

<u>Comment Ref #</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Postcode</u>	<u>Response No</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Policy reference</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Y</u>	<u>U</u>
1	Resident	RH17 6TX	NP1	I do agree with most of the plan. However, I do not think we need quite as many houses, it's a lot for the village and school to cope with.	3				
2	Resident	RH17 6TX	NP1	The school does need more space, whatever happens.	10	1			
3	Resident	RH17 6UQ	NP2	I support the plan only if green sites are protected, ie Butchers Field	6	1			
4	Resident	RH17 6UP	NP3	A doctors surgery is a very good idea	12			1	
5	Resident	RH17 6UP	NP3	Allotments in more than one location would be good	7				
6	Resident	RH17 6UP	NP3	Access to Wakehurst via a cycle path or footpath would be a bonus	26				
7	Resident	RH17 6UP	NP3	Habitat to encourage wildlife in areas not designated for housing	4				
8	Resident	RH17	NP4	I support the reintroduction of a doctors surgery	12			1	
9	Resident	RH17	NP4	I support the inclusion of local green spaces as listed	6				
10	Resident	RH17	NP4	Housing development must be limited to retain the character of the village. Standgrove may be preferable to Butchers Field but I don't support either of these options	3				
11	Resident	RH17 6UN	NP5	Standgrove Field is the obvious site for additional housing as it is adjacent to existing housing and access to the site would be easy. Housing on Butchers Field is not an option, the road is too narrow and it would completely ruin the character of the village.	3	1			
12	Resident	RH17 6RT	NP6	I think this is a well prepared document for which we must be thankful for all the effort that has gone into it's production. I think the result and recommendations are the right way forward for the village.	No-action Comment			1	
13	Resident	RH17 6RU	NP7	Ardingly needs more houses, although new houses by the College will increase traffic to and from the primary school. Anyone living by the College with a car will drive to Haywards Heath, rather than the village to shop.	3			1	
14	Resident	RH17 6TS	NP8	The proposals for the development of either Butchers Field or Standgrove should not be allowed due to the environmental reasons well publicised, with the large majority of village parishioners against these schemes. Likewise the 'Sweetshop Field' behind the old Hapstead Garage should not be considered. Probably the only site which would least affect the village is the SEAS land north of the Recreation Ground. However, any development in the Parish cannot be supported by the local infrastructure, water supply, sewerage disposal, schools, traffic considerations.	3		1		

15	Resident	RH17 6RU	NP9	I feel of the sites originally chosen Standgrove Field would be the most likely to gain approval as Butchers Field opens onto a very narrow lane. The proposal of smaller units 2 & 3 bedrooms rather than 5 & 6 bedrooms would help the younger people of the village.	3			1	
16	Resident	RH17 6UF	NP10	As long as the housing plan is carried out sympathetically (as it appears it will be) I agree that the field at Standgrove is logically the obvious choice, as for as access, etc is concerned. I would value assurance that the site will not be extended and the builders cannot increase the number of houses on the field or beyond. It is important to cater for the needs of young people who need a first home and affordable housing in general.	3			1	
17	Resident	RH17 6SN	NP11	No comments made	NCM			1	
18	Resident	RH17 6SB	NP12	The proposal to build 27 houses in Standgrove Field is going to cause considerable problems to the already dangerous College Road. It will also cause problems with water supply and power which already suffers from time to time in this area. The sewage farm (access adjacent to proposed building site) is already overflowing and has had to resort to dumping excess elsewhere. This is mainly owing to that collected from the Showground we think this present infrastructure, especially drainage, would be unable to cope.	3		1		
19	Resident	RH17 6SB	NP12	In general terms if the Council grant permission for this development it will endanger the surrounding fields and woods to further development, leading to loss of the individuality of Ardingly with boundaries disappearing between Lindfield, Haywards Heath and Ardingly resulting in a large suburban sprawl with all character of a country village lost.	3				
20	Resident		NP13	I thoroughly support this plan.	No-action Comment			1	
21	Resident	RH17 6SA	NP14	It would be a great shame to put any buildings on the Standgrove Field. It would completely destroy the beautiful green entrance into Ardingly from the south side. It would also create more traffic into College Road, which is already a nightmare.	3				1
22	Resident	RH17 6SA	NP14	That field is a haven for wildlife, where I've seen deer, numerous butterflies, birds, especially barn owls.	8				
23	Resident	RH17 6SA	NP14	Houses there would adversely effect the infrastructure as already every time we have heavy rain, water floods in a river down College Road.	27				
24	Resident	RH17 6SA	NP14	Ardingly is one of a very few small villages left and building development here would create a president for other landowners to sell their land to developers.	3				

25	Resident	RH17 6UJ	NP15	I am writing to give support to Policy 3 and the proposed allocation of residential development on Standgrove Field.	3			1	
26	Resident	RH17 6UJ	NP15	I notice that Policy 3 states only 2 and 3 bedroom houses to be built and I feel that this would be rather restrictive for larger families seeking more accommodation.	5				
27	Resident	RH17 6UJ	NP15	I strongly support the protection of land at Butchers Field, Street Lane from development through its identification as a Local Green Space under Policy 6. This field provides an important outlook over the surrounding countryside from Street Lane and reinforces the rural character of our village. I also feel that a development accessed from Street Lane would cause a serious road hazard and put the safety of children traveling to and from school at risk.	6				
28	Resident	RH17 6UJ	NP15	I am pleased to see and support the recognition which is given in the Neighbourhood Plan to the important role played by key local employers and attractions in the village, in particular Wakehurst Place, the South of England Showground and Ardingly College. All of these support the village and contribute to its unique character.	21, 22, 23				
29	Resident	RH17 6GQ	NP16	Improvement to the pavements along High Street, would make pedestrian access to shops and amenities more attractive.	27			1	
30	Resident	RH17 6AN	NP17	I am relieved to hear that some valued green spaces are to be protected under the Neighbourhood Plan.	6			1	
31	Resident	RH17 6AN	NP17	If we have to have 27 new homes in the village then the Standgrove field is the most suitable site.	3				
32	Resident	RH17 6UR	NP18	I have reservations that homes will be kept for those with local connections in the future. How can it be guaranteed?	3	1			
33	Resident	RH17 6UR	NP18	Parking availability is a key problem in Ardingly now and is getting worse - also speeding and dangerous drivers how do not observe the 30 MPH now!	19				
34	Resident	RH17 6UR	NP18	The Scout Hut cannot just be moved easily - it is more complicated.	11				
35	Resident	RH17 6TY	NP19	No comments made	NCM			1	
36	Resident	RH17 6TD	NP20	No comments made	NCM			1	
37	Resident	RH17 6UJ	NP21	What we need is an early morning bus service to Haywards Heath Station to cater for commuters as well as evening buses back in the evening.	27			1	
38	Resident	RH17 6RT	NP22	The Ardingly Neighbourhood Plan states that twenty seven houses should be built to meet our village quota. This figure should not be exceeded.	3	1			
39	Resident	RH17 6RT	NP22	Of the several sites put forward for building on, the land north of Standgrove Place presents the fewest problems regarding access, drainage, loss of countryside views.	3				

40	Resident	RH17 6RT	NP22	Butchers Field is designated as an area of outstanding natural beauty and should remain so.	6				
41	Resident	RH17 6RT	NP22	I think Ardingly could embrace 27 new homes but careful planning of traffic should be started immediately so our lovely village does not loose its identity.	18				
42	Resident	RH17 6RT	NP23	We are both very much in favour of what we have seen of the plan. We are very grateful for all the hard work which has been put into the plan and it's presentation.	No-action Comment			1	
43	Resident	RH17 6RT	NP23	We would like to think that in the housing development (we are strongly in favour of the Standgrove Field option) there could be some provision for those who, like ourselves are considering "downsizing", but do not want to leave the village.	3				
44	Resident	RH17 6RT	NP23	At present there is very little suitable accommodation available. Ideally we would like to see reasonably spacious 2 bedroom flats or apartments. Any hope?	5				
45	Resident	RH17 6SA	NP24	No comments made	NCM			1	
46	Resident	RH17 6RT	NP25	If the proposal for 27 new homes in the village is adopted, then adequate off road parking must be provided in that area.	3 & 19			1	
47	Resident	RH17 6TY	NP26	The area proposed for housing development - Standgrove Field was brought by the College for a playing field - not for any other purpose. College finances should not be a concern of village residents.	3	1			
48	Resident	RH17 6TY	NP26	27 more houses would mean more cars on an already very busy road which has to cope with College traffic, Hanson lorries and other heavy vehicles, plus Police and Ambulance at speed.	18				
49	Resident	RH17 6TY	NP26	Has the village school the capacity to cope with the extra children? More car journeys would be created to get children to the school or elsewhere if necessary.	10				
50	Resident	RH17 6TY	NP26	Village shops are limited - three are empty premises at present.	15				
51	Resident	RH17 6TY	NP26	Bus service is poor, which means new houses would create more car journeys for shopping and employment.	27 & 18				
52	Resident	RH17 6TY	NP26	A new GP surgery was proposed for the village by the John Stuart Nursing Trust to include three affordable rented apartments a few years ago. This was rejected by the Parish Council and Attlee Cottage had to be sold.	12				
53	Resident	RH17 6TY	NP26	In the last 10 years, development at Hett Close and infill has already created a considerable number of new homes in the village.	3				

54	Resident	RH17 6TJ	NP27	Footpaths in the village need attention and Little London is part of the village, but the path from the main gates of the Showground to Tillingshurst Lane are very bad indeed - non existent in places.	27			1	
55	Resident	RH17 6UQ	NP28	We are fully supportive of the proposal to designate Butchers Field as a protected area of green space ...	6			1	
56	Resident	RH17 6UQ	NP28	and for the small scale and sympathetic building activity on the Standgrove site at some point in the future.	3				
57	Resident	RH17 6UQ	NP28	Ardingly's road infrastructure and very limited facilities do not make it suitable for larger scale development within the Neighbourhood Plan period of regard and we hope that the recommendations made within it are approved.	3 & 27				
58	Resident	RH17 6TD	NP29	I am very much in favour of the plan and appreciate all the thought and work that has gone into it.	No-action Comment			1	
59	Resident	RH17 6TD	NP29	I believe the Standgrove site is the best site for new housing as it has good access, is a small continuation of an existing built up area and is close to village amenities.	3				
60	Resident	RH17 6TD	NP29	Reducing the number of houses proposed for this site to 27 will enable green space to be kept in front of the existing houses (or most of them)	6				
61	Resident	RH17 6TD	NP29	I believe the plan will protect the rural areas of the village and will make it an even more attractive place in which to live.	4 & 6				
62	Resident	RH17 6SB	NP30	It is unclear to me not sure why the PC has sent out only 2 forms for people to complete. In effect all policies other than that relating to traffic are to be considered together, no double having the desired effect that people will simply tick the Yes box, thus allowing the housing proposal to skip through. There should be either one form for the whole lot or 27 so that people consider each policy in isolation.	All		1		
63	Resident	RH17 6SB	NP30	The vision laid out in the Plan is centered entirely round the High Street & Street Lane. It may well be that historically this was the village, but I think we should consider the village as it now stands in 2013, extending as it does to the East and the South.	2				
64	Resident	RH17 6SB	NP30	The fact that Ardingly College is a local business seems pretty irrelevant to me. Although it employs several hundred people, very few actually live in the village so that it can hardly be called a 'major local employer'. Giving up Standgrove Field looks increasingly like offering the sacrificial cow on the altar of the College.	3				

65	Resident	RH17 6SB	NP30	I find it interesting that the photo used on page 29 to illustrate Standgrove Field shows the field from the southern end, facing the row of houses at Lodgelands, rather than the more obvious one, taken from the north showing the glorious and extensive views to the Downs!	3				
66	Resident	RH17 6SB	NP30	Finally, how about using all 4 sites, allowing 5-8 houses on each so that the growth looks organic and there is no large estate.	3				
67	Resident	RH17 6TE	NP31	Thank you for the enormous work that has been invested in developing this plan. Please can allotments have increase priority?	7	1			
68	Resident	RH17 6TE	NP31	There seems to be enormous pressure on parking in the village and I fear that this might jeopardize the implementation of traffic calming.	19				
69	Resident	RH17 6TE	NP31	Would it be possible in the new building development to also build some garaging for sale/rent to local residents?	3				
70	Resident	RH17 6TE	NP31	Better public transport links to Haywards Heath to access health care and entertainment.	27				
71	Resident	RH17 6TE	NP31	Shops/business needs greater support. If the shops are limited the temptation is to drive elsewhere. There is a 'critical mass' of shops needed to prevent shopping outside the village. Currently there is a serious lack of fruit, vegetables, hardware and gifts.	15				
72	Resident	RH17 6RS	NP32	Having identified need for 27 homes why can't the building of these be phased between now and 2031?	3	1			
73	Resident	RH17 6SB	NP33	Standgrove Field - The sewage works in the fields through Lodgelands cannot cope with the present pressures from the Showground, without more houses on the doorstep	3 & 27	1			
74	Resident	RH17 6SB	NP33	Standgrove Field - The old problem, traffic and speed.	18				
75	Resident	RH17 6SB	NP33	Standgrove Field - Due to the fact that the College have closed the above field to walkers, the area has become the most wonderful natural area for all flora and fauna with owls, deer, badgers, etc and wild flowers. It is heartbreaking to see this go, it has not been a playing field for years.	4				
76	Resident	RH17 6SB	NP33	Middle Field or Butchers Field not Standgrove please	3				
77	Resident	RH17 6TU	NP34	The word 'vital' with regard to the College is not appropriate	3		1		
78	Resident	RH17 6TU	NP34	380 employers do not all live in the Parish, therefore it is not relevant	3				
79	Resident	RH17 6TU	NP34	The academic record of the College is also not relevant.	3				
80	Resident	RH17 6TU	NP34	It is critical that any landowner that benefits from development gives something back to the village.	3				
81	Resident	RH17 6UB	NP35	First - Sandgrove Field, second - Middle Lodge - not Butchers Field	3			1	
82	Resident	RH17 6TY	NP36	I am impressed - this pre-submission plan appears to be a comprehensive appraisal of what this village is, where it has evolved from and most importantly, where it is going.	2			1	

