in Policy CLW4. We wish the wording of 3.22 to remain as is. Bramley Green is the community's stated "preferred location for the provision of additional primary school places" This is also first choice expressed by ADC. The minutes of ADC's Special Development Control Meeting 8th May 2014, state . . . "there must be a strong commitment for a primary school to be built as the promise of a primary school for Bramley Green had not materialised and it was now a priority." It was also agreed that . . . "in order to support the provision of a primary school, the affordable housing requirement [for the strategic 600+development] should be reduced from 30% to 20%". The also agreed an "amendment to the Heads of Terms as follows: "The contribution would be held by ADC to be spent (within a specified period of time) on the delivery of a new primary school in Angmering"; "Contributions to be spent on the provision of a new school on the Bramley Green site in the first instance", However it is recognised that WSCC have the final say. Therefore the suggested wording has been added as paragraph 7.24 above Policy CLW4. "The education site provided as part of the Bramley Green development remains an option for the provision of additional primary school places in Angmering."	Yes	
58	CLW4	PR67	first para of the policy needs to ensure this does not apply to schemes demonstrably for the elderly, or sheltered housing - again as per Navigus	Amended	Yes	
58	CLW4	PR67	we should include the Bramley Green allocated site within this policy	Agreed - Actioned	Yes	
58	CLW4	PR24	I noted that CLW4, page 58, will require confirmation of the capacity in the parish to accommodate educational needs arising from new developments; however it's unclear to me whether the education authority is obliged to have places in parish schools for the parish's resident children or just that they must provide places in the district? I ask as if it's the latter the intent of the policy may be unenforceable.	Outside the Scope of the NP	No Action	
59	CLW5	PR67	bullets 2,3 and 4, are sub bullets of bullet 1 and should be inset	Agreed - Actioned	Yes	
8 - EMPLOYMENT AND RETAIL						

60+		PR56	What about disabled access in the Core Retail Areas.	To Community Action Plan	
60	8.5	PR6	Refers to section numbers in Local Plan. No doubt these will have changed before our final document is produced	No Action	
60		PR48	The stated aspiration seems to be at odds with residential development on chandlers site, VHB and Manor Nursery.	As Before	No Action
61	8.7	PR67	... The Lamb public house (recently refurbished at considerable expense) not helpful	Agreed	Yes
61	8.7-8	PR48	There is no longer a baker. In terms of retail provision the village currently has a "high end" motor dealer. Ref figure 8.1 would it be worthwhile expanding the map to include the Chandlers Site?	Not applicable	No Action
61	8.9	PR67diversity of retail outlets and the very important policy we have adoptedall our policies are very important	Agreed	Yes
	8.11	PR19	Unfinished	Amended	Yes
62	8.12	PR48	Customers also like choice in retail outlets.	No Change	No Action
62	8.13	PR6	ER1 - Retail Provision : In the first bullet point of this policy we need to add the words "at a reasonable price", so the 2nd sentence now includes the word "site having been marketed at a reasonable price for a period"	Agreed wording amended	Yes
62	8.13	PR6	para below first two bullet points : Also within that policy we need possible to talk about not just classes A2 and A3 but also A4 and A5	Agreed wording amended	Yes
62	ER1	PR67	how does this affect the Chandlers site? We are losing jobs, but not trying to replace the business, and the new Chandlers site is on the parish border	No Action	
62	ER1	PR30	Last bullet point: ".....currently <u>relied upon</u> by" How is this to be measured?	To Community Action Plan	
General Comment		PR6	In referring to the Core Retail Area we must not forget the Retail Area located on Downsview south of the A259	Section has been updated and includes reference to Downsview retail area.	Yes
63	8.17	PR24	are there any statistics to show whether the commuting pattern has changed over the last 10 years; if so it might strengthen the argument.	No further statistics available, these are the latest.	No Action
63	8.18	PR24	reference is made to Angmering is becoming a dormitory village', in truth it is already and has been for a significant period.	Comment	No Action

63	8.18	PR24	In some cases powerful arguments have been overlooked. For instance, much is being made of traffic congestion both on the A259 and what may be expected from more vehicles serving new developments, but, and unless I have missed something, no mention is made of the environmental impact of the increased levels of pollution from such vehicles, except in passing in 8.18. An opportunity missed?	To Community Action Plan	
63	8.19	PR24	8.19: There is no quantification of the number of jobs lost, nor is any attempt made to show the economic benefit to the community of the influx of residents to the new developments Surely it is needed to provide balance?	Comment	No Action
63	8.20	PR6	Refers to 90 employed by VHB, I seem to remembers somewhere else in the document refers to 120. We need to be consistent	Amend to err on side of caution to say over 90	Yes
63	8.20	PR24	is there a possibility that VBH will move regardless of any short term planning application approval?	Yes, sorry to say. Land owner will not renew the Lease.	No Action
63	8.20	PR67	we mention VHB, but not Chandlers - why not.	Chandlers are re-locating within the parish with more jobs.	No Action
63	8.21	PR19	Whilst ADC do not have to seek to find developers to build new homes in Angmering as a number are already queuing up for the opportunity to do so, there have been very limited additional employment generated within Angmering in the last 10 years despite over 700 new dwellings having been built over this period.	Comment	No Action
63	8.22	PR48	Surely existing sites should be encouraged to remain employers. What does second sentence mean? Does it mean avoiding customer choice?	Comment	No Action
63	8.22	PR31	Suggestion for rewording: Our policy is to ensure that existing business units/sites are retained and, whenever possible, new business encourages and established in the Parish. Any proposed new businesses	None that we are aware of	No Action
63	8.23	PR67	This section supports our policy 12 Local Employment using very similar wording - delete this sentence - if it has similar wording why include it? What is policy 12?	Amend Policy to read ER2	Yes
General Comment		PR20	ADC needs to push for extra parking in the centre of the village for businesses to survive	To Community Action Plan	

64	ER2	PR51	In relation to ER2 it should consider adding another possible bullet, or addition to the second bullet point to encourage developers, particularly of large scale developments, to have provision for local employment to discourage the "dormitory" situation, How about adding that "the developer contributes towards local employment schemes such as creation of apprenticeships in local businesses"?	Out of Scope for the NP - Comment	No Action
64	ER2	PR24	policy seems to be focussed solely on loss of locations through redevelopment etc. can it not be expanded to encourage business/commercial development of that will of direct inward investment and create jobs in the parish?		
64	ER2	PR30	1st bullet point.marketed..... How do they demonstrate that it has been 'marketed'	"Prove it"	No Action
64	ER2	PR48	This seems to be totally at odds with stated view as Chandlers site. Chandlers appear to want to relocate for commercial reasons. If the site gets planning permission for residential development it will no longer employ people	Chandlers is relocating to a bigger site within the Angmering parish boundary and increasing the number of jobs.	No Action
9 - TRAFFIC AND MOVEMENT					
65+		PR44	A very full comprehensive plan. 1) What if Arun DC decided not on the identified need for 100 houses but impose 500 or 600 on this parish? 2) with ever increasing volume of traffic, what if the highways agency fail to impose limits on the size and weight of HGV's now coming from the by-pass through the village centre and on to the A259. Is there nothing that Angmering PC can do about that?	To Community Action Plan	
65	9.1	PR6	First sentence, why don't we say 'additional car usage' rather than 'car-borne traffic'. It's not what's being carried in the car that's the problem it's the car itself. Also I thought SAV had carried out a traffic survey, can't we use the results somewhere here.	Author preferred wording 'car-borne traffic'. Survey is in the Evidence Base	No Action
65		PR48	Table at top: I would like to see the objective extended to say "Improve footpaths and cycleways and oppose unnecessary closures".	got a point but we know the feeling over the loses of Pagetts Crossing -	To
65	9.4	PR48	The first sentence needs to be firmer. Suggestion: "It is therefore essential that any new development properly demonstrates"	Para 9.4 amended	Yes

65		PR24	I was also disappointed that in relation to Traffic and Movement policies seem to focus solely on requirements stemming from new developments. I believe the local plan could and should identify more fully aspects of the existing infrastructure that would benefit from improvement, independent of new developments. Concern is expressed for road users other than motorists and the desire to have people use other than motor cars for their journeys. Accordingly, there should be greater emphasis on improving the safety of pedestrians and cyclists. Why is there no proposal for a 20MPH limit to be introduced throughout all internal routes within the parish? Equally, maybe more people would cycle if there were dedicated cycle lane?. Simple low cost proposals that put people before cars, perhaps that could be developed as a key theme?	To Community Action Plan	
66	TM 1	PR 4	Some issues such as speeding traffic through the village shouldn't have to wait for any sort of plan, this problem is evident every day, especially in the mornings, the speed limit being 20mph and even the simple solution of asking the police to set up a mobile speed camera in the square occasionally would make a massive difference to this problem		
65	9.5	PR6	TM1 Traffic Management, first sentence, poor wording doesn't make sense. First bullet point, suggest should read 'Encourage the use of alternative.	Amended	Yes
66	9.6	PR6	2nd point, suggest starts 'Current footways' 4th point, have there been any accidents in Arundel Road, if so we should reference them. 5th point, the additional traffic generated by new development is an important point and should have its own bullet point	Agreed. Please add current on 2nd bullet point and no action on 5th point - all part of the same sentence.	Yes
66	TM 1	PR30	".....core retail areacore retail area" So good they said it twice!	Amended	Yes
66	TM1	PR18	Compliment: We are pleased with the work that has been put into the neighbourhood plan BUT we are still very concerned with the volume and speed of traffic going through the village.	Comment	No Action
66	TM1	PR31	"..... in the proximity of the core retail area where the core retail area is". Delete all and replace with (or something similar), ".....in the centre of the village" where most retail outlets are sited.	TM1 amended	Yes
66	TM1	PR31	3rd bullet point - what is a "traffic impact"	Comment	No Action

66	TM1	PR68-WSCC	In the first bullet point, it is unclear as to why a threshold of 10 dwellings is proposed as a trigger for the consideration of sustainable modes of transport. It is suggested that this threshold is removed, as this should be a principle that is applied in the consideration of all applications. It is unclear what is meant by 'specific links'.	Threshold removed. new wording for 1 st bullet 'Any new development should encourage alternative forms of transport to cars, and provide short, direct links to public transport nodes, e.g. bus stops, railway station, etc	Yes
			For the final sentence, it should be noted that there are existing thresholds for the provision of Transport Assessments and Transport Statements which identify the potential traffic impact of development and identify mitigation measures. Travel Plans will also be required in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).	A new last bullet point has been added as per WSCC wording: 'Travel Plans will also be required in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).	Yes
66	9.6	PR48	As a member of the roads sub-committee, I picked up that the traffic conditions associated with St Margaret's School were of widespread concern.	Comment	No Action
66	9.7	PR31	There is no nexus between the number of commuters and the number of cars	Comment	No Action

66	9.10	PR68-WSCC	<p>Please note, the A259 Route Improvement Study did not assess the impact of a potential link between Roundstone Lane and the adjacent A280. This was assessed as part of the Arun Transport Study for Strategic Development, which was undertaken by WSP. The Arun Transport Study indicates that the Angmering Link Road would have benefits for traffic travelling to and from Angmering, which would be complementary to the A259 corridor improvements as it would provide an alternative point of access for local traffic. The link road scheme would also relieve the volume of traffic on the A259 between Roundstone Lane and the A280 roundabout. However, this section of the A259 is proposed to be dualled as part of the A259 corridor improvement scheme, which provides greater benefit for A259 traffic and is a higher priority for West Sussex County Council as Local Highway Authority.</p>	<p>New wording for 9.10: “Development at Angmering will put additional pressure on the Roundstone Lane link to the A259. The A259 Route Improvement Study, as part of the Arun Transport Study for Strategic Development, undertaken by consultants WSP for WSCC, indicates that the Angmering Link Road would have benefits for traffic travelling to and from Angmering, which would be complementary to the A259 corridor improvements as it would provide an alternative point of access for local traffic. The link road scheme would also relieve the volume of traffic on the A259 between Roundstone Lane and the A280 roundabout.”</p>	Yes
67	TM2	PR68-WSCC	<p>(first bullet point): Given the scale of development proposed in the Plan, further evidence would be required to demonstrate that the provision of this link is deliverable. It is suggested that this proposal is initially included in Appendix G and not a specific policy.</p>	<p>We have merely said that developments seeking to provide this A280 access will be considered more favourably – it does not say we will reject any others – we are just showing a core preference here as requested by the village. NO CHANGE</p>	No Action

			For the third bullet point, it should be noted that the phasing of infrastructure provision will be determined through the development management process.	Bullet re-worded as follows 'The development management plan, must ensure that all mitigation measures are to be completed before the new development is completed and occupied.'	Yes
67	TM2	PR51	should consider "maintaining existing highway of special or historical importance in line with	Comment	No Action
67	9.10	PR48	Does the Parish have a copy of the Parsons Brinkerhoff Report.	Yes it does.	No Action
68	9.17	PR48	First bullet: Add to end "and are continuous"	To Community Action Plan	
68	TM3	PR30	Last para. CIL Define and paid to whom?	Amend to read the same as amended CWL1 "Developer contributions (for example from CIL or S106, as applicable)	Yes
68	TM3	PR48	In first bullet change "convenience" to "convenience and connectivity".	Bullets amended to:- Safety, Directness, Access and Connections, Attractiveness, Convenience, Features such as trees and hedgerows.	Yes
68	TM3	PR68-WSCC	Please provide evidence to support the 20 dwelling threshold	ADC in their consultation feedback "Recommend that the last para is amended as follows ".... Sought from all new developments of 10 units or more to fund"	Yes

69	9.18	PR 3	Safe Routes to school/Traffic, three comments: First - the pavement on Station Road heading south out of village centre is very narrow and not safe, in case pupils are jostled or stumble on the kerb, especially on the bend where drivers accelerate up and out of the village centre. The secondary school acknowledges this section is not safe and advises pupils to divert into the Dell Estate as soon as possible. Secondly: crossing from the village square near the war memorial, to the pavement just outside the Lamb is not safe, my daughter aged 12 was knocked down (at low speed, and was not injured beyond bruising) on Monday 28th April 2014 on her way home from the Angmering school by a car on the school run. The cause was I believe the volume of traffic - a driver in a queue waiting to turn right waved her across the middle of the queue of cars, and a car that was coming up inside the queue in order to turn left collided with her as the driver wasn't expecting a child to pop out between queuing cars. Thirdly - is there a 'missing link' between Chantryfield Road and the BACK of St Margaret's School, that would avoid the dangerous stretch of Arundel Road where children (who are often encouraged to scoot to school) fly along the pavement with no barrier or verge between them and cars, who can be impatiently trying to zoom past the school run traffic jam.	To Community Action Plan	
69	9.18	PR18	There is still NO SAFE ROUTE to the Primary Schools. - AGREED		
69	9.21	PR48	Why can't all parking be of restricted duration with half of it restricted to 30 minutes. It must be robustly enforced.		
69	TM4	PR48	This can best be achieved by locating smaller primary schools convenient to where children live. The fact that children from Bramley Green use St Margaret's leads to significant vehicle movements.		
69	TM4	PR30	".....appro. Five primary school pupils....." Where does this come from? I would say 10-20	Emphasis on "Primary" see Education Evidence Base	No Action
69	TM4	PR9	I am in agreement about the safe routes to school, very much needed. I always try to avoid walking around Angmering during the start and end of the school day as it is much too hazardous	Comment	No Action
69	TM4	PR67	first bullet - children are able to travel to village primary and secondary schools (pre-schools, primary and secondary) safely	Agreed	Yes
69	TM5	PR30	What about the train schedules?	Comment	No Action