83	Resident	RH17 6TY	NP36	The success of any mission, owes much to the planning and the depth of analysis is evident in this document suggests that Ardingly is in with (at least) a chance of developing into a cohesive village. (Although it is accepted that hopes of total consensus in any social unit are unlikely to be fully realised)	3				
84	Resident	RH17 6TY	NP36	One thing strikes me, the reference to a doctors surgery with a population of 127,328 it seems odd that Ardingly is ? Surgery. Bonkers. How big is a doctors practice? 12,000 to 14,000? Seems we have space for several surgeries let alone NONE!	12				
85	Resident	RH17 6UQ	NP37	We are delighted to find that Butchers Field along with the Sweetshop Field have been designated or allocated as Local Green Space. In regard to Butchers Field, during the very early morning throughout the summer we have heard owls quartering the field looking for breakfast in the lovely long grass.	6			1	
86	Resident	RH17 6UQ	NP37	and also that the gap between Hapstead and Ardingly has been recognised as special.	2				
87	Resident	RH17 6UQ	NP37	We feel that the proposal of 27 homes being built on part of Standgrove Field is appropriate if they can be built with as little impact on the site and especially the woodland as possible.	3				
88	Resident	RH17 6UQ	NP37	There is so much in the Neighbourhood Plan we feel the Parish Council are to be congratulated for doing such an excellent job in its execution.	No-action Comment				
89	Resident	RH17 6UQ	NP37	Delighted to see something being done about speeding and traffic generally in the village and through it. (refers to Traffic Consultation I assume)	18				
90	Resident	RH17 6TD	NP38	Thanks to the Parish Council for all their hard work	No-action Comment			1	
91	Resident	RH17 6TD	NP38	We really like the creation of Local Green Spaces as per Policy 6 of the plan and we agree with the ones chosen	6				
92	Resident	RH17 6TD	NP38	It seems sensible to put forward Standgrove for housing as there is a road already in existence near this site. This is better than cutting through the countryside to make a new road.	3				
93	Resident	RH17 6UQ	NP39	I have not seen the plans and intend to view them on Friday 30th.	No-action Comment	1			

94	Resident	RH17 6UQ	NP39	My personal views are that housing should only be built on land with previous developments on. Lindfield has taken on a vast amount of housing, Cuckfield has a planning application for around 400 new homes. These villages are near enough to Ardingly. The village does not have amenities to support housing. The wider area does not have enough amenities to support more housing. Common sense is a good plan.	3				
95	Resident	RH17 6UQ	NP39	Street Lane (road to Balcombe) needs a cycle path or footway as it is hazardous and a speed limit.	18				
96	Resident	RH17 6RP	NP40	I think if we are to have more houses in Ardingly, we need more parking.	19	1			
97	Resident	RH17 6RP	NP40	I feel Butchers Field is out of the question, too much congestion, Standgrove would be preferable.	3				
98	Resident	RH17 6RP	NP40	I also think affordable homes should be for people who live in this area.	3				
99	Resident	RH17 6TD	NP41	Would a village mini bus be an asset to the community? (in France many villages have them and they are sponsored by and carry adverts for local business)	General comment	1			
100	Resident	RH17 6TD	NP41	Could parking in the Rec be enhanced? CCTV?	19				
101	Resident	RH17 6AN	NP42	I think it is important that the affordable housing is only offered to people with village connections in perpetuity.	3	1			
102	Resident	RH17 6AN	NP42	Fell very necessary to have a further car park in the village, especially as the traffic calming measures will reduce the present inadequate number of parking spaces.	19				
103	Resident	RH17 6TX	NP43	No comments made	NCM			1	
104	Resident	RH17 6TB	NP44	No comments made	NCM			1	
105	Resident	RH17 6TB	NP45	Since the plan has not been approved we haven't heard much information.	No-action Comment				1
106	Resident	RH17	NP46	In the Village Voice Summer 2013 Message from the Chairman , 3 potential location's had been made for housing development , these being Butchers Field , Stangrove and land south to Middle Lodge (I am the landowner). In the consultation report there is no mention of the land south of Middle Lodge being put forward for possible development or any mention of this land being available . It does state that the Ardingly Parish Council will be putting forward there approval for development on Stangrove Place .	3				1

107	Aerodrome Safeguarding for and on behalf of Gatwick Airport Ltd	RH6 ONP	NP47	Gatwick Airport Ltd are a statutory consultee and we would ask that any future development complies with aerodrome safeguarding requirements as detailed in ODPM/DfT Circular 01/2003 'Safeguarding Aerodromes, Technical Sites and Military Explosives Storage Areas: The Town & Country Planning (Safeguarded Aerodromes Technical Sites and Military Explosives Storage Areas) Direction 2002.	General comment				1
108	Aerodrome Safeguarding for and on behalf of Gatwick Airport Ltd	RH16 ONP	NP47	For example some of the matters that we would take into consideration are building design including heights, landscaping, water bodies and any other bird attractants, renewable energy with particular regard to wind turbines and large areas of solar panels. We are happy to work with yourselves, MSDC and developers at the early stages of any proposed developments to advise on aerodrome safeguarding requirements.	General comment				
109	Resident	RH17 6UP	NP48	No comments made	NCM			1	
110	Resident	RH17 6RT	NP49	No comments made	NCM			1	
111	Resident	RH17 6TU	NP50	Would still like to see houses on the Showground land fronting onto the recreation ground. This would actually improve the feel of the site - North side only - and an Ardingly housing association.	3			1	
112	Resident	RH17	NP51	Not very pleased about additional houses.	3		1		
113	Resident	RH17	NP51	Not enough shops in Ardingly to sustain more people.	15				
114	Resident	RH17 6SB	NP52	No comments made	NCM		1		
115	Resident	RH17 6RU	NP53	I don't agree with the building of more houses.	3	1			
116	Resident	RH17 6RU	NP53	The school is already full.	10				
117	Resident	RH17 6RU	NP53	We have problems with traffic in Ardingly and you are proposing to bring in more traffic. Will the traffic calming happen? I hope so.	18				
118	Resident	RH17 6RU	NP53	I support the policies, except the building proposal, we can do without that.	3				
119	Resident	RH17 6RP	NP54	The amalgamation of the College plan and the village plan is a good idea (as 3 possible plans is excessive), for housing on Standgrove Field.	3			1	
120	Resident	RH17 6RP	NP54	I hope affordable housing will not be whittled down.	3				
121	Resident	RH17 6UQ	NP55	I think Standgrove is the best site we have to build on, best for access, etc	3	1			
122	Resident	RH17 6UQ	NP55	I agree to the plan on the condition that the proposed green sites are protected!	6				
123	Resident	RH17 6TY	NP56	No comments made	NCM			1	
124	Resident	RH17 6TB	NP57	No comments made	NCM			1	
125	Resident	RH17 6TY	NP58	We are very supportive of the village plan and always have been. We believe the current Parish Council are doing a sterling job.	No-action Comment			1	
126	Resident	RH17 6SB	NP59	No comments made	NCM		1		

127	Resident	RH17 6UQ	NP60	I am broadly in agreement with the need to develop a limited number of houses over the next few years.	3			1	
128	Resident	RH17 6UQ	NP60	I am pleased and agree with the Parish Council about the greenfield site demarkation as they are important sites which preserve the village's character and beauty.	6				
129	Resident	RH17 6UQ	NP60	Their location also means that development is not suitable/sensible due to access and other environmental issues such as flooding as well as their importance as wildlife habitats and protecting ancient woodland.	4 & 6				
130	Resident	RH17 6TD	NP61	No comments made	NCM			1	
131	Resident	RH17 6TS	NP62	No comments made	NCM			1	
132	Resident	RH17 6UP	NP63	I have read with care the above pre-submission Plan and write to register my serious concerns on a number of issues. It is clear that a great deal of effort has gone into preparing a document which in general is both comprehensive and well founded, so it is all the more regrettable that the Plan is marred by a thoroughly misguided attempt, for political reasons, to allocate Standgrove Field as the only sustainable site to satisfy the housing needs of the Village over the Plan period, based on inaccurate and misleading information.	3		1		
133	Resident	RH17 6UP	NP63	The first duty of the Parish Council is to act in the best interest of local residents, not local landowners, as the consultation draft attempts to do. The choice of housing sites to meet local needs over the next 20 years is too important to be decided before all residents have been provided with an accurate and impartial assessment of the merits of both Standgrove Field and Butchers Field and any other sustainable site in order to make an informed judgment. The proposed allocation of Standgrove Field is in direct conflict with with the Council's stated Vision & Objectives for Environment, Local Economy, Housing, Transport and Community Services.	General comment				

134	Resident	RH17 6UP	NP63	It is inevitable that any housing development capable of satisfying the identified local housing needs of the Village over the Plan period can only be accommodated outside the present Village boundaries, ie, in the ANOB. Virtually all such land was or is part of the ancient assart field system dating from Norman times, including both Standgrove Field and Butchers Field. The ANP concedes that any development of Standgrove Field would be highly visible from College Road and the High Weald Landscape Trail but does not mention that the proposed Butchers Field development by comparison enjoys extensive screening by mature trees along most of the frontage to Street Lane and is screened from the South by the mature trees along the ridgeline forming the Southern boundary.	2				
135	Resident	RH17 6UP	NP63	The location of future housing in the Village is primarily a planning issue but in Ardingly the impact on the adjoining Area of Natural Beauty is also an important consideration. It is difficult therefore to reconcile the Parish Council's proposed allocation of Standgrove Field within the AONB Unit's summary response to the Standgrove Field planning application, which reads:- 'The proposed development is a sub-urban, cul de sac style typical residential development, that does not connect to any landscape objectives, does not relate to the historic character or local distinctiveness of Ardingly and does not respond to landscape character. It is 'bolted onto' and does not integrate with the village or rural area, and will not conserve and enhance the landscape of the High Weald'.	3				
135	Resident	RH17 6UP	NP63	In planning terms the reasons for advocating the allocation of Standgrove Field are seriously flawed. The Parish Council suggests that Standgrove Field could more suitably provide a reduced scheme of 27 two and three bedroomed homes to meet local needs. The present application however is for 37 mostly larger homes appealing to wealthy buyers. There is no public indication that the site owner is willing to reduce the size and content of its proposal.	3				
136	Resident	RH17 6UP	NP63	The Parish Council advises that the site owner is prepared to transfer part of the Standgrove Field site to them to provide a SANG (a Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace). Both Mid Sussex District Council and Natural England advised the site owner in 2012 that the available land offered for the purpose is insufficient to meet the requirements for a SANG.	4				
137	Resident	RH17 6UP	NP63	The suggestion by the Parish Council that the need for the College to realise development value from Standgrove Field is a justifiable reason for allocating Standgrove Field to the exclusion of other sites in the Village is misconceived. This important choice should be made on merit alone.	3				

138	Resident	RH17 6UP	NP63	The minutes of the meeting of the Neighbourhood Plan Committee of 30th July 2013 record that following the proposed allocation of Standgrove Field for 27 homes Neil Homer, the Council's consultant, recommended that other possible sites "should be protected" from development by being designated as Local Green Spaces. "Protection" in this context is nothing more than a device to prevent competitor sites from being properly considered, and no self-respecting Councillor, in the interest of the residents he or she serves, should be a party to any such artifice.	6				
139	Resident	RH17 6UP	NP63	Concerns about traffic volumes and excessive speeds, primarily in the High Street and College Road, have long featured as the issue that most concerns residents on grounds of noise, nuisance and safety. There are no practical measures which can be taken to reduce traffic volumes which will inevitably rise if Standgrove Field is developed for housing purposes, but suggestions which reinforce Ardingly's sense of identity can make through traffic more aware of the need to control speed and respect others.	18				
140	Resident	RH17 6UP	NP63	Standgrove Field is too far from the Village centre to support the Post Office, bakery and other businesses.	3 & 15				
141	Resident	RH17 6UP	NP63	Mothers and children will be faced with an uphill walk on narrow pavements of more than 500 metres, even further to the Primary School.	3 & 10				
142	Resident	RH17 6UP	NP63	Butchers Field is within easy walking distance of the Village Centre and a stone's throw from the Primary School and Recreation Ground. Its allocation will benefit a Local Hospice, First Time buyers living locally, provide a new Scout Hut and create space for another classroom at the Primary School.	3, 10 & 11				
143	Resident	RH17 6UJ	NP64	No comments made	NCM			1	
144	Resident	RH17 6UQ	NP65	No comments made	NCM			1	
145	Resident	RH17 6RT	NP66	I am not in favour of the development proposed at Butchers Field. This is a poor location for new homes, AONB, narrow lanes, poor visibility, drainage, etc.	3	1			
146	Resident	RH17 6RT	NP66	The Standgrove site is my preferred choice, provided a proper roundabout is built for vehicle flow, entry/exit and to slow traffic north and south bound into and out of Ardingly.	3 & 18				
147	Resident	RH17 6UR	NP67	No comments made	NCM			1	
148	Resident	RH17 6UQ	NP68	I support any development on Standgrove Field	3			1	
149	Resident	RH17 6UQ	NP69	No comments made	NCM			1	

150	Resident	RH17 6UQ	NP70	I am in full support of the Parish	No-action Comment			1	
151	Resident	RH17 6UQ	NP71	I feel that keeping Butchers Field unbuilt on should be because of the view of outstanding natural beauty and also woods next to it. I think it would be better to build in Standgrove Place also because this comes out onto a main road.	3			1	
152	Resident	RH17 6UQ	NP72	No comments made	NCM			1	
153	Resident	RH17 6UQ	NP73	No comments made	NCM			1	
154	Resident	RH17 6RP	NP74	Personally still feel that Butchers Field offers a better development outcome than Standgrove, because of position in village away from the busier College Road	3	1			
155	Resident	RH17 6QZ	NP75	Traffic speed must be reduced even for current levels, but especially for the new housing quota.	3 & 18			1	
156	Resident	RH17 6QZ	NP75	Parking opportunities must be addressed and more spaces provided safely	19				
157	Resident	RH17 6QZ	NP75	A "crossing" in the High Street and on College Road (top end) is necessary	18				
158	Resident	RH17 6UQ	NP76	My congratulations to the Parish Council and their consultants on an excellent plan full of merit on which I make comments which I trust will be of interest. Vision and objectives (p 23) seems admirable meeting the purpose of the Plan	No-action Comment	1			
159	Resident	RH17 6UQ	NP76	Policy 1 & 2 - agreed	1 & 2				
160	Resident			I agree with the approval to give planning permission for 27 houses on Standgrove Field especially as the owner, Ardingly College, has agreed to transfer the rear (east) part of the site to the Parish Council as a Natural Greenspace. I agree the conditions for the 'affordable houses' listed in Appendix C. I believe these houses will have 'the right to buy' and thus in 10 years time many, if not all, will be owner occupied and a cry for the need of some 'affordable houses' will be heard in the Parish	3				
161	Resident	RH17 6UQ	NP76	Whilst agreeing with this policy as it emphasises the Plan policy for Standgrove Field, I am a little concerned that land owners might feel that any planning application for housing development might meet with approval if they provided part of the site as a Natural Green Space.	4				
162	Resident	RH17 6UQ	NP76	Very important I agree	5				
163	Resident	RH17 6UQ	NP76	Agree that the 6 locations listed must be retained and any proposals for any development on the land must be strongly resisted.	6				
164	Resident	RH17 6UQ	NP76	Strongly agree	7				