69	TM5	PR51	increasing the car parking at the station encourages the "dormitory" population to drive to the station. Could an improvement not be to encourage cycle/walking to the station through a "safe" cycle/pedestrian route from both east and west of the village.	Out of Scope for the NP - National Rail Controlled so cannot enforce - Comment	No Action
69		PR11	(see comment above page 57 PR11) With this in place, then ensure safeways for cycles & pedestrians are planned and implements. The safe routes planned are 10 years ago have never been implemented.	Comment	No Action
General Comment		PR20	Traffic congestion: Angmering is currently VERY CONGESTED, not just congested	Comment	No Action
10 - ENVIRONMENT AND HERITAGE					
		PR31	Comment 2: An index cross-referencing specific topics e.g. the initial section on flooding (3.86 - 3.1207) with related commentary in Section 10 Environment and Heritage, particularly sub-section 10.12, 10.13 and EH7. It is only when the two sections are read sequentially that it is possible to appreciate the actual risks to the village.	Comment	No Action
71+		PR43-Natural England	Thank you for consulting Natural England on your Neighbourhood Plan. We welcome the emphasis placed on the landscape quality of the plan area and the objective and policy to protect and enhance that quality. The recognition of the importance of the trees and hedges is also supported. The nature, scale and location of development means there are limited opportunities to enhance landscape, habitats and biodiversity, nevertheless the context should inform the development of the site and any opportunities for appropriate onsite enhancements should be taken.	Comment	No Action
71		PR1 - SDNPA	"conserve and enhance" is more appropriate terminology than "protect in perpetuity" which has connotations of no change whatsoever	Wording replaced	Updated
72	EH 2	PR1 - SDNPA	Policy EH 2 does not mention the automatic protection that existing trees have within Conservation Areas and this should be raised here in brief - suggest "trees within conservation areas are protected by law and should not be removed, pruned, lopped, topped or have their roots cut without prior Conservation Area consent from Arun District Council"	Wording replaced	Updated
			Alternatively this could be covered in the policy on trees and woodlands - where there is reference to TPOs, but it sits well in the Conservation Area Policy		

72		PR67	the original policies EH2 on Maintaining existing visual connections with the countryside, and EH3, Protecting views to and from the SDNP have been lost - why, as these are both important?	Retain	NO
74	10.8	PR1 - SDNPA	The references to the Options Consultation Document appear to have been incorrectly copied. Paragraph 3.23 is the right reference and it is welcomed it is included in the plan. The full quote is: " <i>development in the wrong location can have a negative impact on the landscape and can result in the loss or reduction of landscape character or local distinctiveness. The scale and location of some developments can also harm important views or landmarks and detract from the visual integrity, identity and scenic quality that are characteristic of the National Park .. the use of standard design solutions erodes local distinctiveness in urban and rural areas. Poor or inappropriate design can increase the sense of urbanisation in the countryside. Ineffectual landscape enhancement, or mitigation of certain developments, can also impact on the special qualities of the landscape, such as the erosion of tranquillity or the impact on dark night skies by increased light pollution.</i> " Historic landscape patterns can also be harmed (para 3.24)	Correction made to paragraph 10.8.... Now under heading 10.11	Yes
74	EH5		I agree with Arun's comments about editing the policy down however, the need for development in the setting of SDNP to conserve and enhance <i>landscape character</i> should be mentioned (cross refer to West Sussex County Council and ADC landscape guidance/evidence which sets out the landscape character types of relevance.	Confirmed with ADC that reference is to bullet points not paragraphs. Replaced with wording suggested by ADC and added references as suggested.	Yes
75	EH7	PR38- Environment Agency	We support the inclusion of Policy EH7: Flood Prevention. Please note that we only respond to planning application consultations in Flood Zone 1 that are over 5ha in size. As the policy relates to all development sites, we would therefore suggest removing reference to us in the Policy wording. You may wish to consider including a reference to the Lead Local Flood Authority who have responsibility for local flood risk instead.	Amended to WSCC as the Local Flood Authority (Note: Policy is now re-numbered EH8).	Yes
75	EH7	PR51	and pathways of historical importance should be protected (e.g.. Cow Lane)	Added to "Assets of Community Value	
75	EH7	PR67	we have lost the protection of tree canopies and roots - I see this is in policy HD8, but more appropriately also lives in policy EH7	Policy EH7 amended to include same wording as HD8	Yes

76	10.12	PR48	At top of page before this para should be a heading "Flood Risk and Prevention"	Amended	Yes
76	EH7	PR48	This box should read EH8 and not EH7. If there was a desire to expand the box I would suggest "The Sequential Test and, where appropriate, the Exception Test should be applied for ALL sources of flooding. There should be an appropriate balance between conflicting materials planning considerations but new development should always be safe and should never force flood risk to others.	Amended	Yes
76	EH 7	PR4	I was pleased to see that the APC are taking the flooding issues in the village seriously and are working with the Environment Agency to try and finally address this long term problem for many households in the village.	Comment	No Action
76	10.15	PR55	"Ham Manor Golf Club - Angmering Roman Villa", My understanding is that this site is a few hundred yards north of the Golf Club, under farm land and adjacent to Black Ditch.	Para 10.15 amended	Yes
78		PR67	last para of the section in the top right box - some of the hundred or so flint mine shafts at Harrow Hill, Angmering, north of Patching which were in use about 4900 years ago. This does not make sense or English - I suggest the sentence is deleted	This is the exact wording taken from Label/Sign	No Action
78	EH8	PR36	Amend to read EH9: Archaeology	Amended	Yes
General Comment		PR 2	On a small point the trees and hedgerows issues must take account, not only of danger but also of sensible forestry. For example many self seeded trees (mainly Sycamore) are basically weeds which have grown and allowed to mature in the wrong places and these need to be capable of removal without beaurocracy.	Comment	No Action
		PR69 - MHollywood	The policy pages should use more bullet points and have a bulleted summary section to assist outsiders to get to grips with the document without the need to read 89 pages. This will mean it becomes more detailed as the reader chooses to read on but can get a snap-shot if they need to.	The policy wording has been put in a coloured box so that it is absolutely clear that they are policies.	Yes
SECTION 3: HOUSING ALLOCATION - SITE SPECIFIC POLICIES					
		PR67	For all of the housing allocation sites, it should be specified that they will be delivered over the plan period, so "The site will provide xxx dwellings, over the plan period"	Agreed. Over the plan period the site	Yes
11 - PARISH HOUSING ALLOCATION					

General Comment		PR 2	With the number of homes needed by local families being so low the plan might also wish to argue against the National view that the country, and Angmering in particular are actually in need of more housing generally	National Planning Policy	No Action
81		PR48	I am not clear whether the 100 houses are instead of, or in addition to, the much larger number Arun wants.	'in addition to'	No Action
81	11.7	PR48	First bullet. I don't know the site but couldn't this again become employment sites? Bullet at top of page: Chandlers site is currently a significant employer. If the site did not get planning permission for residential development it is likely a further non-residential use would be found.	Landowner has stated intention to use for residential development	No Action
83	HA1	PR10-Hargreaves	Site Allocation - Bramley Green South (Mayflower Way) - This land is currently under multiple ownership, clarification therefore needs to be made as to how access is made to the site i.e. to the south, east or west and having regard to the different ownerships the fact that the site may be developed in parts and that the existing uses on site within the site allocation not subject to re-development are not adversely affected by new residential development next door.	New access is already being negotiated by owner of cement works. Mayflower Way can be negotiated with the Parish Council	No Action
83+	HA2	PR17	SUGGESTION: Offer Mayflower Way Site to be developed by a Community Land Trust	Comment	No Action
83	11.18	PR72 - HAdams	Thank you for sending the submission version of your Neighbourhood Plan. If I have understood it correctly 11.18 refers to my clients site. As you have already noted the site area is 1.0 hectares. With regard to the second sentence regarding ownership, we don't feel that this information particularly adds anything. My client has owned the land for in the region of 26 years and any separate arrangements, we believe are not relevant to be included in the neighbourhood plan. My clients land is available for residential development and he is happy for it to form part of your 100 unit allocation. However we would not want any specific use allocation to be given to my clients land at this stage. Please do contact me with any further questions in regard to the land.	The last sentence " <i>The site Option to develop</i> " has been removed as requested	Updated
83	HA1	PR47-Eclifford	I especially agree with this site allocation proposals. This will finish off the Bramley Green development and eradicate a lot of the unsocial behaviour and compliment the open space which so many local residents enjoy.	Comment	No Action

84	HA2	PR51	This goes against many of the values of the local plan. It is a Greenfield site, and has a very high proposed housing density not in keeping with the rest of the village. An alternative site should be considered.	re-worded policy to explain reasons	Yes
84	HA2	PR10-Hargreaves	Site Allocation - field in Mayflower Way: - Having regard to Mayflower Way being unadopted, clarification is needed as to who will maintain Mayflower Way which currently provides access to the commercial land to the north and leisure uses to the west.	This would need to be addressed with the current owners Angmering Parish Council.	Yes
		PR69 - MHollywood	Why is the field at mayflower not being managed through the community trust mentioned earlier?	There is no CLT at present	No Action
85	11.3	PR48	Surely it is much more likely that general parking could be provided on this site if the site has a non residential use.	Comment	No Action
	11.28	PR19	Change Water Land to Water Lane	Amended	Yes
85	HA3	PR48	The second bullet: It should be "flash" and not "flashing"	Agreed Amended	Yes
85	HA3	PR 4	Further to my e-mail I enclose a copy of what the "Save Angmering Village's" position is on the Chandlers site taken directly from their website, note they also say "It is important to keep the centre of the village attractive and vibrant" so I cannot see how a dirty tarmacked car park will look anything but dreadful.	Matter discussed verbally with Responder. Responder happy to agree to car park on the site provided it is not against his boundary	No Action
85		PR 4	SAV supports the Localism Bill's giving the people the right (through the creation of Neighbourhood Plans) to say the type of houses they want built and where they want them. The surveys have indicated we want small developments of up to 10 houses within the village boundary. The Chandlers site in the village provides Angmering with a site for housing development which could go some way to meeting these requirements. SAV believes that the site should be used for appropriate and suitable housing, rather than for any other use (eg.parking). It is important to keep the centre of the village attractive and vibrant. SAV will therefore be supporting the application for housing, but with certain conditions as we do have some concerns regarding the proposed plans.	Comments	No Action

85	HA3	PR22	Suggestion: You may want to consider allocating retirement home development for the Chandlers site due to the proximity to the shops and other facilities.	Comment	No Action
		PR69 - MHollywood	Chandlers needs to be more robustly worded otherwise we will get a Tesco express in there	Our responsibility is to allocate in the best way we can. Once site is accepted for housing, any application for Tesco Express would be contrary to policy and likely to fail.	No Action
Small Scale Housing Sites		PR68-WSCC	Given that the pre-submission Neighbourhood Plan for Angmering includes the proposed allocation of small scale housing sites (policy HD2), it should be noted that site specific principles in the Neighbourhood Plan will need to be tested and refined through the Development Management process (through the provision of pre-application advice or at the planning application stage) or as part of a consultation for a Community Right to Build Order. Whilst the County Council supports the proactive approach undertaken to allocate sites in the Neighbourhood Plan, we are unable to comment on site specific principles at this stage. In considering site specific principles, please refer to the attached Development Management guidance.	Comment	N/A
			The County Council currently operates a scheme of charging for highways and transport pre-application advice to enable this service to be provided to a consistent and high standard. Please find further information on our charging procedure through the following link: http://www.westsussex.gov.uk/leisure/getting_around_west_sussex/roads_and_pathways/plans_and_projects/development_control_for_roads/pre-application_charging_guide.aspx		
SECTION 4: LIST OF NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN POLICIES & APPENDICES					
APPENDIX 1: LIST OF PLAN POLICIES					
88		PR67	Appendix 1 - it would be helpful if this list also included the page numbers for quick reference and access	Agreed	Yes
88		PR36	Housing: HD4 Local Connection is missing	Amended	Yes
APPENDIX 2: LIST OF PLAN APPENDICES					

89		PR48	Where do I see the appendices?	On the Parish Website.	no action
Appendix G		PR68-WSCC	These aspirations have been noted. The County Council is in ongoing discussions with the local community regarding the Local Infrastructure Plan, which is used to guide local investment in highway improvement schemes identified as community priorities. Further discussion will be undertaken and the plan will be updated at appropriate intervals to ensure that it continues to reflect issues of current interest within communities.	The issues and comments in this appendix will be progressed through the Angmering Parish Council Community Action Plan with WSCC. No Change refer to Community Action Plan	N/A
		PR20 more warning was not given for the consultation process - Why nothing from ADC?	Not ADC Responsibility	no action
		PR24	Comment: Also, by the end of the document the use of Bramley Green to exemplify all that is wrong with larger developments has the capacity to come across as a negative reflection on the document. Love it or hate it Bramley Green is a part, and a large part of our village. While various negative features are identified, it has also served the community well; providing homes, creating employment, supporting local retail businesses and commerce, as well as significantly impacting the demographic of the village not the least of which in lowering the average age of the resident population. Additionally, some of the comparative arguments are not well served when the quoted statistics are from a 2004 survey; fresher data would better support the cause.	The 2004 survey is the only and latest one available. The usage of Bramley Green has not been designed as a negative effect on the estate, but to highlight the problems experienced with a large housing estate being introduced within the village. Lessons have been learnt from this development, both good and bad and we need to expand on that experience.	no action
		PR33	Comments: There are also some good maps showing flood risk areas, especially through the village centre, but it is not clear on the Chandler site map whether flood risk is shown in relation to the site. Baring in mind the frequency of flooding in this area it needs to be included.	Available flood map does not include specific area of Chandlers	Yes
		PR55	Comment: All maps need to be reproduced much larger and in colour. All photographs would benefit from being larger say quarter page.	Agreed. Amendments being made	Yes
		PR63	Comment: Some of the maps in the plan are blurred and cannot be seen very well.	Agreed. Amendments being made	Yes