165	Resident	RH17 6UQ	NP76	Most important I think	8				
166	Resident	RH17 6UQ	NP76	An important aspect of Ardingly that must be preserved.	9				
167	Resident	RH17 6UQ	NP76	Agreed. The Primary School has an excellent standard of education and is an outstanding part of Ardingly life and the sooner the Scout Hut is removed and the site becomes part of the School complex the better.	10				
168	Resident	RH17 6UQ	NP76	Knowing the history of the Scout Hut being on its present site only because at the time the County Council's policy was to close the village school and therefore the whole site was leased to the Scouts. Fortunately, the Managers fought against the County's proposal to such an extent that the County did a U-turn by closing the old school and replaced it by the present primary school at Holmans.	11				
169	Resident	RH17 6UQ	NP76	Whilst agreeing with the policy, I doubt whether the local Doctor's G.P's would implement the Plans policy.	12				
170	Resident	RH17 6UQ	NP76	I do not agree with the Plan proposal that the Sports Pavillion on the Recreation Ground should become a Community Centre. We have, I suggest, adequate Community buildings in Hapstead hall, Koorana Centre, St Peter's Centre and in addition Wakehurst Place and Ardingly Showground can be hired for Conferences, Wedding Receptions, individual and corporate parties, meetings of all kinds, etc. It was built as a Sports Pavilion for the accommodation of those using the Recreation Ground, ie, the Village Cricket and Football teams, and any other sports club or individual wishing to play games, the Village School for its annual Sports Day, a fete or fayre and other organisations or individual wishing to use the Recreation Ground. Use of the Pavilion as proposed would cause confusion of bookings, especially to the regular users of the ground. I think money spent on an extension as proposed in the Plan is totally unnecessary. Yes the facilities in the present pavilion need modernisation, and possibility of upgrading the front of the pavilion to improve the appearance of the building and use of it by seating and cover for the users of the building, players, their relatives and supporters and just visitors. But another Community Centre - No.	13				
171	Resident	RH17 6UQ	NP76	I agree with this policy except my comments of Policy 13	14				
172	Resident	RH17 6UQ	NP76	Strongly agree with this policy	15				
173	Resident	RH17 6UQ	NP76	Yes, I agree this policy with the added connection to the tourist attraction of Ardingly.	16				
174	Resident	RH17 6UQ	NP76	Agreed.	17				

175	Resident	RH17 6UQ	NP76	I thought Ardingly Traffic Appraisal was very good especially the proposed 20 m.p.h. through the village centre but had reservations on the suggestion of sculptures	18				
176	Resident	RH17 6UQ	NP76	A very difficult problem as stated in the policy: Parking in the High Street causes a problem which is offset by the fact that it reduces the speed of vehicles through the High Street, a good thing. With reference to the Car Park in Street Lane, although inadequate, I feel that it should be purchased from the Mid Sussex District Council as a Village asset but also to avoid any possibility in the future of the District Council imposing any charges on the car parking.	19				
177	Resident	RH17 6UQ	NP76	I agree the policy	20				
178	Resident	RH17 6UQ	NP76	Agreed	21				
179	Resident	RH17 6UQ	NP76	Agreed	22				
180	Resident	RH17 6UQ	NP76	Strongly agree the policy	23				
181	Resident	RH17 6UQ	NP76	Agreed, the Reservoir is a great asset to the Parish not only to its residents but many in the District and should be preserved and protected.	24				
182	Resident	RH17 6UQ	NP76	Strongly agree that Ardingly Station must be preserved for the future possibility of the Bluebell Railway's plan to reinstate the line from Horsted Keynes, Ardingly to Haywards Heath (to connect to the main London to South Coast lines)	25				
183	Resident	RH17 6UQ	NP76	Agreed	26				
184	Resident	RH17 6UQ	NP76	I think that as much funding as possible should be obtained from the Community Infrastructure Levy Fund. It might be premature but might the addition of 'British Legion Club as per policy 14' be added to the list of projects. My thinking is that within the next year the British Legion Club will cease to exist and then the obvious consequence is that the building becomes part of Hapstead Hall, that part that stands on Parish Council land should revert to the Council, that part on private land has now been purchased by the Legion Club and a purchase would be correct. The bar in the building could be used by organisations and individuals hiring the Hall requiring such a facility, the flat could be occupied by the Hapstead Hall caretaker or let to supplement the Hall's income. The building would make an ideal place for the Parish Council office and all its documents, etc. It might also provide accommodation for hiring by the Youth Club and other Youth organisations.	27				
185	Resident	RH17 6UQ	NP76	Appendix A - interesting but wished it had stated what form the referendum will take in order to obtain the highest possible response from the residents of Ardingly.	General comment				

186	Lynn C Wilson Chair of Governors St Peters Primary School	RH17	NP77	The Governors are mindful of the need for our village to continue to thrive into the future and that this will necessarily involve the provision of a variety of housing whether by modernisation of existing dwellings, by infill and/or new developments. The advantages and indeed disadvantages of such increases in the village population should of course be considered in light of many other factors, as detailed in the Draft Plan and in our view should, if approved, be coupled with due consideration to local facilities, particularly public transport, and shops.	3	1				
187	Lynn C Wilson Chair of Governors St Peters Primary School	RH17	NP77	With specific regard to the Primary School, we welcome the Plan's observations that the school has identified its needs to include the removal and replacement of the remote classroom, the probable expansion of the school in light of any new development's), the requirement for a green play-site adjoining the existing playground and, in conjunction with and recognising the Scouts' future requirements, the possible re-siting of the existing Scout Hut.	10 & 11					
188	Chris Owen Principle Planner WSCC	PO19 1RH	NP78	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 own website or that of the relevant Local Planning Authority.	10					1
188	Chris Owen Principle Planner WSCC	PO19 1RH	NP78	In relation to its 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. The County Council also recommends that its published service plans, for example Planning School Places, are taken into account.						

189	Chris Owen Principle Planner WSCC	PO19 1RH	NP78	Following a review of the Pre-Submission Neighbourhood Plan for Ardingly Parish, it has been decided to provide officer comments rather than submit a formal County Council response. Policy 20: Ardingly Rail Depot does however raise a strategic issue for the County Council in its role as Minerals Planning Authority, namely that the policy as currently worded could be prejudicial to the future development of the rail depot and hence its viability, because it places conditions on the transport impact of any future development which have not been tested for consistency with paragraph 32 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).	20				
189	Chris Owen Principle Planner WSCC	PO19 1RH	NP78	In the event of a further planning application for the rail depot, the proposals would be assessed for compliance with the NPPF and any other relevant, up to date policies. This would include consideration of its transport impacts in accordance with paragraph 32 of the NPPF. The County Council considers that any such applications together with associated planning conditions should be determined based on appropriate and up to date evidence once a planning application has been submitted. The Parish Council is therefore requested to review the wording of this policy and amend it as necessary to achieve conformity with paragraph 143 of the NPPF which requires the safeguarding of existing rail heads, storage, handling and processing facilities.					
190	Chris Owen Principle Planner WSCC	PO19 1RH	NP78	Given that the Pre-Submission Neighbourhood Plan for Ardingly Parish includes the proposed allocation of a small-scale housing site, 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 Neighbourhood Plan's proactive approach to allocating land for development, 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.	3				
191	Chris Owen Principle Planner WSCC	PO19 1RH	NP78	The County Council currently operates a scheme of charging for roads 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: www.westsussex.gov.uk/leisure/getting_around_west_sussex/roads_and_pathways/plans_and_projects/developments_control_for_roads/pre-application_charging_guide.aspx	3				

192	Resident	RH17 6TD	NP79	I feel the village must grow and develop in order to be 'healthy'. Different bands of housing must be provided, especially the lower end or those in need of 'shared' or the equivalent of 'council houses', ie social housing. There are plenty of upmarket housing for people who move into the village and don't want change!	3	1			
193	Resident	RH17 6TD	NP79	We would have no shops or Post Office if the village does not progress and grow in order to survive the village must expand.	15				
194	Resident	RH17 6RP	NP80	I am totally opposed to building on the scale outlined at Butchers Field and Standgrove Field. Some of the 8 'affordable' houses could easily be allocated in the heart of the village on a 'brownfield site' behind Victoria House, College Road. As more than 4 properties will be built at some point this site would lend itself to this. To start developing outside the village boundary, on green field sites is a dangerous precedent to set. It could well open the floodgates for further development in the future and the position adopted by MSDC should be supported.	3		1		
195	Resident	RH17 6TY	NP81	No comments made	NCM				1
196	Resident	RH17 6RY	NP82	I feel that Standgrove Field is an ideal situation for all types of housing (except 4 & 5 bedrooms) it is imperative that affordable housing for local people be included.	3			1	
197	Resident	RH17 6RY	NP82	A small roundabout in the entrance would act as traffic calming	18				
198	Resident	RH17 6RY	NP82	Allotments would be a great improvement for villagers financially and socially.	7				
199	Resident	RH17 6TE	NP83	We believe that the proposal to build on Standgrove Field is the logical and best solution. We would expect the entry to the proposed development to be off Standgrove and not College Road.	3			1	
200	Resident	RH17 6TE	NP83	Lorries and cars speed along College Road and entry/exit onto this road would be suicidal, someone would be bound to be badly injured if not killed.	3 & 18				
201	Resident	RH17 6TB	NP84	No comments made	NCM			1	
202	Resident	RH17 6UB	NP85	No comments made	NCM			1	
203	Resident	RH17 6TU	NP86	No comments made	NCM			1	
204	Resident	RH17	NP87	No comments made	NCM			1	
205	Resident	RH17 6TF	NP88	No comments made	NCM			1	

206	Iain Nicol South of England Agricultural Society	RH17	NP89	Having read it through thoroughly, I wanted to re-affirm on behalf of The South and England Agricultural Society that The South of England Showground is already subject to a Section 52 Agreement with Mid-Sussex District Council and a Premises Licence (see documents attached). As a result, we would like to make a formal request to Ardingly Parish Council to remove the section 'Policy 22: South of England Showground' from the Neighbourhood Plan as it is selective in its application, unnecessary and contrary to the overriding obligation to support local business, particularly as our activities are already restricted and governed by existing agreements and licences. We are concerned that there is no guarantee of it being objectively or fairly implemented in practice and could be used as a pretext to prevent any changes whatsoever, rather than working within the parameters that are already set out in the Section 52 Agreement and Premises licence.	22		1		
207	Iain Nicol South of England Agricultural Society	RH17	NP89	I wish to stress that the Society will continue to do everything in its power to mitigate noise and amenity issues. However, we do operate open air events (which have been going for 50 years) and therefore, some noise spillage beyond the site boundary may be an inevitable part of these activities. However, we will continue to consult with the Parish Council and local community in good faith and operate in accordance with the existing agreements and licences.	22				
207	Iain Nicol South of England Agricultural Society	RH17	NP89	Additional comments received: Suggested text for Policy 22: South of England Showground. The Neighbourhood Plan supports proposals to allow the South of England Showground to expand its range and style of operations to meet new and changing needs, to attract new inward investment and to meet the challenges relating to its primary focus of Agriculture, Education and Rural Business – especially local food.	22				
207	Iain Nicol South of England Agricultural Society	RH17	NP89	The Neighbourhood Plan recognizes that the South of England Agricultural Society operates under a Section 52 Agreement and Premises Licence under the governance of Mid-Sussex District Council which regulates the use of the Showground including the type of events that are permitted and environmental factors such as the use of public address systems and equipment. The Society will continue to comply with the prevailing terms of these agreements and will inform Ardingly Parish Council if any changes to these terms are sought in the future.	22				

207	Iain Nicol South of England Agricultural Society	RH17	NP89	I hope you agree that this makes it clear that The Society will operate within the current agreements, without adding any additional tier of controls or restrictions that are added separately to the Neighbourhood Plan. We are happy to leave clauses 4.62, 4.63, 4.64 and 4.65 intact which provide more detail in relation to the development needs of The Society and need to protect the rural environment.	22				
208	Lynne Standing Head of Housing, Environmental Health & Building Control MSDC	RH17	NP90	I am writing on behalf of Mid Sussex District Council to comment on Policy 3 and Appendix C of your Neighbourhood Plan, which relate to the allocation of affordable homes. Whilst your policy of requiring 30% of new homes to be affordable is acceptable, references to how those homes will be allocated is not appropriate in a planning document. I would therefore suggest that the first bullet point of Policy 3 be omitted, so that the second paragraph would read: "A site at Standgrove Field is allocated for up to 27 homes in the period 2013-2018, comprising 2 and 3 bed homes, of which 30% will be affordable homes, provided suitable land is provided within the site for a Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space, to the satisfaction of the local planning authority, to be transferred to the Parish Council or another agreed body, prior to the completion of the scheme."	3				1
209	Lynne Standing Head of Housing, Environmental Health & Building Control MSDC	RH17	NP90	The whole of Appendix C should be omitted. I appreciate that the parish council and local residents are concerned about the allocation of affordable homes, and want to ensure that local people benefit from these. I can give some reassurance on this front. Our normal allocation policy is to grant priority for 100% of first lettings of new developments to people from the village or town concerned. Councillors Snowling and Marsh, Claire Tester and I met in April with representatives of parish councils who may be bringing forward through their Neighbourhood Plans sites that are within the AONB or the South Downs National Park and we agreed in principle that, on such sites, additional priority should be given to local people so that they are prioritised for relets of 50% of those homes. This was endorsed by Scrutiny Committee on 11 September and now just needs to be formally approved by Councillor Snowling as the portfolio holder for affordable housing. I expect this to happen within the next week or two. I attach a copy of the report for your information. I believe Sarah Chapman attended that meeting for Ardingly PC. Fiona Rocks and Mick Brixey also expressed an interest, and I would be grateful if you could update them on this matter.	Appendix C				

210	Lynne Standing Head of Housing, Environmental Health & Building Control MSDC	RH17	NP90	Document attached with comments - Review of Rural Housing Allocations in the South Downs National Park & Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty.	Appendix C				
211	Paddy Jackman Director of Operations Ardingly College	RH17	NP91	I write in response to the public consultation on your emerging Neighbourhood Plan (NP) and have pleasure submitting the following comments to feed into this process. First of all I would like to put on record our thanks for the detailed considerations which the Neighbourhood Plan Group have undertaken to date in relation to the College's landholdings and interests and the time that the group have afforded to us during this process. The pre-submission plan is a testimony to a lot of hard work from the whole group and I am sure it has the basis to be a solid bedrock of planning policy for the village in many years to come.	No-action Comment	1			
212	Paddy Jackman Director of Operations Ardingly College	RH17	NP91	We are particularly pleased to note that the Neighbourhood Plan (NP) has supported the College's aspirations in two forms: firstly by adopting a site specific policy for the core buildings at the centre of the College campus, and secondly by identifying our surplus land at Standgrove Field as a future site for residential development. As you are aware, the development of Standgrove Field will enable the College to realise significant funds to invest back into the campus and ensure that the educational experience provided to our pupils can continue to be enhanced.	21 & 3				
213	Paddy Jackman Director of Operations Ardingly College	RH17	NP91	The College do however have two key concerns on the detail within the NP and a handful of other more minor comments which we consider it helpful to set out below.	No-action Comment				