GENERAL COMMENTS

Page No.	Para	Code	Comment	Action by SG	Plan Amended
		PR7	I have no major comments to make or concerns with the report other than worry about whether ADC will charge ahead approving unsustainable developments before the Plan is agreed.		N/A
		PR12	Yes - it seems to provide a more 'sustainable' plan for the village - extra car parking, and use of brown field sites make sense and will help protect the 'village' nature of Angmering		N/A
		PR16	What about the increased Traffic?		N/A
		PR16	Less Local Employment		N/A
		PR16	New School !!! (Promised school at Bramley Green - never materialised)		N/A
15		PR19	Healthcare: Only 1 Dentist	Has one of the private dentists now gone, needs to be checked	N/A

		PR23	The ANP was started 3 years ago! It is already 2 years too late. What good did Cllr Turner do other than dilly dally for so long that any recommendations in it were way out of date by the time ADC got their claws into Angmering. Interesting to note that all the hard work done by some Cllrs on the pollution aspect has been completely forgotten about and ignored in the ANP. The plan is not worth the paper that has been wasted on it.	Replied to in an e-mail by Steering Group Chairman. The document was extremely good, the whole group agreed on this fact. Our problem was, that it was more of a statement than a policy so the group spent several weeks trying to make it into a workable policy. Hands are greatly tied when writing policies, they have to be deliverable and it has proved very difficult trying to get the correct wording together to ensure it stands up to examination. It was removed from the pre-submission document, to give us time to investigate it further and is currently with our consultant to see if he can assist us to make this a workable policy. Alternatively, if this is not possible he will advise us the best way to include this in the plan so at least it can be referenced to.	N/A
		PR24	While I would not disagree with the policies per se, I don't think that the document is necessarily well served by the presentation of some of the statistics both alone and those used for comparative purposes.		N/A
		PR25	I would liked to have seen response options of "Mostly "and "Partially" in addition to the three offered. Had they so been offered, I would have been able to submit "Mostly" as the appropriate answer		N/A
		PR11	Concentrate on what with your limited powers you can affect. Central Government will through planners create the macro-structure.		N/A
		PR33	The location of the Parish housing seems logical however the maps could be clearer.		N/A

		PR33	The policies that talk about infrastructure provision being phased alongside new development are also sensible, especially as further new housing without enhanced road infrastructure will only exacerbate the existing village rat runs and overflow parking at Angmering Station.		N/A
		PR69 - MHollywood	In my view the more words a statutory document has the more opportunity outsiders will have to miss-quote, argue and challenge its content. And that document has an awful lot of words; a lot of which are interesting but unnecessary in a document of the type and others conflicting. If the document was 75% smaller I believe it would be more powerful and robust.	We believe he actually means reduce to 75% of the original here, but we do not think we should reduce too much as we could be in danger of losing what we have to say.	N/A
		PR35	<u>Comments regarding current Major Development Applications:</u>		
			Unfortunately, all too often the views of residents go unrespected because developers can afford to appeal until they achieve their objectives.		N/A
			The underlisted planning applications were submitted to Arun District Council during the first quarter of 2014		N/A
			1) A/134/13 Land east of Dappers Lane. 2) A/82/12 Land east of Roundstone Lane. 3) A/135/12 Land at Pound Nursery. 4) on land owned by Manor Nursery. My comments are based upon a detailed study of the content of each of the above planning applications.		N/A
			In the case of application 1) above the appointed specialist consultant approved by the land owner compiled an application in such a manner in order to present a convincing case for approval; Regrettably the contents generated as factual contained elements of disinformation on the one hand and was disingenuous in overall presentation.		N/A
			The same observations to a lesser degree are also applicable to nos 2 and 3 above		N/A
			In the case of No. 4 - Land owned by Manor Nursery, the applicant, a private property company had the audacity to state that the nursery was no longer viable as a business since Haskins had re-developed their site; How can such a statement be made when the applicant had never been afforded the opportunity to examine the trading account of Manor Nursery in any event; I was able to confirm this fact when consulting a senior member of staff at Manor nursery.		N/A
		In addition the land upon which Manor Nursery operates is owned solely by them and <u>NOT</u> the company submitting the application.		N/A	

		<p>In conclusion it is my strongly held belief that it is wrong that any organisation can submit a planning application without the formal agreement and knowledge of the land owner and should be at all times subject to a STATUTORY requirement to ensure that all statements made within the application can be fully supported and VERIFIABLE.</p>		N/A
		<p>In addition it is also very important that Officers of Arun District Council's Planning Department, are able to examine the verifiable content of applications in order to prove the veracity of such content and if any item or statement is found to be disinformative or misleading then such data should be REDACTED: Such detailed examination and redaction would result in a "Cleansed Document" which could withstand rigorous scrutiny by elected councillors and members of the public alike.</p>		N/A
	PR41	<p>My major concerns have been the issues of over-development and the need for an infrastructure to address and protect the village. How appalling therefore the politicking of the District Council that has ignored the Plan, the wishes of residents, campaign groups. With enormous indignation and anger I feel that recent decisions badly damage the immense effort put into developing the policies concerned with housing and the associated needs for infrastructure.</p>		N/A
	PR41	<p>Please believe that none of my comments is intended to be negative.</p>		N/A
	PR48	<p>This has been challenging because of the lateness of Arun's next Local Plan, that the community views on dwelling numbers don't seem to have got through to them and that the parish has two local planning authorities and the National Park's local plan will be even later than Arun's. I had not realised that the Neighbourhood Plan's boundaries excluded the National Park. I am interested in flood risk and the safer areas are to the North.</p>		N/A
	PR57	<p>We feel the Development Plan should have been allowed to comment on Housing for the area - without this it appears to be a 'toothless dog'</p>		N/A
		<p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment upon the Parish Council's Consultation Pre-Submission Neighbourhood Plan for Angmering. Given the short timescale for response, the following comments will focus on key issues. Further comments will be provided as part of the next formal consultation</p>	None	

		PR68 - WSCC	In general, the County Council looks for Neighbourhood Plans to be in conformity with the District and Borough Councils' latest draft or adopted development plans. The County Council supports the District and Borough Councils in preparing the evidence base for these plans and aligns its own infrastructure plans with them. The County Council encourages Parish Councils to make use of this information which includes transport studies examining the impacts of proposed development allocations. Where available this information will be published on its website or that of the relevant Local Planning Authority.	Noted	
			In relation to its own statutory functions, the County Council expects all Neighbourhood Plans to take due account of its policy documents and their supporting Sustainability Appraisals. These documents include the West Sussex Waste Local Plan, Minerals Local Plan and West Sussex Transport Plan. It is also recommended that published County Council service plans, for example Planning School Places, are also taken into account.	Noted	
		PR1 - SDNPA	Many thanks for consulting with us on this document. It is recognised that an enormous amount of effort has gone into its production. Please do not hesitate to contact us at any time if you have further questions relating to coverage of SDNP in the submission version of the Plan or regarding any of the comments I have made above.		N/A
		PR7	I am very impressed with the Draft Neighbourhood Plan and want to thank all those involved in its creation.		N/A
		PR8	The teams who put the Plan together are to be congratulated for their hard and dedicated work which has resulted in a creditable document which I hope that both the Parish Council and the District Council will adhere to in the future.		N/A
		PR13	The Neighbourhood draft plan was very well drawn up expressing the villagers' concerns/views - too late unfortunately.		N/A
		PR20	Congratulations to APC on the Plan.		N/A
		PR24	Thank you for the copy of the pre-submission neighbourhood plan document. I must congratulate you and the other committee members in seeing the project through to this advanced stage; it's quite an achievement given the various hiccups along the way and the at times and apparent lack of local interest		N/A