214	Paddy Jackman Director of Operations Ardingly College	RH17	NP91	Policy 3 - Land at Standgrove Field Whilst we wholeheartedly support the allocation of our surplus land at Standgrove Field for the development of 27 residential dwellings, the proposed wording and restrictions do cause us some concern. Our professional advisors do not consider this to be sufficient quantum of housing to ensure the longevity of the NP when adopted, and have advised us that such a low provision will not remain consistent with the emerging Mid Sussex District Plan and its associated evidence base. This is based on the fact that the submission draft District Plan identifies that out of a total projected housing need for the district (in terms of housing sites still to be identified) of 5864 dwellings, 2000 dwellings are to be allocated within Neighbourhood Plans (Policy DP5 Housing). The remaining numbers are identified within the Strategic Development site at Burgess Hill.	3				
215	Paddy Jackman Director of Operations Ardingly College	RH17	NP91	Within Mid Sussex there are a total of 24 Town and Parish Councils which could come forward with Neighbourhood Plans in the future, however these include some very small rural parishes without services of any description, parishes within the South Downs National Park, and the major centres of Burgess Hill, East Grinstead and Haywards Heath which have all been subjected to very significant housing growth in recent years. Accordingly it would be reasonable to suggest that the current total of 19 Neighbourhood Areas is likely to be the maximum number coming forward which would be capable of designating sustainable housing sites in their respective NP's. This would mean that, on average, each NP should designate sites for 105 dwellings to provide the required number of new dwellings. Clearly some settlements will be more suitable and more sustainable locations for additional housing than others and notably the Slaugham NP has already allocated housing sites for 130 residential dwellings.	3				

216	Paddy Jackman Director of Operations Ardingly College	RH17	NP91	Ardingly as a local centre is reasonably well catered for in terms of providing shops and services for residents' day to day needs and also has significant employment opportunities within the Parish including the College. These facts point to the village being a reasonably sustainable location capable of accommodating its fair share of additional development but it is also accepted that there are other settlements which could be regarded as more sustainable. With this balance in mind it is considered that only allocating a total of 27 dwellings within the NP, against an average requirement per NP of 105, based largely on a survey of local opinion, rather than objectively assessed need using the District Plan evidence base, will not be sufficient housing to ensure the longevity of the NP in planning application decision making going forward. The submission draft District Plan clearly indicates that if insufficient housing does not come forward through NP's then MSDC will progress with work on a Site Allocations DPD.	3				
216	Paddy Jackman Director of Operations Ardingly College	RH17	NP91	This of course all assumes that the proposed housing targets, as set out in the draft District Plan are accepted following independent examination, which is by no means a foregone conclusion given the significant reduction proposed from the former South East Plan targets, and likely challenges at the forthcoming EIP from major house builders. With all this in mind it is considered that the Ardingly NP should actually be identifying sites for 50 additional dwellings at the very least to ensure that the parish can be seen to have accommodated its fair share of housing growth going forward and therefore enable the shelf life of the NP to be absolutely maximised.					
217	Paddy Jackman Director of Operations Ardingly College	RH17	NP91	When looking further into specific affordable housing need within the parish, identifying a site for 27 dwellings will only provide 8 new affordable dwellings (based on 30% on site affordable provision). Allocating 50 dwellings would near double the number of affordable homes sourced for the village and so better provide for the needs of the residents in the longer term, again ensuring the longevity of the NP is maximised in terms of these specific housing needs	3				

218	Paddy Jackman Director of Operations Ardingly College	RH17	NP91	We must also register our surprise over the proposal to allow only 2 and 3 bed homes under Policy 3. Our advisors have raised concerns over this proposal for a number of reasons. Principally this prescribed mix does not provide a balanced range of housing types and therefore does not conform with Policy H2 of the adopted Mid Sussex Local Plan, Policy DP28 of the Submission draft District plan, or Paragraph 50 of the NPPF, or indeed with the NPPF's overarching requirement to ensure that sustainable development plays an important social role by "supporting strong, vibrant and healthy communities, by providing the supply of housing required to meet the needs of present and future generations" (Para 7). It simply cannot be correct to say that over the plan period the only need for new homes will be from occupiers requiring 2 and 3 bed dwellings.	3				
219	Paddy Jackman Director of Operations Ardingly College	RH17	NP91	Paragraph 4.11 considers the current appeal proposals which the College have ongoing for a 37 dwelling scheme on Standgrove Field. It should be formally noted that the College and their advisors have to disagree with the very generalised assessments made in the NP text. Specifically, the proposed development scheme would not be highly visible from the High Weald Landscape Trail and would not be highly visible from users of College Road. To reinforce our assessment of these points we attach to this letter a copy of the site specific Landscape Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) which was submitted with our planning application (See LVIA Page 43, and Views 25 & 26 on Page 40).	3				
219	Paddy Jackman Director of Operations Ardingly College	RH17	NP91	In addition we also attach four Computer Generated Images (CGI's) of our proposals showing two different views, one looking south down College Road to the site and one looking east to the site from the footpath which crosses our playing fields on North Field on the opposite side of College Road. These images are 'verified views' and have been generated using on site topographical data to ensure buildings heights and locations are entirely accurate. There are four views as we have also shown the impact which the proposed landscaping would have in providing further natural screening when it matures (a Year 15 view). We also enclose the detailed landscaping plan submitted as part of the appeal proceedings for your reference. We genuinely believe that our appeal scheme will blend appropriately into the local landscape context.					

220	Paddy Jackman Director of Operations Ardingly College	RH17	NP91	Paragraph 4.12 states that Standgrove Field has been rarely used as a College playing field. Whilst this is broadly accurate we would like to note for the record that it has not actually been formally used as playing fields for well over 10 years for both physical and locational reasons, and prior to that was an infrequently used three hole practice golf course. The key locational reason it was not used was that being so far from the main College campus this field posed the College very significant child protection and health and safety issues.	3				
221	Paddy Jackman Director of Operations Ardingly College	RH17	NP91	Paragraph 4.13 and Policy 3 both refer to the provision of an onsite (localised) SANG. Whilst the College is indeed willing to hand over the remaining undeveloped back half of Standgrove Field for general village use, once the development scheme has been completed, it should be noted that due to the strict interpretations and requirements of areas of land to qualify as SANG (as prescribed by Natural England) it is not possible to actually define this area of land as SANG - the land area is simply not large enough. Instead, to avoid misinterpretation and challenge, we are advised that this would be better referred to simply as public open space, and clearly the proposed designation and protection of this land, as a Local Green Space under Policy 6 would still apply.	3 & 4				
222	Paddy Jackman Director of Operations Ardingly College	RH17	NP91	Within Paragraph 4.14 we are pleased to note the NP Group's recognition of the important economic and employment role the College plays in the village and, in particular, we would like to note that we employ in the region of 300 people at the College, the vast majority living locally.	3				
223	Paddy Jackman Director of Operations Ardingly College	RH17	NP91	<u>Policy 6 - Local Green Space</u> We note that the remaining undeveloped land at Standgrove Field is to be designated as a Local Green Space, which clearly ties in with this land being handed over as Public Open Space for informal village use once the development proposals have been implemented. Whilst we are happy for this designation to come forward in conjunction with an allocation for residential development on the front half of the field we would appreciate the list being amended so that it only refers to the "Land at the Rear of Standgrove Field" to avoid any later confusion.	6				

224	Paddy Jackman Director of Operations Ardingly College	RH17	NP91	Policy 21 - <u>Ardingly College</u> Policy 21 and its supporting text again kindly acknowledge the important function of the College and we are pleased to see the policy support for future sensitive development proposals which may come forward within the defined built core of the campus. However, the policy is silent on how any future proposals outside of this defined central core would be considered. Whilst we would hope that such proposals would still be viewed positively, but on a case by case basis subject to wider visual and landscape impact, we did hope to see confirmation of this point within this policy. Accordingly we would be grateful if an additional sentence to this effect could be added at the bottom of Policy 21	21				
225	Paddy Jackman Director of Operations Ardingly College	RH17	NP91	<u>Sustainability Appraisal of the Ardingly NP</u> . Our advisors have also reviewed the draft Sustainability Appraisal of the NP and recommended that we submit specific comments in relation to some of the assessments made against Policy 3, the site allocation of Standgrove Field. It is considered that the site allocation would actually have a positive effect on both No.8 Water Quality and Resources and No.9 Biodiversity. The current appeal proposals include the provision of an on site SUDS pond to collect and control surface water run off from the development whilst also creating a significant water body and feature. Even though the proposed site allocation is different to the appeal scheme, there is no reason why this positive water feature should not remain within the proposals, so it would still be able to provide a positive feature which will significantly enhance the overall biodiversity interest of the site. Given the above it is requested that the scoring for both No.8 and No.9 should be altered to include a single positive impact on both counts.	Sustainability Appraisal				
226	Paddy Jackman Director of Operations Ardingly College	RH17	NP91	I would like to conclude by reiterating our thanks to NP Group for all their hard work in pulling together this impressive document. I do hope that the above comments are helpful and would be pleased to discuss any aspect further if that would be of assistance.	No-action Comment				
227	Paddy Jackman Director of Operations Ardingly College	RH17	NP91	Attachments : Landscape & Visual Appraisal Land & Standgrove Field (Oct 2011)	No-action Comment				
228	Resident	RH17	NP92	We would like to thank the committee who put together the very comprehensive, well planned, surveyed, discussed and guided village plan. We feel happy with all aspects of this plan.	No-action Comment			1	

229	Resident	RH17	NP92	Standgrove is the right place for the development of further housing,	3				
230	Resident	RH17	NP92	the green sites are all very well located, enjoyed and respected by the village populations	6				
231	Resident	RH17	NP92	and the traffic calming plans are both enterprising and exciting and fully supported by us.	18				
232	Resident	RH17 6AN	NP93	I have read the Ardingly Neighbourhood Plan 2013-2031 and I am broadly supportive of the plan.	No-action Comment			1	
233	Resident	RH17 6AN	NP93	The most controversial part of the plan is the location of the 27 new houses. May I state that I believe the overriding priority should be the number of <u>residents</u> directly affected by this part of the plan, i.e. having new houses backing onto them and thus detracting from their views /general environment. On this basis, of the sites under consideration, the two that stand out as acceptable are; Standgrove Field and Butcher's field. Perhaps controversially, I include Butcher's field because, although it has a lovely view, in fact very few people would have that view obscured by housing development.	3				
234	Resident	RH17 6AN	NP93	May I take the opportunity to thank the Council for their diligent work in preparing the plan, which would make Ardingly and even nicer place to live. It's not easy to please all of the people all of the time.	No-action Comment				
235	Resident	RH17 6AN	NP93	Just one final point. We are lucky to live where we do and I feel we have a duty to share Ardingly with our 'fair share' of new residents. And I would be the first to admit that it's not easy to sustain this view when your own back yard is under threat. Can we do anything to compensate the residents directly affected by the proposed Standgrove Field development?	3				
236	Resident		NP94	Please please do not build on our Sweet Shop land my children play there . It should remain fields for our childrens children to enjoy	6				1
237	Resident	RH17 6TU	NP95	Many thanks for your response to my original e-mail (see below) outlining the position of my family and I with regard to the proposed development at Standgrove Field. I am now re-submitting those views so that their submission falls within the appropriate dateline, as you helpfully suggested. Thank you also for letting me know about the exhibition this weekend on the draft Neighbourhood Plan which I believe is being held at Hapstead Hall. I will certainly be attending tomorrow, along with three of my sisters, and look forward to the opportunity to further scrutinise the outline plans.	3		1		

238	Resident	RH17 6TU	NP95	In any event we would like to place on record the considered and very strongly held continued objections by the Thompson family of "Culpepers", 11 College Road, Ardingly to the proposed development of the site. It has already been rightly rejected by Mid Sussex District Council but I understand will now be subject to an appeal later this year.	3				
239	Resident	RH17 6TU	NP95	It is not just my five siblings and I who are against the development of the field, it was also my late mother's firm belief that it rowed against the best interests of the village community and the green belt aspirations to which successive local and national governments have worked collaboratively since the (quite literally...) ground breaking Town & Country Planning Act originally gave councils like our own the power (66 years ago...) to include them in their own visionary plans.	3				
240	Resident	RH17 6TU	NP95	My family and I have long supported the development of the college, sponsored its appeals and backed its growth. My great uncle designed the greater part of the college chapel and my grandfather taught at the college once he had retired from the Bar; other family members have been pupils at the school. Ordinarily we would be prominent advocates of any sensible evolvement of the school, regrettably this does not fall into the category.	3				
241	Resident	RH17 6TU	NP95	My grandparents and great uncles were very supportive of the decision by the Clark family, very close family friends, to hand the field over the college - but on the basis that it be used only for recreational purposes. This is clearly not the current aim of the college and an apparently dramatic change from that clear understanding and act of faith and generosity.	3				
242	Resident	RH17 6TU	NP95	If permitted to proceed we also fear that it would provide a dangerous momentum for on-going development by the college into land around the village, effectively allowing the natural boundaries of the village to increasingly encroach upon and urbanise outstandingly beautiful green belt land. Furthermore there appears to no consideration whatsoever of whether the existing village services can support any further development; such as water, gas, electricity or sewage.	3 & 27				
243	Resident	RH17 6TU	NP95	Recreational and leisure pursuits have not meaningfully increased within the village despite an increase of several hundred people in the last decade to bring the community to its current peak of just under 2,500. The countryside, and especially the ancient woodlands of the sort that border Standgrove Field, do a great deal to compensate with their bridle paths and rights of way through such historic copse and pasture with its abundant wildlife.	No-action Comment				

244	Resident	RH17 6TU	NP95	I'm not a naturalist and couldn't provide you with a specific audit of the wildlife and fauna that exists in the area upon which the college now proposes to build. However when I was starting out on my media career thirty years ago as a young reporter on the Mid Sussex Times I was charged with covering the paper's rural affairs. On more than one occasion when we required evocative images of the rural splendour for which the region was rightly renowned it was to that very field that I would be taken by one of our experienced photographers to capture fabulous photographs of the wildlife, flora and fauna that stood around it. It felt then that nothing had changed (for the worse) in hundreds of years. It's quite possible that some of those matchless pictures are still held in the newspaper's archive. There's a unique opportunity now for that privileged and traditional rural splendour to be preserved for future generations of villagers.	8				
245	Resident	RH17 6TU	NP95	Finally the council has a clear functional and legally enshrined duty of care to ensure the safest possible transport infrastructure. The B2028, and specifically College Road as a spur road from it, have suffered a number of appalling road accidents, including an unacceptable number of fatalities. This development would significantly increase road usage on what is already a narrow and difficult road, increasingly the likelihood of further serious accidents. I hope these thoughts help focus and inform your own deliberations on such an important local issue. Many thanks thanks for giving them your consideration.	18				
246	Resident	RH17 6TU	NP96	This e-mail is from Laura Thompson and Douglas Taylor - whose residence is Culpepers, 11, College Road, Ardingly, West Sussex RH17 6TU. I have accordingly copied in my partner Douglas to evidence his rejection of the plan. This e-mail is to confirm that we reject the Ardingly Neighbourhood Plan with its proposals to develop Standgrove Field - please refer to the objections outlined in my earlier correspondence with the parish council.	3		1		
247	Resident	RH17 6TU	NP96	I believe most of my siblings - Fiona, Ian, Neil, Sarah and Alexander - with whom I co-own Culpepers, also intend to be in touch today to share their similar rejection of the plans. Thank you for your consideration in this matter and I look forward to being updated on the situation.	No-action Comment				
248	Resident	RH17 6TU	NP97	This e-mail is from Neil & Emma Thompson - whose residence is Culpepers, 11, College Road, Ardingly, West Sussex RH17 6TU. It also includes the views of my eldest daughter Lily (19). I have accordingly copied in both my wife and Lily to evidence their rejection of the plan. My other two daughters - Madeleine and Isabella also object though as they are 17 and 13 respectively I appreciate that their views may hold no weight.	3		1		

249	Resident	RH17 6TU	NP97	This e-mail is to confirm that we reject the Ardingly Neighbourhood Plan with its proposals to develop Standgrove Field - please refer to the objections outlined in my earlier correspondence with the parish council.	3				
250	Resident	RH17 6TU	NP98	As residents of Culpepers, 11 College Road, Ardingly, RH17 6TU this email is in response to the proposed developments of Standgrove field. I am writing to confirm that I and my partner, Jai Moodie strongly reject the Ardingly neighbourhood plan to develop Standgrove Field.	3		1		
251	Resident	RH17 6TU	NP99	This letter is to confirm that we reject the Ardingly Neighbourhood Plan with its proposals to develop Standgrove Field.	3		1		
252	Resident	RH17 6TU	NP99	There are many varied objections to this plan most of which already have been documented in correspondence from my brother, Neil Thompson in a letter to the Parish Council. The least of these are the location of the field; the dangers of building on the land and the precedents it will set to future building by Ardingly College, contrary to the welfare of the village and its surrounding historical green field sites and most importantly the fact planning permission to build on this field has already been turned down by the Ardingly Parish Council, MSDC and is pending an appeal.	3				
253	John Lister Land Use Services Team Natural England		NP100	Thank you for consulting Natural England on your Plan. My brief comments are as follows.	No-action Comment	1			
254	John Lister Land Use Services Team Natural England		NP100	Para 2.40 – We welcome the recognition that some development needs to provide Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace sites (SANGs) and Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM) measures on Ashdown Forest itself.	4				
255	John Lister Land Use Services Team Natural England		NP100	Para 3.3 – We support the objectives particularly to protect the environment of the parish in terms of its: § AONB designated landscape - distinct rural identity and outstanding landscape setting - key views and vistas - biodiversity and wildlife networks - local green space	4,6 & 8				

256	John Lister Land Use Services Team Natural England		NP100	Policy 3: Housing Supply & Site Allocation - Makes provision for supporting windfall development within the built up area boundary, subject to a number of tests. The final clause regarding the loss of valuable trees, hedges or other natural features – is welcome. However considerations may need to be given to the use of potential development sites by protected species. Whilst this may not preclude development, it may require the protection or re-provision of habitats, and careful management of the site during development and thereafter.	3				
257	John Lister Land Use Services Team Natural England		NP100	Para 4.13 - Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG) – issues such as the scale, nature and ongoing management of the SANG will be necessary to ensure that it meets the Ashdown Forest Special Protection Area requirements.	4				
258	John Lister Land Use Services Team Natural England		NP100	Policy 8: Biodiversity – Is welcomed, however in view of a range of pressures (including development, economic and climatic), a policy to protect and maintain ... may not be effective in delivering the government's aim of halting the decline in biodiversity (see NPPF Para 109). The wording (and a commitment to "protect and enhance" would be more appropriate. The policy correctly goes on to seek "favourable conditions for biodiversity including maintenance and enhancement of habitat connectivity and landscape scale conservation".	8				
259	Resident	RH17 6UN	NP101	No comments made	NCM			1	
260	Resident	RH17 6SD	NP102	This is to formally raise my objection to the neighbourhood plan namely the proposed development on Standgrove. I have raised this on a number of occasions before.	3		1		
261	Resident	RH17 6SD	NP102	I do not agree for the following reasons: 1. It is outside the village boundary in an area of AONB. A development here would increase the amount of traffic on the already busy fast road. People are less likely to walk a half mile into the village than drive. The pavements are too thin to cater for people with young children. Therefore if you are getting in the car, why stop at the village bakery when you can go to Lindfield/Haywards Heath and do the bakery, butcher shop etc at the same time?	3, 15 & 18				
262	Resident	RH17 6SD	NP102	2. Just because the college owns the field and they are a major employer in the village, I do not see this as a reason to "help" them by getting planning permission so they can line their pockets. I would like to know what percentage of villagers the college employs on a whole time equivalent basis?	3				

263	Resident	RH17 6SD	NP102	3. The other proposed fields, not just Butchers seem more appropriate as they are at the centre of the village for the school, pubs, shops.	3				
264	Resident	RH17 6SD	NP102	4. There is a huge amount of diversity in the field in terms of birds, mammals and other wildlife. What would happen to their homes?	8				
265	Resident	RH17 6SD	NP102	Where does all this stop? Are we to eventually meet up with Haywards Heath/Lindfield boundary?	3				
266	Resident	RH17 6SD	NP102	The development would be seen from the road and the High Weald which would change and spoil the beautiful far reaching views. Ardingly is a beautiful village, lets keep it this way.	3				
267	Resident	RH16 6SD	NP103	I do not agree with the proposal to build on the above field. (Standgrove) The proposal will incur more traffic on College Road as the walk into the village particularly to school is dangerous as the path is narrow.	3	1			
268	Resident	RH16 6SD	NP103	The field provides a natural environment for many species of animals and flora. I do not feel that the proposals will bring any enhancements to Ardingly.	8				
269	Resident	RH17 6UP	NP104	The village can't avoid taking additional houses outside the present BUA, and Standgrove is the least objectionable site.	3			1	
270	Resident	RH17 6UP	NP104	I welcome the proposal for Butchers Field to be designated as Green Space since it is an important finger of countryside penetrating into the centre of the village with wonderful views.	6				
271	Resident	RH17 6UP	NP104	I understand the the South of England Agricultural Society now wants Policy 22 'South of England Showground' withdrawn. Since they were extensively consulted, and involved in the drafting of this policy, I can only conclude that their present stance is prompted by the addition of the bullet point that "proposals which would increase the current range or intensity of activities will be subject to careful scrutiny, especially in relation to noise." Their new objection suggests to me not only that the expansion of the range of activity would involve increased [possibly greatly increased] noise levels, but also that the policy as presently drafted would give the Local Authority power to ensure that noise levels are kept at an acceptable level. I believe that such power is essential since, although noise levels are generally acceptable, there are occasions [particularly 'fun' days] when they are unnecessarily high and are a considerable inconvenience to residents.	22				

271	Resident	RH17 6UP	NP104	My experience is that the showground noise is more audible in the Church Lane/Street Lane area than in the centre of the village. It would not surprise me therefore if there were different reactions from different parts of the village. However just as I share College Road and High Street concerns about traffic, though less affected, the same consideration should apply in the case of noise levels					
272	Resident	RH17 6GQ	NP105	Agree more affordable homes are needed for local folk	3			1	
273	Resident	RH17 6GQ	NP105	Provided the infrastructure can cope with the added requirements, especially water and associated services.	27				
274	Resident	RH17 6GQ	NP105	More people in the village will hopefully be good for the Ardingly community itself.	No-action Comment				
275	Resident	RH17 6RS	NP106	We feel development is needed and are in agreement with both the applications should be given approval (Butchers Field & Standgrove)	3			1	
276	Resident	RH17 6UQ	NP107	We are totally against the new homes scheme as we would like to protect our countryside.	3		1		
277	Resident	RH17 6UQ	NP107	The traffic management plan needs to be looked at as during school times ie, 09.15 to 0940 and 15.00 to 15.30 the roads are very busy, also we cannot park in our area, whilst we agree parents need to drop off/collect children a bit more consideration to tenants would not go amiss.	18 & 10				
278	Resident	RH17 6UQ	NP107	Further reference to the new homes, surely traffic will increase say for arguments sake 20 of the 27 homes had 2 cars, that is another 40 vehicles in and out of Ardingly at very busy times. We do not think more housing is good for the village as it would lose it's village status.	3				
279	Resident	RH17 6UQ	NP107	We are sure that building on Butchers Field is just greed on behalf of the landowner concerned.	3				

280	Guy Dixon Associate Director Savills on behalf of The Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew	TN13 1JR	NP108	On behalf of my client "The Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew" (Kew), I write to provide their formal feedback to the public consultation which is currently running on the Pre-Submission Ardingly Neighbourhood Plan. Kew are pleased to note the site specific policy for Wakehurst Place and Millennium Seed Bank which is included at Policy 23 of the draft Neighbourhood Plan, and the support with the NP conveys for their ongoing operations. I confirm that Kew are happy with the proposed wording and are very grateful for the time which has been afforded to them by members of the NP Group in formulating this policy and meeting with them to discuss their ongoing requirements for the site. It is understood why reference to the emerging Masterplan for the wider Wakehurst Place estate has not been included at this stage, but Kew would still like to put on record that their Masterplan vision is something which they intend to actively pursue in the near future and something which they would be pleased to engage with the Neighbourhood Plan Group or Parish Council on in due course.	23			1	
281	Resident	RH17 6SQ	NP109	Firstly thank you for giving the local residents a chance to have their say and voice their opinion, I support Policy 3 and the proposed allocation of residential development on Standgrove Field as it is important for any village to plan for continuing growth and this is clearly the best possible location.	3	1			
282	Resident	RH17 6SQ	NP109	I am however surprised to see that Policy 3 states only 2 and 3 bedroom houses to be built. Whilst I can understand the need to provide smaller dwellings in the village and therefore more affordable housing it does seem a little restrictive on future families who may also wish to stay within our beautiful village and may require 4 to 5 bedroom houses. Surely a more balanced range of house sizes would have been more appropriate? I would therefore propose the majority of houses to be 2 – 3 bedroom with a small amount of 4 – 5 bedroom houses also being available	3				
283	Resident	RH17 6SQ	NP109	I <u>support</u> the protection of land at Butchers Field, Street Lane, from development through its identification as a Local Green Space under Policy 6. This field provides an important outlook over the surrounding countryside from Street Lane and reinforces the rural character of our village.	6				

284	Resident	RH17 6SQ	NP109	I am pleased to see, and <u>support</u> , the recognition which is given in the Neighbourhood Plan to the important role played by key local employers and attractions in the village, in particular Wakehurst Place, the South of England Showground and Ardingly College. All of these support the village and contribute to its unique character. It is hoped that the development of the village will encourage new business and further support current business's and recreational facilities that are currently struggling.	15,21,22 & 23				
285	Resident	RH17	NP110	We <u>support</u> Policy 3 and the proposed allocation of residential development on Standgrove Field as it is important for any village to plan for continuing growth.	3	1			
286	Resident	RH17	NP110	We were however surprised to see that Policy 3 states only 2 and 3 bedroom houses to be built. Whilst we can understand the need to provide smaller dwellings in the village it does seem a little restrictive on future families who may also wish to stay within our beautiful village. Surely a more balanced range of house sizes would have been more appropriate?	3				
287	Resident	RH17	NP110	We <u>support</u> the protection of land at Butchers Field, Street Lane, from development through its identification as a Local Green Space under Policy 6. This field provides an important outlook over the surrounding countryside from Street Lane and reinforces the rural character of our village.	6				
288	Resident	RH17	NP110	We are pleased to see, and <u>support</u> , the recognition which is given in the Neighbourhood Plan to the important role played by key local employers and attractions in the village, in particular Wakehurst Place, the South of England Showground and Ardingly College. All of these support the village and contribute to its unique character.	15, 21, 22 & 23				
289	Resident	RH17 6RT	NP111	Whilst I appreciate that the only way to get NP approval by the referendum is to only approve a small number of new houses, I feel that 27 homes in 20 years is a joke, especially as there are only 8 'affordable' homes.	3	1			
290	Resident	RH17 6RT	NP111	I think the traffic calming proposals for the High Street are totally inappropriate and keep 200 'nimby' villagers happy at the expense of thousands of motorists.	18				
291	Resident	RH17 6RT	NP111	The photograph of 'Ardingly from the Air' on p26 is a complete misrepresentation of what the village looks like.	General comment				
292	Resident	RH17 6UP	NP112	No comments made	NCM			1	
293	Resident	RH17 6UP	NP113	No comments made	NCM			1	
294	Resident	RH17 6SD	NP114	No comments made	NCM		1		
295	Resident	RH17 6UH	NP115	Please protect Butchers Field as a Local Green Space Policy 6	6			1	

296	Resident	RH17 6UG	NP116	Protect Butchers Field as Local Green Space Policy 6	6			1	
297	Resident	RH17 6UG	NP117	I am in favour of protecting the Green Space known as Butchers Field and any other within our area.	6			1	
298	Resident	RH17 6TY	NP118	We have vigorously argued against any new large development in Ardingly and we believe that the Parish Council should be behind the village as a whole, resisting all further development, not setting out to divide the village residents by promoting one site for development in favour of another. It is our opinion that your reasons for supporting Standgrove Field rather than Butchers Field are quite wrong.	3		1		
299	Resident	RH17 6TY	NP118	We all know that we live in the High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and we must ALL do all we can to protect it, additionally, Standgrove Field is outside the village boundary for development, and has already been refused planning consent by the MSDC. Development here would create a very real precedent for future development of neighbouring fields, and would have a disastrous effect on the wildlife and biodiversity of adjacent ancient woodland.	3 & 8				
300	Resident	RH17 6TY	NP118	Until the arrival of the present College Headmaster, the villagers have had access through Standgrove Field for generations, a Right of Way appeal is still in progress. It is well known that the College will push for the full 37 houses on the site and not the 27 the Parish Council is suggesting will be built.	3 & 4				
301	Resident	RH17 6TY	NP118	The small portion of field left after building, the College are proposing to donate as a SANG space. MSDC and Natural England have deemed it too small. The College are trying to make out that they are gifting us the space that the village has always been able to use, and making it sound that they are doing us a favour. The Parish Council may be taken in by this ploy, but we are not.	4				
302	Resident	RH17 6TY	NP118	Under section 4.14 of your pre-submission plan you state that the Standgrove Field, is deemed surplus to the College requirements, as this is field already outside the village development boundaries and it is technically already a green field site, it could be donated to the village as a SANG, the same as you are expecting the owner of Butchers Field to donate his land as a SANG.	4 & 6				

303	Resident	RH17 6TY	NP118	We all know the dangers of fast traffic in College Road, which may or may not be eased with traffic calming measures, but there is still the huge volume of traffic that these will not address and this will increase with the addition of another 74 cars in and out of any housing on this site. The pavements are not very wide and the risk to even more children crossing and walking the length of College Road to school or the bus stop is a frightening prospect. We believe that a housing estate here would encourage greater dependence on the car and as a result we are doubtful of any substantial benefit to the village shops and amenities.	18 & 15				
304	Resident	RH17 6TY	NP118	Butchers Field however is situated right in the heart of the village, within easy walking distance of the shops and amenities and therefore more likely to be used regularly and its right across the road from the Primary School.	3				
305	Resident	RH17 6TY	NP118	Whilst the pavements in Street Lane are not wide, in parts they are protected from the road by grass verges and with careful consideration to road improvements this could be extended to provide safe walking along the road, particularly with the addition of a crossing point.	3				
306	Resident	RH17 6TY	NP118	The site is shielded on three sides by trees and the plot slopes away from Street Lane, lessening the visual impact on a development here.	3				
307	Resident	RH17 6TY	NP118	The owner of Butchers Field has offered to provide a new Scout hut, which surely the Scouts should be pleased to accept as the current one is old and draughty and it would free up the current Scout Hut site for the Primary School, an issue that has been discussed in the past, but the Scouts had nowhere else to go. The new Scout hut would still be central in the village.	11				
308	Resident	RH17 6TY	NP118	For generations we have enjoyed fine views across Butchers Field to the Downs, unfortunately these have now been lost as the owner planted a tree line several years ago, we believe purposely to block the view. We will never get that view back.	3				
309	Resident	RH17 6TY	NP118	In your pre-submission plan, section 4.14 you state that the College is a vital employer in the parish, and that this is a reason to support their bid. Given the fact that most of the children in Ardingly will not go to school there, the majority of the villagers do not have any interest in supporting them financially with the sale of this land. The amount of staff the College employs will not change whether or not they sell Standgrove Field, so this is clearly NOT a valid reason for the Parish Council to suggest we support them.	3				