		PR24	The document has changed a lot from the initial drafts I worked on and benefits now from greater focus on the individual elements of policy included as well as in its presentation.		N/A
		PR25	First, I would like to say thank you to Pat and her team for preparing such a wide-ranging document.		N/A
		PR26	I just wanted to note here sincere thanks for the Neighbourhood Plan. It is an extremely impressive document, you have done an amazing job.		N/A
		PR31	Please convey my compliments and congratulations to Cllr. Pat Turner, and her colleagues on the Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Group, for all their work over the many months past. The document is readable, well organised and generally cohesive in its presentation, which would have been no easy task.		N/A
		PR32	An excellent and fair reflection of what Angmering residents desire		N/A
		PR33	I would like to congratulate the Parish Council and the members of the Community who have obviously worked very hard to put together a great document. It is easy to follow and in my opinion reflects the views of the community in regard to the issues of congested roads and schools and also in protecting the rural landscape setting of the village and the National Park.		N/A
		PR34	Very impressive presentation. Thank you for all the hard work involved.		N/A
		PR41	I congratulate wholeheartedly those who have worked so hard to bring the Plan to this stage (and was amazed and thrilled to see one of my photographs included!).		N/A
		PR42	I think the Plan has been well constructed and a credit to the hard work that has gone into it. I support the plan as it is presently drafted and look forward to the final version		N/A
		PR45	Thank you to everyone involved in putting "The Plan" together, as I appreciate the hardwork and commitment that has gone into it for everyone in Angmering.		N/A
		PR47-EClifford	I agree with the Parish Councils proposals which reflect a lot of careful thought and planning. It is clear the Parish Council is working in the interests of residents and the village.		N/A
		PR48	I must congratulate you on what you have done. I hope my comments are useful.		N/A
		PR41	I was hugely impressed by the Plan and the incredible amount of work that has gone into it.		N/A
		PR49	It is an excellent and very interesting document, which I enjoyed reading.		N/A

		PR52	What a lot of good work has gone into Neighbourhood Plan.		N/A
		PR53	I think its an excellent plan and accurately assesses the state of the village and wishes sensible policy recommendations for the future.		N/A
		PR54	A huge thank you to those involved as appreciate the amount of work involved. I don't have any issues with the plans – points around housing and related education, transport, drainage and other matters are well made. It would certainly be good to see the retail offer protected and possibly expanded – maybe incorporated as part of Chandler site development?		N/A
		PR57	We would like to thank members of the Steering Group for their concerted efforts on behalf of the Parish.		N/A
		PR66- EastPreston PC	On behalf of East Preston Parish Council I have been asked to thank you for the opportunity to comment upon Angmering's Pre-Submission Neighbourhood Plan. EPPC wishes to congratulate you all on a great piece of work, and has no further comment to make. Keep up the good work.		
		PR67	A great document that hopefully gives our rural Angmering Village a future, that is not destroyed by over development.		
		PR70	I believe the plan is completely wrong. The area around Mayflower Way was for business and as a buffer for the village. The so called need for housing is misguided. The whole area will just be one huge Estate with little quality of life. Landlords and construction are the winners, everyone else pays the price. Just like the fractured Bramley Green deals. I believe there is still a covenant on part of the land?		
		PR71	I have spent some time reading the draft Neighbourhood Plan. <i>It is an exceptionally good and well presented plan and one I endorse without any serious reservation. All those concerned with the preparation and initial approve of the document at parish level deserve to be congratulated on the thoroughness of their approach and for the drafting of sensible and appropriate proposals for our village over the next fifteen years. I have lived in Angmering for more than twenty five years and I understand the importance of maintaining the character of the village, which I think the plan seeks to preserve and enhance in just the right way. It is a pity that those in charge at Arun District Council do not appear to view our village and its residents in same sympathetic light. Thank you for all the hard work.</i>		

COMPLAINTS not relating to the Plan but to the overall development situation

Page No.	Para	Code	Comment	Action by SG	Plan Amended
		PR12	It is a shame the larger development proposals have been accepted/approved by the District Council rather than a common sense approach.		N/A
		PR13	Yes very much BUT why hasn't this been agreed before ADC agreed to 370 plus houses being built. That was agreed within a few days! We were present at that meeting in the Civic Centre Council Offices. Sue Ware was devastated as we all were. So much hardwork!		N/A
		PR33	It is unfortunate that Arun District Council has decided to push ahead with their plans for another large housing development in Angmering against the wishes of the majority of residents and ahead of both their Local Plan and the Angmering Neighbourhood Plan. It is therefore even more to the credit of the remaining volunteers for soldiering on during what must have been a very disheartening time. Especially as most people I have spoken to regard Localism as a lost cause and doubt the effectiveness of the Neighbourhood Plan as far as Angmering is concerned. WELL DONE again APC let's hope Arun takes note.		N/A
		PR58	What action can be taken to reduce/remove Arun DC's current & totally unacceptable intentions for the Parish & is there any possibility that they will listen to any local views or concerns. Certainly, on past performance it is somewhat dubious.		N/A
		PR63	It is very disappointing that Arun has decided to let the developers get their way for some of the planned development in Angmering without any infrastructure agreement usually provided by the builders (see Weavers Hill develops have returned).		N/A
		PR49	It is just such a shame that it comes too late to influence the terrible decision made by ADC to build 600 houses on the east side of Roundstone Lane !!!!		N/A
		PR53	It is most unfortunate that ADC's recent approval of the development to the east of Roundstone Lane rides roughshod over the expressed preferences of the village population and makes a mockery of the planning policies laid down in the neighbourhood plan. The excellent work alone by those producing the plan has been sadly ignored.		N/A

RESPONSES TO BE REFERRED TO A COMMUNITY ACTION PLAN

Page No.	Para	Code	Comment	Action by SG	Plan Amended
		PR3	The play areas for children in the north end of the village are very poor compared to the south end, and the surface is not so safe either. I think there is a need for challenging play equipment for the older kids (less likely to be damaged if it provides challenging play) as well as suitable safe play on a suitable ground surface for younger kids.	Agreed.Responsibility of ADC.	
		PR3	Also in the north end of the village: would love there to be a facility to use for pre-schoolers and their parents/carers, such as exists in the village centre (church hall and village hall) and in the south (community centre) William Older Playgroup kindly plan to allow me to use their facility in the evenings for parents relationship-skills sessions (Let's Stick Together by the charity Care for the Family) but there is no available daytime venue. I have been the Tots-in-Tow Playgroup for the village community for four years now (Cllr Sylvia Verrinder has seen the group in action) and would love to move it to the north end of the village to benefit the community there, should a facility become available as part of the wider provision. Perhaps a room earmarked for younger families within a youth centre and near to an outside playground.		
			In regard to traffic management, I'm not sure I agree with some of the conclusions in the draft document. I live, and have lived, in North Drive for 27 years. I'm probably one of the longest residents in this road. I've lived with traffic in this part of the World for some significant time and can tell you that without the existing traffic management in Angmering that I'm sure where we live would be significantly worse than it currently is. To conclude the current management systems don't work is too final. I do accept however things could do with improving.		
			I'm not convinced that "dualing" the A259 between Station Rd and the Angmering by-pass (East of "Haskins") on its own or as the <i>prime</i> measure is the final solution to our traffic problems.		