310	Resident	RH17 6TY	NP118	If a choice of site for development does have to be made, then we are of the opinion that Butchers Field is a preferable location, being within the village boundary. Once we begin to allow building outside the boundary, I am sure you will agree, that in the long term, once this argument has been forgotten, the precedent will have been set and become the thin edge of the wedge for any future planning proposals.	3				
311	Resident	RH17 6TY	NP118	We feel that this reason alone is sufficiently important to put Butchers Field forward and not Standgrove Field. Financial gains of the College should not be influencing yours or anyone else's decision, neither should any other influence they may have.	3				
312	Resident	RH17 6TY	NP118	It's definitely a NO to any development in the village and especially a NO to Standgrove Field being developed.	3				
313	Resident	RH17 6RZ	NP119	Planning matters are rightly complex and subject to stringent regulation and correct procedure. Sadly they are also potentially very ?. The footpath across Standgrove Field was almost unanimously accepted by MSDC. Both applications for outline planning permission for both Standgrove Field and Butchers Field were equally strongly rejected by MSDC and have now been taken to enquiry. Confusion and doubt re the outcome of both enquiries and the appeal taint all ??? plans for our villages future.	3		1		
314	Resident	RH17 6RZ	NP119	All villagers interests should be weighted equally and only those on the electoral register and members of council tax paying household counted. It will be our taxes that are paying for this process. Rushing to submit the Ardingly Neighbourhood Plan will prejudice all present enquiry and appeals. Are all Neighbourhood Plans subject to such deadlines? I trust the second "Yes" box will not be counted as a Yes, Why not a "No" unless box!	No-action Comment				
315	Resident	RH17 6UW	NP120	Agree with the development proposals	3			1	
316	Resident	RH17 6UW	NP120	Agree with traffic proposal providing parking in the High Street is also dealt with. It is essential to ensure two way flow of traffic all the way through the village and at a reduced speed. Parking so as to reduce the flow to only one way is often the cause of the problems.	18 & 19				
317	Resident	RH17 6UA	NP121	No comments made	NCM			1	
318	Resident	RH17 6UA	NP122	No comments made	NCM			1	
319	Resident	RH17 6UA	NP123	No comments made	NCM			1	
320	Resident	RH17 6UA	NP124	Already too much traffic in Street Lane. Even if there were room to widen the road, it would spoil the villagey look for Street Lane. More traffic on route to school is not a good idea - put children at risk.	3			1	

321	Resident	RH17 6UA	NP124	Development in Butchers Field would threaten the survival of Butchers Shaw Wood and the wild life in it - flora and fauna - as the wood would be almost completely trapped in a "square of roads and buildings".	3 & 6				
322	Resident	RH17 6RR	NP125	No comments made	NCM			1	
323	Resident	RH17 6RR	NP126	No comments made	NCM			1	
324	Resident	RH17 6TY	NP127	We have vigorously argued against any new large development in Ardingly and we believe that the Parish Council should be behind the village as a whole, resisting all further development, not setting out to divide the village residents by promoting one site for development in favour of another. It is our opinion that your reasons for supporting Standgrove Field rather than Butchers Field are quite wrong.	3		1		
325	Resident	RH17 6TY	NP127	We all know that we live in the High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and we must ALL do all we can to protect it, additionally, Standgrove Field is outside the village boundary for development, and has already been refused planning consent by the MSDC. Development here would create a very real precedent for future development of neighbouring fields, and would have a disastrous effect on the wildlife and biodiversity of adjacent ancient woodland.	3				
326	Resident	RH17 6TY	NP127	Until the arrival of the present College Headmaster, the villagers have had access through Standgrove Field for generations, a Right of Way appeal is still in progress. It is well known that the College will push for the full 37 houses on the site and not the 27 the Parish Council is suggesting will be built.	4 & 3				
327	Resident	RH17 6TY	NP127	The small portion of field left after building, the College are proposing to donate as a SANG space. MSDC and Natural England have deemed it too small. The College are trying to make out that they are gifting us the space that the village has always been able to use, and making it sound that they are doing us a favour. The Parish Council may be taken in by this ploy, but we are not.	4				
328	Resident	RH17 6TY	NP127	Under section 4.14 of your pre-submission plan you state that the Standgrove Field, is deemed surplus to the College requirements, as this is field already outside the village development boundaries and it is technically already a green field site, it could be donated to the village as a SANG, the same as you are expecting the owner of Butchers Field to donate his land as a SANG.	4				

329	Resident	RH17 6TY	NP127	We all know the dangers of fast traffic in College Road, which may or may not be eased with traffic calming measures, but there is still the huge volume of traffic that these will not address and this will increase with the addition of another 74 cars in and out of any housing on this site. The pavements are not very wide and the risk to even more children crossing and walking the length of College Road to school or the bus stop is a frightening prospect. We believe that a housing estate here would encourage greater dependence on the car and as a result we are doubtful of any substantial benefit to the village shops and amenities.	3 & 18				
330	Resident	RH17 6TY	NP127	Butchers Field however is situated right in the heart of the village, within easy walking distance of the shops and amenities and therefore more likely to be used regularly and its right across the road from the Primary School.	3				
331	Resident	RH17 6TY	NP127	Whilst the pavements in Street Lane are not wide, in parts they are protected from the road by grass verges and with careful consideration to road improvements this could be extended to provide safe walking along the road, particularly with the addition of a crossing point.	3 & 18				
332	Resident	RH17 6TY	NP127	The site is shielded on three sides by trees and the plot slopes away from Street Lane, lessening the visual impact on a development here.	3				
333	Resident	RH17 6TY	NP127	The owner of Butchers Field has offered to provide a new Scout hut, which surely the Scouts should be pleased to accept as the current one is old and draughty and it would free up the current Scout Hut site for the Primary School, an issue that has been discussed in the past, but the Scouts had nowhere else to go. The new Scout hut would still be central in the village.	11				
334	Resident	RH17 6TY	NP127	For generations we have enjoyed fine views across Butchers Field to the Downs, unfortunately these have now been lost as the owner planted a tree line several years ago, we believe purposely to block the view. We will never get that view back.	3				
335	Resident	RH17 6TY	NP127	In your pre-submission plan, section 4.14 you state that the College is a vital employer in the parish, and that this is a reason to support their bid. Given the fact that most of the children in Ardingly will not go to school there, the majority of the villagers do not have any interest in supporting them financially with the sale of this land. The amount of staff the College employs will not change whether or not they sell Standgrove Field, so this is clearly NOT a valid reason for the Parish Council to suggest we support them.	3				

336	Resident	RH17 6TY	NP127	If a choice of site for development does have to be made, then we are of the opinion that Butchers Field is a preferable location, being within the village boundary. Once we begin to allow building outside the boundary, I am sure you will agree, that in the long term, once this argument has been forgotten, the precedent will have been set and become the thin edge of the wedge for any future planning proposals.	3				
337	Resident	RH17 6TY	NP127	We feel that this reason alone is sufficiently important to put Butchers Field forward and not Standgrove Field. Financial gains of the College should not be influencing yours or anyone else's decision, neither should any other influence they may have.	3				
338	Resident	RH17 6TY	NP127	It's definitely a NO to any development in the village and especially a NO to Standgrove Field being developed.	3				
339	Resident	RH17 6TY	NP128	We have vigorously argued against any new large development in Ardingly and we believe that the Parish Council should be behind the village as a whole, resisting all further development, not setting out to divide the village residents by promoting one site for development in favour of another. It is our opinion that your reasons for supporting Standgrove Field rather than Butchers Field are quite wrong.	3	1			
340	Resident	RH17 6TY	NP128	We all know that we live in the High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and we must ALL do all we can to protect it, additionally, Standgrove Field is outside the village boundary for development, and has already been refused planning consent by the MSDC. Development here would create a very real precedent for future development of neighbouring fields, and would have a disastrous effect on the wildlife and biodiversity of adjacent ancient woodland.	8 & 3				
341	Resident	RH17 6TY	NP128	Until the arrival of the present College Headmaster, the villagers have had access through Standgrove Field for generations, a Right of Way appeal is still in progress. It is well known that the College will push for the full 37 houses on the site and not the 27 the Parish Council is suggesting will be built.	4				
342	Resident	RH17 6TY	NP128	The small portion of field left after building, the College are proposing to donate as a SANG space. MSDC and Natural England have deemed it too small. The College are trying to make out that they are gifting us the space that the village has always been able to use, and making it sound that they are doing us a favour. The Parish Council may be taken in by this ploy, but we are not.	4				

343	Resident	RH17 6TY	NP128	Under section 4.14 of your pre-submission plan you state that the Standgrove Field, is deemed surplus to the College requirements, as this is field already outside the village development boundaries and it is technically already a green field site, it could be donated to the village as a SANG, the same as you are expecting the owner of Butchers Field to donate his land as a SANG.	4				
344	Resident	RH17 6TY	NP128	We all know the dangers of fast traffic in College Road, which may or may not be eased with traffic calming measures, but there is still the huge volume of traffic that these will not address and this will increase with the addition of another 74 cars in and out of any housing on this site. The pavements are not very wide and the risk to even more children crossing and walking the length of College Road to school or the bus stop is a frightening prospect. We believe that a housing estate here would encourage greater dependence on the car and as a result we are doubtful of any substantial benefit to the village shops and amenities.	3 & 18				
345	Resident	RH17 6TY	NP128	Butchers Field however is situated right in the heart of the village, within easy walking distance of the shops and amenities and therefore more likely to be used regularly and its right across the road from the Primary School.	3				
346	Resident	RH17 6TY	NP128	Whilst the pavements in Street Lane are not wide, in parts they are protected from the road by grass verges and with careful consideration to road improvements this could be extended to provide safe walking along the road, particularly with the addition of a crossing point.	3				
347	Resident	RH17 6TY	NP128	The site is shielded on three sides by trees and the plot slopes away from Street Lane, lessening the visual impact on a development here.	3				
348	Resident	RH17 6TY	NP128	The owner of Butchers Field has offered to provide a new Scout hut, which surely the Scouts should be pleased to accept as the current one is old and draughty and it would free up the current Scout Hut site for the Primary School, an issue that has been discussed in the past, but the Scouts had nowhere else to go. The new Scout hut would still be central in the village.	11				
349	Resident	RH17 6TY	NP128	For generations we have enjoyed fine views across Butchers Field to the Downs, unfortunately these have now been lost as the owner planted a tree line several years ago, we believe purposely to block the view. We will never get that view back.	3				

350	Resident	RH17 6TY	NP128	In your pre-submission plan, section 4.14 you state that the College is a vital employer in the parish, and that this is a reason to support their bid. Given the fact that most of the children in Ardingly will not go to school there, the majority of the villagers do not have any interest in supporting them financially with the sale of this land. The amount of staff the College employs will not change whether or not they sell Standgrove Field, so this is clearly NOT a valid reason for the Parish Council to suggest we support them.	3				
351	Resident	RH17 6TY	NP128	If a choice of site for development does have to be made, then we are of the option that Butchers Field is a preferable location, being within the village boundary. Once we begin to allow building outside the boundary, I am sure you will agree, that in the long term, once this argument has been forgotten, the precedent will have been set and become the thin edge of the wedge for any future planning proposals.	3				
352	Resident	RH17 6TY	NP128	We feel that this reason alone is sufficiently important to put Butchers Field forward and not Standgrove Field. Financial gains of the College should not be influencing yours or anyone else's decision, neither should any other influence they may have.	3				
353	Resident	RH17 6TY	NP128	It's definitely a NO to any development in the village and especially a NO to Standgrove Field being developed.	3				
354	Resident	RH17 6RU	NP129	Butchers Field should be allocated as Green Space	6			1	
355	Resident	RH17 6RU	NP129	I don't support further development in the village but if inevitable I consider Standgrove to be preferable.	3				
356	Resident	RH17 6RT	NP130	Although I do not think that Ardingly is a suitable location for development of this kind, I find Standgrove a preferable location	3			1	
357	Resident	RH17 6RT	NP130	over Butchers Field which I feel should be preserved as a Green Space.	6				
358	Resident	RH17	NP131	No comments made	NCM			1	
359	Resident	RH17	NP132	No comments made	NCM			1	
360	Resident	RH17 6SD	NP133	No comments made	NCM		1		
361	Resident	RH17 6SD	NP134	No comments made	NCM		1		
362	Resident	RH17 6SD	NP135	No comments made	NCM		1		
363	Resident	RH17 6SD	NP136	No comments made	NCM		1		
364	Resident	RH17 6SD	NP137	No comments made	NCM		1		
365	Resident	RH17 6AN	NP138	Standgrove Field would appear to be the most appropriate place to build the required housing.	3			1	
366	Resident	RH17 6AN	NP138	The Neighbourhood Plan and Sustainability Appraisal are comprehensive and appear well thought through. Thank you to all those who took part.	No-action Comment				

367	Resident	RH17 6UP	NP139	The school is full,	10	1			
368	Resident	RH17 6UP	NP139	there is no parking in the village for the current residents, travelling through Street Lane and the High Street is a nightmare.	18 & 19				
369	Resident	RH17 6UP	NP139	The village has expanded enough in the last twenty years and I don't believe we can accommodate more housing.	3				
370	Resident	RH17 6UP	NP139	Green fields should stay green fields to retain the character of the village, protect countryside.	6				
371	Resident	RH17 6UP	NP139	Safe crossing for our young people and our elderly people should be our first priority.	18				
372	Resident	RH17 6UP	NP140	The reation of new homes is an important issue which I question.	3	1			
373	Resident	RH17 6UP	NP140	Can the village accommodate new families at the school,	10				
374	Resident	RH17 6UP	NP140	more traffic,	18				
375	Resident	RH17 6UP	NP140	poor parking?	19				
376	Resident	RH17 6UP	NP140	If it must happen I feel Standgrove is the only place for the new houses.	3				
377	Resident	RH17 6TS	NP141	We are a small village and would like to keep it that way. However , we appreciate the need for further housing and feel that any new developments should be within the perimeters of the village, ie, infilling.	3	1			
378	Resident	RH17 6UH	NP142	I fully support the Neighbourhood Plan which has been carefully considered and I commend the PC on the right choice of development site which lies on the main road at Standgrove.	3			1	
379	Resident	RH17 6UH	NP142	Our local business should be supported as stated in the NP as this creates employment within the village adding to it's sustainability as well as supporting all community services.	15, 21,22,23, 24 & 25				
380	Resident	RH17 6UH	NP142	Any areas of outstanding beauty, especially in the conservation areas should be protected!	6				
381	Resident	RH17 6UH	NP142	I also support the policy on 'green space' as per policy 6.	6				
382	Resident	RH17 6UQ	NP143	I agree with the Neighbourhood Plan which says Butchers Field should be protected s a Green Space and	6			1	
383	Resident	RH17 6UQ	NP143	development should take place on the more suitable site of Standgrove Field.	3				
384	Resident	RH17 6UR	NP144	I applaud and heartily endorse virtually the entire Neighbourhood Plan. Very well done. Our plan, in my view deals very satisfactorily with my two major concerns. These are :-	No-action Comment			1	
385	Resident	RH17 6UR	NP144	That sufficient emphasis given to protecting Green Spaces	6				

386	Resident	RH17 6UR	NP144	That the vexing issue of new housing is adequately dealt with by the allocation of 27 new build houses within the Standgrove development.	3				
387	Resident	RH17 6UP	NP145	I support the NP which states policy 6 Green Field protection, east of High Street, Recreation Ground and Butchers Field.	6			1	
388	Resident	RH17 6UP	NP145	Development makes sense at Standgrove	3				
389	Resident	RH17 6UP	NP146	Protect Butchers Field Green Space	6			1	
390	Resident	RH17 6UP	NP146	I support Standgrove Development	3			1	
391	Resident	RH17 6UQ	NP147	No comments made	NCM			1	
392	Resident	RH17 6UH	NP148	I support the Neighbourhood Plan, especially keepng Butchers Field as green space and	6			1	
393	Resident	RH17 6UH	NP148	development along College Road as it's a maind throughfare with easy access.	3				
394	Resident	RH17 6UQ	NP149	No comments made	NCM			1	
395	Resident	RH17 6UH	NP150	No comments made	NCM			1	
396	Resident	RH17 6QU	NP151	I agree with all the proposals,	No-action Comment			1	
397	Resident	RH17 6QU	NP151	especially regarding the local Green Space Protections.	6				
398	Resident	RH17 6TJ	NP152	Although a little concerned about road narrowing in village	18			1	
399	Resident	RH17 6UQ	NP153	I support the plan which protects Butchers Field	6			1	
400	Resident	RH17 6QU	NP154	I'm supported of the Green Space	6			1	
401	Resident	RH17 6QU	NP154	and Standgrove Site	3				
402	Resident	RH17 6UH	NP155	Please keep Butchers Field a green space	6			1	
403	Resident	RH17 6UD	NP156	No comments made	NCM			1	
404	Resident	RH17 6UE	NP157	No comments made	NCM			1	
405	Resident	RH17 6UD	NP158	No comments made	NCM			1	
406	Resident	RH17 6UE	NP159	No comments made	NCM				1
407	Resident	RH17 6UF	NP160	No comments made	NCM			1	
408	Resident	RH17 6UF	NP161	No comments made	NCM			1	
409	Resident	RH17 6SB	NP162	I do not agree with the suggestion that Standgrove Field should be developed. College Road is a busy North to South road to and from Ardingly and does not need the extra pressure of even more houses.	3	1			
410	Resident	RH17 6SB	NP162	Also the field is an area of natural beauty.	8				
411	Resident	RH17 6SB	NP163	I disagree with the decision to buildon Standgrove Field rather than Butchers Field.	3		1		
412	Resident	RH17 6QY	NP164	No comments made	NCM			1	

413	Resident	RH17 6QY	NP165	I am supporting future development on Standgrove Field, in as much as it already has College buildings opposite and beyond it tennis courts and communal areas for the college.	3			1	
414	Resident	RH17 6QY	NP165	I much prefer that Butchers Field with its outstanding natural beautiful views and the two other green areas mentioned should remain protected and free from development.	6				
415	Resident	RH17 6UH	NP166	I support the Neighbourhood Plan, especially protecting Butchers Field as a green space	6			1	
416	Resident	RH17 6UH	NP166	and that any development should be along the main roads as recommended in the plan (Standgrove).	3				
417	Resident	RH17 6QZ	NP167	Really supportive of Neighbourhood Plan, very well done PC.	No-action Comment			1	
418	Resident	RH17 6QZ	NP167	I particularly support the development on College Road as Ardingly College is a good employer of village.	3				
419	Resident	RH17 6QZ	NP167	Also protection of local green spaces particularly Butchers Field and land East of the High Street.	6				
420	Resident	RH17 6UJ	NP168	We need more buses	General comment			1	
421	Resident	RH17 6UJ	NP168	We also need allotments	7				
422	Resident	RH17 6TJ	NP169	Excellent Plan - village needs more houses to keep shops, church, school going - although rather a long time plan 2031? The shops may have closed by then!!	3 & 15			1	
423	Resident	RH17 6SR	NP170	No comments made	NCM			1	
424	Resident	RH17 6RR	NP171	I am not in favour of the Plan because I do not believe that Standgrove is a good choice fo site for the 27 houses.	3		1		
425	Resident	RH17 6RR	NP171	I feel that the loss of wildlife, increase in traffic congestion/volume and impact on the High Weald trail mitigate against this site.	3				
426	Resident	RH17 6RR	NP171	What is the hurry? If 27 houses are required over the next 20 years (!!) can these not be gradually built using brownfield sites/infill? Why destroy a large area of biodiversity in one fell swoop?	3 & 8				
427	Resident	RH17 6RR	NP171	Other sites, such as Middle Lodge (which because of the tree-line, would not be affected so badly in terms of loss of views) and land at Bawtry - have not been properly considered.	3				

428	Resident	RH17 6RR	NP171	Why has this debate become a "two horse race"? With each site being viewed as mutually exclusive of each other - they need not be - let us please consider other sites as alternatives.	3				
429	Resident	RH17 6AN	NP172	I agree with Standgrove Field being the choice for the development of 27 houses (to include low cost housing for those with local connections) and	3			1	
430	Resident	RH17 6AN	NP172	not Sweet Shop Field which should be left as a green space for Ardingly villagers to enjoy now and in the future.	6				
431	Resident	RH17 6AN	NP172	No Butchers Field to be developed	6				
432	Resident	RH17	NP173	No comments made	NCM		1		
433	Resident	RH17	NP174	No comments made	NCM		1		
434	Resident	RH17 6TY	NP175	No comments made	NCM		1		
435	Resident	RH17	NP176	No comments made	NCM		1		
436	Resident	RH17 6SB	NP177	I am not in support of developing Standgrove Field for reasons in my letter attached.	3		1		
437	Resident	RH17 6SB	NP177	I also understand Standgrove Field was sold/given to Ardingly College on the understanding it was never developed.	3				
438	Resident	RH17 6SB	NP177	Following the recent tragic fatality near Haywards Heath Gold Club I would again like to bring to your attention the dangerous conditions of traffic in College Road. Entering College Road from Standbridge Way is difficult and dangerous with the speeding traffic and lack of visibility. I regularly get hooted at and flashed at by impatient motorists who are usually travelling much too fast. Walking to the village is also hazardous as the pavements are so narrow, again, traffic is usually travelling far too fast and certainly not at 30 miles per hour. Added to which is the greatly increased number of lorries approaching and leaving the Hansons depot. Surely, building on Standgrove Field would increase these dangers. Perhaps members of your council would like to visit Standbridge Way and see for themselves the dangers mentioned.	3 & 18				
439	Resident	RH17 6UP	NP178	No comments made	NCM			1	
440	Resident	RH17 6UE	NP179	No comments made	NCM			1	
441	Resident	RH17 6SD	NP180	We do not agree with the plans due to the local facilities not being available to support growth.	15		1		
442	Resident	RH17 6SD	NP180	Also the impact on the wildlife would be devastating.	8				
443	Resident	RH17 6RZ	NP181	No comments made	NCM		1		
444	Resident	RH17 6SD	NP182	No comments made	NCM		1		
445	Resident	RH17 6SD	NP183	No comments made	NCM		1		
446	Resident	RH17 6SD	NP184	No comments made	NCM		1		

447	Resident	RH17 6RZ	NP185	No comments made	NCM	1		
448	Resident	RH17 6RZ	NP186	No comments made	NCM	1		
449	Resident	RH17 6RU	NP187	No comments made	NCM	1		
450	Resident	RH17 6RU	NP188	No comments made	NCM	1		
451	Resident	RH17 6RU	NP189	No comments made	NCM	1		
452	Resident	RH17 6SH	NP190	I do not agree with building	3	1		
453	Resident	RH17 6SH	NP191	No, I do not agree	No-action Comment	1		
454	Resident	RH17 6SH	NP192	No	No-action Comment	1		
455	Resident	RH17 6SH	NP193	No I do not approve of building in Ardingly	3	1		
456	Resident	RH17 6SH	NP194	No I do not support development	3	1		
457	Resident	RH17 6SH	NP195	I do not support any development in Ardingly, particularly Standgrove Field	3	1		
458	Resident	RH17 6SH	NP196	No, no, no	No-action Comment	1		
459	Resident	RH17 6SD	NP197	No comments made	NCM	1		
460	Resident	RH17 6SD	NP198	No comments made	NCM	1		
461	Resident	RH17 6SD	NP199	No comments made	NCM	1		
462	Resident	RH17 6UR	NP200	It is my clear and considered view that Butchers Field should be preserved and protected.	6		1	
463	Resident	RH17 6UR	NP200	Standgrove Field is a far more suitable option.	3			
464	Resident	RH17 6UJ	NP201	No comments made	NCM		1	
465	Resident	RH17 6RU	NP202	No comments made	NCM	1		
466	Resident	RH17 6RU	NP203	No comments made	NCM	1		
467	Resident	RH17 6UR	NP204	Although there is a need for some housing within Ardingly, I don't feel greenfield sites are the way forward.	3 & 6		1	
468	Resident	RH17 6UR	NP204	Also the infrastructure is not there, the sewage works at Lodgelands cannot cope at present and if there is any increase, such as an event at the showground, tankers have to be bought in at half hour intervals to take sewage away, it will not cope with anymore use.	27			
469	Resident	RH17 6UR	NP204	However, if we have to choose a greenfield site, Standgrove has better road access to have extra housing.	3			
470	Resident	RH17 6UJ	NP205	It looks as if the Parish Council is really trying to develop a great plan for Ardingly for the next 20 years - that is for me and my generation. Thank you.	No-action Comment		1	

471	Resident	RH17 6UE	NP206	I fully support the Ardingly Neighbourhood Plan. I fee there is a definate need for development within the village in order to sustain the village school, pre-school, clubs and associations, shops and businesses.	3, 10 & 15			1	
472	Resident	RH17 6UE	NP206	Of all the sites suggested for development, I wholly endorse the proposed Standgrove site as it is currently a wasteland which separates Standgrove and indeed Ardingly College from the rest of the village. It's development would have the least impact on the traffic within the village and on the environment.	3				
473	Resident	RH17 6UE	NP207	No comments made	NCM			1	
474	Resident	RH17 6UR	NP208	I'd like to commend the Parish Council for compiling the Village Plan and for trying to find smaller infill sites for new homes.	No-action Comment			1	
475	Resident	RH17 6UR	NP208	I truly hope that the proposed development at Standgrove enhances the village character and surrounding landscape.	3				
476	Resident	RH17 6UR	NP208	I encourage provision of super-fast broadband.	17				
477	Resident	RH17 6UR	NP208	I would like the Neighbourhood Plan to encourage more sensitive use of bonfires from an environmental point of view and out of courtesy to fellow residents.	General comment				
478	Resident	RH17 6UF	NP209	I would prefer little or no development to local green field sites.	3 & 6			1	
479	Resident	RH17 6UF	NP209	If development has to occur I prefer the Standgrove development, provided the Scout Hut and Primary School benefit.	3, 10 & 11				
480	Resident	RH17 6UF	NP210	I'm glad that village development is being controlled.	3			1	
481	Resident	RH17 6UF	NP210	I am strongly opposed to any development at Butchers Field.	6				
482	Resident	RH17 6UE	NP211	Protect Butchers Field and the integrity of Ardingly as a village	6			1	
483	Resident	RH17 6UE	NP211	No more new builds apart from what is deemed absolutely necessary	3				
484	Resident	RH18 6UE	NP212	Do not use Butchers Field for development as it will spoil the whole effect of people living around or near.	6			1	
485	Resident	RH17 6UF	NP213	Yes, I am supportive	No-action Comment			1	
486	Resident	RH17 6UE	NP214	No comments made	NCM			1	
487	Resident	RH17 6SZ	NP215	Yes, I am supportive	No-action Comment			1	
488	Resident	RH17 6SZ	NP216	Yes, I am supportive	No-action Comment			1	

489	Resident	RH17 6QZ	NP217	Supprt policy 6 'local green space',	6			1	
490	Resident	RH17 6QZ	NP217	traffic and	18				
491	Resident	RH17 6QZ	NP217	development at Standgrove.	3				
492	Resident	RH17	NP218	No comments made	NCM		1		
493	Resident	RH17	NP219	No comments made	NCM		1		
494	Resident	RH17 6UE	NP220	No comments made	NCM		1		
495	Resident	RH17	NP221	No comments made	NCM		1		
496	Resident	RH17	NP222	No comments made	NCM		1		
497	Resident	RH17 6UP	NP223	No comments made	NCM			1	
498	Resident	RH17 6UP	NP224	I am broadly supportive of the Plan and draft Sustainability Appraisal and request that the following comments are taken into consideration.	No-action Comment			1	
499	Resident	RH17 6UP	NP224	Policy 1: <u>Presumption in favour of sustainable development:</u> Agreed	1				
500	Resident	RH17 6UP	NP224	Policy 2: <u>Spatial Plan for the parish:</u> The last line of this policy refers to key views. The text should be amended to state: '- protecting key views of the surrounding countryside as shown on the Proposals Map.' The reason for this is that the Neighbourhood Plan will be used by development management staff to assess planning applications. They will not have time to refer to a map in the Landscape Appraisal to check whether a proposal might be within the scope of the key views identified in that report. As this factor is included in the policy it should be shown in the NP document itself.	2				
501	Resident	RH17 6UP	NP224	Policy 3: <u>Housing supply and site allocation</u> To achieve a balanced community in a small village, the market element of the Standgrove scheme should include a mix of house types/sizes. A mixed scheme will help to develop a strong community identity and a range of accommodation may allow design with less impact on landscape. On a very small site it might be suitable to specify small units, but for a development of 27 new homes where the policy specifies that 8 will already be 2/3 bedroomed, a mixed scheme is more appropriate. Homes for sale will be available on the open market and will not be restricted to local people.	3				