17

PR25

<p>The key to resolving traffic problems is traffic flow management. Our problems stem directly from the transient flow of traffic from the historical (and continued) growth of Littlehampton and the inhabitants thereof needs to get to the A24 to head North or for traffic to head East (in the morning and clearly the opposite in the evening) and the poor management of it.</p>		
<p>When Bramley Green was built it was something of a falsehood marvel that Angmering would get a by-pass which would go some way to resolving the ever increasing traffic problem. Trouble was, and WSCC knew this, the by-pass was built on the wrong side of Angmering (because of the previously alluded transient traffic need) and so our problems in Angmering were never going to diminish.</p>	AGREE	
<p>For Angmering to be a trouble free traffic zone, the by-pass should have always been built in the Black Ditch corridor with a new junction built on the A27 and if there is ever consideration of a further relief road for Angmering (and it has to be said for benefit of all those folk wanting to get north/south from/to Rustington and Littlehampton), then this is where the by-pass should be sited</p>		
<p>In its current form, the existing by-pass will always fail to deliver what the residents of Angmering really want, not only because it's on the wrong side of Angmering but also because of the poor flow management off the by-pass. Why? Because those that use the by-pass cannot get off onto the A259 quick enough... the waiting time to come off the by-pass onto the A259 (at the "Chips-away" roundabout) is glacial. Therefore, drivers use Angmering as a cut through. To put that right, you need a serious traffic management system not only at the "Chips-away" roundabout, but also more enforcement and traffic calming (not less) within Angmering.</p>		
<p>As a resident of North Drive, I would also press for an "Access only" and "No Motor Vehicles – Except for Access" at the north end of north of North Drive because if you witness the end of the day rush-hour in this road you will see it can become a "rat-run".</p>		

			There would be no need for such signs at the south end of North Drive because transient traffic isn't a problem at the beginning of the day		
17+		PR51	In relation to transport, A259 improvements only serve to help those by-passing Angmering and not Angmering itself as Angmering traffic would still have to join/exit onto this road. I would therefore propose that any large developments exit off Roundstone Lane have entry/exit only onto the A280 or have an exit onto the A280 and Roundstone Lane but are not permitted to turn north onto Roundstone Lane.		
18		PR51	Has raised cobbling (in keeping with the historical feel of Angmering) been considered as a way of slowing traffic through the village?		
19	3.57	PR55	"an exit should be made onto the A280". I agree, There could <u>also</u> be an entrance for northbound traffic. Suitable traffic calming within the housing area would prevent this becoming a rat-run.		

19	3.58	PR 5	<p>One issue which you seem to have identified perfectly, is that the system of traffic calming installed just outside the Village does not work. As one of the four or five properties sandwiched between the chicanes (pinch points) of Mill Road & the Village Hall, we find ourselves having to run the gauntlet, on a daily basis, of drivers (particularly those heading south) who seem to have developed a "Red Mist Syndrome" and, who on passing the Village Hall, heading south towards Littlehampton, put their foot down, and seem to want to reach ridiculous speeds, blasting their way through to assert their right of way on the next chicane. Having lived most of our lives with daily experience of the M25/M1 and other major routes, we find the behaviour of some drivers appalling. The pavement (there is only one as you round the bend) is so narrow, that it is sometimes not possible for pedestrians to pass in opposite directions without someone stepping into the road. Elderly people and children going to school are 'on offer' at rush-hour times. Uncut roadside vegetation exacerbates the problem. We were aware of the traffic calming measures, before we bought. But, we were a little surprised to find that far from calming, the system is positively an incitement to bad driving habits. We are situated right next to the chicane closest to Mill Road. Every morning, and evening, at busy times we have to put up with car horns, and at times abusive language, as drivers give no quarter to 'the opposition' (another road user coming the other way). We have personally been on the receiving end of abusive gestures, just for having the audacity of slowing down (whilst indicating) to turn into our own driveway!</p> <p>SUGGESTION: Some Concealed Entrance signs on the southbound carriageway, might be useful.</p>		
19	3.62	PR48	<p>There are a wide range of views about buses. A particular concern is buses operating on unsuitable residential roads (road less than 6m wide)</p>		
20	3.66-3.71	PR14	<p>Footpaths and Pavements: SUGGESTION: In Mayflower Park there is a "Public Footpath". Please will you for safety sake put a cycle lane beside it as it is, its dangerous, as bikes seem to think they have the right to fly through, regardless of people walking their dogs etc.</p>		
20	3.66-67	PR48	<p>Footways and Footpaths must be enhanced.</p>		

22		PR25	In regard to water management I see little or no consideration of this topic. Year on year we hear that fresh water is a dwindling resource, yet year on year we find more houses are being developed. Most if not all the water we consume in Angmering comes from the South Downs' aquifer. This means we are reliant solely on rainfall. If it doesn't rain, our water will run out because we all draw upon the aquifer.		
			We are familiar with "hose-pipe bans"... but why should we be? More houses without further water provision will inevitably lead to continuous water rationing, and who wants that as a way of life? This really is a case of "you can't get a quart out of a pint pot". If you want "hose pipe-bans" to become an ever-present factor of life in Angmering, then build more houses.		
			Whatever the future of planning in this part of Sussex, serious and deep thinking must be given to the absolute basic need of life – water.		
27	3.105	PR38 - Environment Agency	We note that para 3.105 refers to an Environment Agency project to address flooding within Parish boundaries and to improve flood defences. The project is known as the "Angmering Flood Alleviation Scheme" and the Parish Council have been involved in meetings. The project is still at an early stage but it is worth highlighting that any outputs will likely require some external funding before construction. Therefore this may be something your NP may choose to support.	Environment Agency project name "Angmering Flood Alleviation Scheme" has been referenced in the Plan. This feedback comment has also been included in the Community Action Plan as discussions on external funding	
36		PR48	Table bottom of page: Need in village is for, say, half of the parking spaces to be 30 minutes only and robustly enforced.		
	General Comment	PR56	Can we update the terrible playground In Palmer Road?		
56	CLW2	PR24	In relation to CLW2, page 56, will the policy prevent a developer's contribution being used for the provision of a play area or similar, but elsewhere in the district and outside the parish?		
57	7.20	PR48	This provides NPPF support to increasing school choice. The need for a non secular school in the south east of Angmering.		
58	7.23	PR48	There has been a failure to recognise the accommodation impact of development.		

60+		PR56	What about disabled access in the Core Retail Areas.		
62	ER1	PR30	Last bullet point: ".....currently <u>relied upon</u> by" How is this to be measured?		
63	8.18	PR24	In some cases powerful arguments have been overlooked. For instance, much is being made of traffic congestion both on the A259 and what may be expected from more vehicles serving new developments, but, and unless I have missed something, no mention is made of the environmental impact of the increased levels of pollution from such vehicles, except in passing in #8.18. An opportunity missed?		
General Comment		PR20	ADC needs to push for extra parking in the centre of the village for businesses to survive		
65+		PR44	A very full comprehensive plan. 1) What if Arun DC decided not on the identified need for 100 houses but impose 500 or 600 on this parish? 2) with ever increasing volume of traffic, what if the highways agency fail to impose limits on the size and weight of HGV's now coming from the by-pass through the village centre and on to the A259. Is there nothing that Angmering PC can do about that?		
65		PR48	Table at top: I would like to see the objective extended to say "Improve footpaths and cycleways and oppose unnecessary closures".	got a point but we know the feeling over the loss of Pagetts Crossing -	
65		PR24	I was also disappointed that in relation to Traffic and Movement policies seem to focus solely on requirements stemming from new developments. I believe the local plan could and should identify more fully aspects of the existing infrastructure that would benefit from improvement, independent of new developments. Concern is expressed for road users other than motorists and the desire to have people use other than motor cars for their journeys. Accordingly, there should be greater emphasis on improving the safety of pedestrians and cyclists. Why is there no proposal for a 20MPH limit to be introduced throughout all internal routes within the parish? Equally, maybe more people would cycle if there were dedicated cycle lane?. Simple low cost proposals that put people before cars, perhaps that could be developed as a key theme?		

66	TM 1	PR 4	Some issues such as speeding traffic through the village shouldn't have to wait for any sort of plan, this problem is evident every day, especially in the mornings, the speed limit being 20mph and even the simple solution of asking the police to set up a mobile speed camera in the square occasionally would make a massive difference to this problem		
67	TM2	PR51	should consider "maintaining existing highway of special or historical importance in line with their original character". None of us wish to see Roundstone Lane or Dappers Lane changed to an urban road - they should be kept as country lanes.		
68	9.17	PR48	First bullet: Add to end "and are continuous"		
68	TM3	PR48	In first bullet change "convenience" to "convenience and connectivity".		
69	9.18	PR 3	Safe Routes to school/Traffic, three comments: First - the pavement on Station Road heading south out of village centre is very narrow and not safe, in case pupils are jostled or stumble on the kerb, especially on the bend where drivers accelerate up and out of the village centre. The secondary school acknowledges this section is not safe and advises pupils to divert into the Dell Estate as soon as possible. Secondly: crossing from the village square near the war memorial, to the pavement just outside the Lamb is not safe, my daughter aged 12 was knocked down (at low speed, and was not injured beyond bruising) on Monday 28th April 2014 on her way home from the Angmering school by a car on the school run. The cause was I believe the volume of traffic - a driver in a queue waiting to turn right waved her across the middle of the queue of cars, and a car that was coming up inside the queue in order to turn left collided with her as the driver wasn't expecting a child to pop out between queuing cars. Thirdly - is there a 'missing link' between Chantryfield Road and the BACK of St Margaret's School, that would avoid the dangerous stretch of Arundel Road where children (who are often encouraged to scoot to school) fly along the pavement with no barrier or verge between them and cars, who can be impatiently trying to zoom past the school run traffic jam.		
69	9.18	PR18	There is still NO SAFE ROUTE to the Primary Schools. - AGREED		
69	9.21	PR48	Why can't all parking be of restricted duration with half of it restricted to 30 minutes. It must be robustly enforced.		

75	EH7	PR51	and pathways of historical importance should be protected (e.g.. Cow Lane)		
84	HA2	PR10- Hargreaves	Site Allocation - field in Mayflower Way: - Having regard to Mayflower Way being unadopted, clarification is needed as to who will maintain Mayflower Way which currently provides access to the commercial land to the north and leisure uses to the west.		
85	11.3	PR48	Surely it is much more likely that general parking could be provided on this site if the site has a non residential use.		
		PR8	Suggestions: However, there is one major matter which the Plan does not address and that is the provision of public toilets in the centre of the village. This should be near the top of the priority lists for new amenities.		N/A
		PR21	Suggestions: A259 must be widened		N/A
		PR21	Suggestions:: The needs to be signs from By-Pass & Station Roundabout - Angmering Village Only NO HGV		N/A
		PR22	Suggestions: The issue regarding a Roundstone Lane/A280 Link Road is now rather constrained by planning permission having been granted for the Barrett's, JVPlants and VHB Sites. The only access possible now is through the Rugby Club should this be taken into consideration?		N/A
		PR31	An appendix listing all the organisations, activities, and specific programmes that are currently supported by the Parish Council on behalf of, and for the benefit of, the residents. There are general references in the Plan but, in the main they are described in terms of aims and objectives for the future whereas, in fact, a great deal is already being done. Including details of the Parish Council's achievements, would emphasise the vital role of the Council in developing, supporting and sustaining the lives of all who live and work in Angmering.		N/A
		PR39	Suggestions: There should be provision for public toilets somewhere in the village!		N/A
		PR41	I feel very anxious that the prospects for retention of a village ambiance are made harder by the actions of the District Council and I would propose that a priority should be to demand improved and adequate infrastructure as identified by the Plan and this should be pursued actively by every village council, organisation and society.		N/A

		PR41	Suggestions: The Plan has more than recognised so many of the issues of concern to residents and I suggest that it is the instrument by which we can address the issue of bringing together the residents of all parts of the village into a cohesive community. I applaud the Plan's commitment "to deliver education, health and open space, leisure and play provision for a growing community, both young and old." How to encourage participation/use and include those villagers living on the outer peripheries who look elsewhere for entertainment, work, and leisure? How to bring the elderly and disabled away from isolation and loneliness?		N/A
		PR56	Comment & Request: Can we look at getting public toilets re-instated please?		N/A
		PR46	Suggestions: We are concerned that DAPPERS LANE, the only truly rural approach to the recreational areas of Angmering Park and the South Downs National Park should remain very much as it is now and has been for hundreds of years. The possible prospect of some development to the East Side of Dappers Lane may lead to consideration of improvements ????? possibly urbanisation of the Lane to accommodate more traffic - with footpaths, street lighting etc., which would we consider to be a total disaster and would destroy forever the charm and idyllic nature of the last remaining rural approach to the area North of the A27, used very frequently by walkers including very many children, cyclists, equestrians and others who are protected to a large degree, by its winding nature which is a deterrent against speeding traffic on this ancient thoroughfare.		N/A
		PR52	Suggestions: What a lot of good work has gone into Neighbourhood Plane. Roads around village A259 & A27 totally inadequate without further building. A lot of mention is made of the A259 but we are bounded other side by A27 which particularly travelling West is abysmal.		N/A
		PR59	It is very slow to join the A259 from the Bramley Green Estate at the Roundstone Roundabout already. Many more car movements from the intended HSG Devs will make it even more difficult. The By-pass is already underused. Further HSG Devs create problems for the		N/A
		PR60	Concerned about traffic - can be difficult getting off bramley green estate due to long queues on A259. By-pass is underused and will not have any connection to new development, so traffic will join the current congested roads. No new employment locally, so traffic increase is inevitable. Medical facilities - increases in population will put severe strain on resources very difficult to get appointments now.		N/A

		PR61	The greatest concern is the health hazard of pollution and the lack of adequate hospital facilities for any more buildings. The roads will be gridlocked. Having some contribution to dualing the A259 doesn't address the problem as it won't be enough money to do it. If it was done, we are back to pollution.		N/A
		PR63	The "rat run" through the village should be stopped. It needs humps in the road to reduce speeds to 20mph (as in West Worthing !). The A259 should be a dual carriageway.		N/A
		PR64	Suggestions: Arun has allowed the developers to get their way. The Schools won't cope. The Roads Won't cope. Flooding will happen! The Doctors won't cope. You need to insist that there will be a link road from the by-pass to any Roundstone Lane development, but I don't expect that will happen! I AM CROSS, ANGRY, FED-UP and considering our future in the VILLAGE TOWN - SAVE ANGMERING VILLAGE.		N/A
		PR36	The plan discusses air pollution but there is no mention about NOISE POLLUTION. In a recent effort by the BBC Horizon Programme regarding the flooding of Angmering over the last two years, they found they could not produce any recording due to the excessive traffic noise from 8am to 9:30am in the village centre. Filming and recording of Angmering had to be made from Highdown Hill and others points away from the centre.		N/A