502	Resident	RH17 6UP	NP224	The scheme must be carefully designed to minimise visual impact and Policy 3 should make reference to this. The density and layout should allow for areas of open space and landscape buffer planting. This could be achieved by reducing the density of dwellings on the edges of the residential area to help create a gradual transition from built area to green space. The policy could also make reference to improvements to footpath links and green corridors to enhance biodiversity and create a high quality environment. Alternatively Policy 3 could state that a design brief will be produced setting out the principles for development. This must be submitted to and agreed by Mid Sussex DC and Ardingly PC before submission of any planning application.	3				
503	Resident	RH17 6UP	NP224	<u>Policy 4: Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space</u> Suggest this states 'will deliver within Ardingly parish' one or more Suitable Alternative Natural Green Spaces...	4				
504	Resident	RH17 6UP	NP224	<u>Policy 5: Housing Design:</u> For clarity I suggest 'to be sympathetic to' rather than 'to take account of'.	Text Comments				
505	Resident	RH17 6UP	NP224	<u>Policy 6: Local Green Spaces:</u> Agreed	6				
506	Resident	RH17 6UP	NP224	<u>Policy 7: Allotments:</u> Agreed	7				
507	Resident	RH17 6UP	NP224	<u>Policy 8: Biodiversity:</u> I suggest second sentence should start..." It will support the provision of favourable conditions..."	8				
508	Resident	RH17 6UP	NP224	<u>Policy 9: Heritage Assets:</u> Agreed	9				
509	Resident	RH17 6UP	NP224	<u>Policy 10: Primary School:</u> The present wording implies that the provision of a permanent classroom is dependent on relocation of scout hut. This is not the case.	10				
510	Resident	RH17 6UP	NP224	<u>Policy 11: Scout Hut:</u> Agreed	11				
511	Resident	RH17 6UP	NP224	<u>Policy 12: Medical Services:</u> Agreed	12				
512	Resident	RH17 6UP	NP224	<u>Policy 13: Pavilion:</u> I suggest this should state 'refurbish and upgrade'.	13				
513	Resident	RH17 6UP	NP224	<u>Policy 14: Assets of community value:</u> The first sentence should be deleted as it refers to the pavilion. I suggest the village car park should be included in the list of assets.	14				
514	Resident	RH17 6UP	NP224	<u>Policy 15: Village shops:</u> Agreed	15				
515	Resident	RH17 6UP	NP224	<u>Policy 16: Cafes, pubs and restaurants:</u> Agreed	16				
516	Resident	RH17 6UP	NP224	<u>Policy 17: Broadband:</u> Agreed	17				
517	Resident	RH17 6UP	NP224	<u>Policy 18: Traffic Management:</u> Suggest delete the word 'core' as some of the proposals relate to the wider parish.	18				
518	Resident	RH17 6UP	NP224	<u>Policy 19: Car parking:</u> Agreed	19				

519	Resident	RH17 6UP	NP224	Policy 20: Ardingly Rail Depot: Line 3 – heavy goods vehicle movements. Line 4- delete 'is'.	20				
520	Resident	RH17 6UP	NP224	Policy 21: Ardingly College: Line 3- listed buildings. Line 5- delete 'and support'.	21				
521	Resident	RH17 6UP	NP224	Policy 22: South of England Show ground: Agreed, in particular the reference to the issue of noise	22				
522	Resident	RH17 6UP	NP224	Policy 23: Wakehurst Place and Millennium Seed Bank: Agreed	23				
523	Resident	RH17 6UP	NP224	Policy 24: Ardingly Reservoir: Agreed	24				
524	Resident	RH17 6UP	NP224	Policy 25: Bluebell Railway: Agreed. Line 4- add comma after 'traffic'	25				
525	Resident	RH17 6UP	NP224	Policy 26: Ardingly -Wakehurst Place Cycle Route: Agreed	26				
526	Resident	RH17 6UP	NP224	Policy 27: Infrastructure Investment: Suggest add 'and Parish Council' at end of line 2	27				
527	Resident	RH17 6UP	NP224	Proposals Map: Suggest add title at top of map, notation for AONB, Ashdown Forest Safeguarding and key views.	Proposals Map				
528	Resident	RH17 6UP	NP224	Proposals Map: Village inset: Include key views	Proposals Map				
529	Resident	RH17 6UP	NP224	Appendix C: Definition of local connection hierarchy: I support retention of this definition	Appendix C				
530	Resident	RH17 6UP	NP224	Page 7, para 1.2: '...lies in <u>the northern part</u> of the district of Mid Sussex' – see para 2.1	Text Comments				
531	Resident	RH17 6UP	NP224	Page 9, line 2- ' of the plan <u>has enabled</u> alternative options...'	Text Comments				
532	Resident	RH17 6UP	NP224	Page 11, Selected Parish Statistics- include data from Rural Community Profile, 2013 Update.	Text Comments				
533	Resident	RH17 6UP	NP224	Page 13, Biodiversity- delete ref to Conservation Area Heritage- 'numerous buildings of local interest'	Text Comments				
534	Resident	RH17 6UP	NP224	Page 15, para 2.16, line 3- 'that <u>it</u> is consistent..'	Text Comments				
535	Resident	RH17 6UP	NP224	Page 19, para 2.34, 'The Submission District Plan <u>was submitted</u> for examination in <u>July</u> 2013'	Text Comments				

536	Resident	RH17 6UP	NP224	Page 24, para 3.4, this relates to sustainability objectives rather than NP objectives.	Text Comments				
537	Resident	RH17 6UP	NP224	Page 25, suggest photo caption- should read 'sheltered housing at Priceholme'	Text Comments				
538	Resident	RH17 6UP	NP224	Page 27, line 1- 'focus <u>of</u> new development..'	Text Comments				
539	Resident	RH17 6UP	NP224	Page 28, para 4.9 Suggest 'This view has since been evidenced by the Neighbourhood Plan village survey, 2012 which identified support for 16 to 30 new homes over next 20 years and most support for family homes for sale and homes for retirees followed by small homes for sale. The Housing Needs Survey identified a need for delivering smaller affordable homes within the parish.	Text Comments				
540	Resident	RH17 6UP	NP224	Page 29, para 4.13, line 5- suggest ..'meets <u>many of</u> the criteria set out by MSDC..'	Text Comments				
541	Resident	RH17 6UP	NP224	Page 30, para 4.17, line 4. Suggest: 'and with the village Policy Aims of the Mid Sussex Local Plan, 2004', para 14.11.	Text Comments				
542	Resident	RH17 6UP	NP224	Page 31, para 4.20, line 2. Suggest : 'In addition to its historic value, it defines the gap between the two hamlets and Conservation Areas of Ardingly and Hapstead and makes a significant contribution...' 'The land East of the High Street adjoins the Conservation Area, provides the setting for a number of Listed Buildings, is traversed by a public footpath and has'	Text Comments				
543	Resident	RH17 6UP	NP224	Page 33, para 4.27, line 5. Suggest: 'the area of <u>ancient</u> woodland'.	Text Comments				
544	Resident	RH17 6UP	NP224	Page 36, para 4.40 suggest: '.. bring forward proposals to upgrade the pavilion at the recreation ground. The building requires modernisation and may benefit from extending to meet needs of users such as youth club and scouts.'	Text Comments				
545	Resident	RH17 6UP	NP224	Page 40, para 4.51, line 2- delete 'core'. Suggest: '...and approved by Ardingly PC for consultation, supports the NP's traffic management policy and is included in the County Council's Infrastructure Plan.'	Text Comments				
546	Resident	RH17 6UP	NP224	Page 41, para 4.56, line 6, suggest: 'The District and Parish Councils will continue to explore..'	Text Comments				

547	Resident	RH17 6UP	NP224	Page 46, para 4.69 line 1- suggest: 'This policy will replace...' (However this appears to be the only site where the saved policy is included in the text, so para could be deleted).	Text Comments				
548	Resident	RH17 6UP	NP224	Page 47, para 4.75, line 2. I suggest this could be reworded, for example as follows: 'The ANP supports the extension of the Bluebell Railway and the possible future reinstatement of the station provided it can be demonstrated that traffic generation, access and car parking are acceptable in terms of residential amenity and impact on the surrounding natural environment.'	Text Comments				
549	Resident	RH17 6UP	NP224	Comments on draft Sustainability Appraisal I support the contents and assessments in this draft document. Page 21, Assessment of Neighbourhood Plan Policy 3, Sustainability objective 12: Option B provides significant support to local business and should be amended to ++	Draft Sustainability Appraisal				
550	Resident	RH17	NP225	No comments made	NCM		1		
551	Resident	RH17 6UJ	NP226	No comments made	NCM			1	
552	Resident	RH17 6UD	NP227	Overall the plan appears to be a good one.	No-action Comment			1	
553	Resident	RH17 6UD	NP227	I support the choice of opposite Lodgelands being the best area to build houses, but slightly anxious that the number of houses eventually built might end up as more than 27, once the developers get their teeth into it! I have an idea this happened in Ardingls Close (so I am told!)	3				
554	Resident	RH17 6UD	NP227	Thank you to all who have contributed and developed the Plan and Sustainability Appraisal a great deal of work has obviously gone into it.	No-action Comment				
555	Resident	RH17 6RT	NP228	If houses have to be built in the village we feel 27 is more than enough to be built in a small village. Standgrove is the only option as there is access to the main road without affecting the running of the village too much.	3			1	
556	Resident	RH17 6RT	NP228	Butchers Field is not an option due to Street Lane being so narrow and near to the school causing parking problems.	3				
557	Resident	RH17 6RT	NP229	A critical issue mentioned in the ANP is the overcrowding at the school which will only get worse with house building - both in the parish and the local area.	10				

558	Resident	RH17 6RT	NP229	This can be relieved as acknowledged in the plan by relocating the Scout Hut. I believe that this must be a priority for any development, including that proposed at Standgrove Field (as was part of the Butchers Field proposal) There would be very few potential sites within the village that would be suitable for Scouts to use.	11				
559	Resident	RH17 6RT	NP229	It must be addressed for any future development as any other chances for the issue to be resolved would be few and far between and most likely more complex to achieve.	3				
560	Resident	RH17 6RT	NP230	The need to find a new location and to build a new Scout Hut should be liked to all opportunity for development.	11	1			
561	Resident	RH17 6RT	NP230	As the Neighbourhood Plan identifies Standgrove as the preferred location, it should be a condition of planning that a new Scout Hut is provided by the current owner of the field (Ardingly College). This would be an appropriate gesture from those at Ardingly Collge who enjoy abundant resources when compared with the village Primary School. It would also support the development of young people in our community through scouting.	11 & 3				
562	Resident	RH17	NP231	I was good to see the display in Hapstead Hall on Saturday and to have the opportunity to talk to members of the Parish Council about the plan and matters concerning the plan.	No-action Comment	1			
563	Resident	RH17	NP231	Community Self-Build: I would be keen to see a part of any green-field development be given to a small community self-build scheme to encourage local people/families to build their own house to live in in Ardingly. Whether or not some sort of plan could be put in place to restrict onward sales to those outside the village is a key question, but I feel such self-build scheme would be beneficial to the landowner and the village.	3				
564	Resident	RH17	NP231	Scout Hut: (I should point out the I am Treasurer of the 1st Ardingly Scouts) Should the Butchers Field development not go ahead the Scouts will not have a plan B for a replacement scout hut. Since we have about 10 years left on the current lease to use the present land/scout hut we would need to formulate a plan in line with the policies in the Neighbourhood plan.	11				

564	Resident	RH17	NP231	I have not discussed it with the Showground yet, but my idea would be to talk to them about the possibility of building a scout hut in the compound to the north of the entrance of the Showground opposite Cobb Lane. This compound is used for the Machinery Sales and has an area next to the hedge adjoining the road that I can see as being considered for this use. Any such building might be shared with the Showground for their use during their shows and would not necessarily require the sale of land to the Scouts, but a lease, such as we have at present. I have put forward this idea to the Ardingly Scouts' Executive at our meeting last night and it had broad support, so I agreed that I would try to foster dialogue with the Showground to see how receptive they might be to the idea.	11				
565	Resident	RH17	NP231	Showground: I would support the Parish Council in keeping the Showground in the plan.	22				
566	Resident	RH17 6SF	NP232	I am writing to support Policy 3 and the proposed sale of Standgrove Field for development as residential housing.	3			1	
567	Resident	RH17 6SF	NP232	I would always support the maximum size of housing possible, with 3 and 4 bedroom family homes (to attract families with children whose long-term investment in the village is important) as part of the plan amongst a range of housing options on the site, including affordable housing.	3				
568	Resident	RH17 6SF	NP232	I support policy 3 and the proposed allocation of residential development on Standgrove Field as it is important for any village to plan for continuing growth.	3				
569	Resident	RH17 6SF	NP232	We support the protection of land at Butchers Field, Street Lane from development through its identification as a Local Green Space under Policy 6. This field provides an important outlook over the surrounding countryside from Street Lane and reinforces the rural character of our village.	6				
570	Resident	RH17 6SF	NP232	We are pleased to see, and support the recognition which is given in the Neighbourhood Plan to the important role played by key local employers and attractions in the village, in particular Wakehurst Place, the South of England Showground and Ardingly College. All of these support the village and contribute to its unique character.	21, 22 & 23				
571	Resident	RH17	NP233	Having studied the presentation it does not change my mind that selecting Standgrove Field for the development is the wrong choice, with a much better location for existing and new Ardingly residents being Butcher's Field.	3		1		

572	Resident	RH17 6SA	NP233	In your presentation you say you favour Standgrove Field over Butcher's Field and the land south of Middle Lodge because:- "- Some of the reasons why the committee believe Standgrove Field will be most acceptable to the village include:	3				
573	Resident	RH17 6SA	NP233	• It is adjacent to existing housing - So is Butcher's Field	3				
574	Resident	RH17 6SA	NP233	• It will benefit a significant employer in the village - Any development in Ardingly would do the same. Presumably the employer is Hanson. Surely the Parish Council are not using Hanson as a factor in where to site the development? I'm certain most, if not all, Ardingly residents would be distressed if they felt you were.	3				
575	Resident	RH17 6SA	NP233	• Access to the site is easy - This should not be a significant reason in your decision, making the right decision for existing and future residents should be the priority. The disruption will be extreme wherever you decide to build the development.	3				
576	Resident	RH17 6SA	NP233	• The site owner has indicated that they would: (i) contribute a SANG if development were approved (ii) set aside the rear of the site for informal public use in perpetuity" - Within your Neighbour Plan you define SANG as "Suitable Alternative Natural Green Spaces (SANG) are sites that cater for the recreational needs of communities in order to reduce the likelihood of visitor pressure and disturbance on important nature conservation areas.". Although it is a laudable aim, why would establishing a SANG be significant in an area such as Ardingly, which is surrounded by wonderful countryside which is not in danger of being put under visitor pressure. I do not believe this is a significant factor.	3 & 4				
577	Resident	RH17 6SA	NP233	I believe the Parish Council should focus its attention on safety, of existing residents and the families of the proposed development.	3				

578	Resident	RH17 6SA	NP233	College Road is already an extremely busy road. Despite the introduction of the 30mph limit, from the start of the village down to past Ardingly College, it is frequently ignored by motorists on their way into Haywards Heath, presumably to catch a train or going to their place of work. One presumes the residents of the proposed development are likely to be younger families, with children, as that is the Parish Council's stated aim in their 'Vision for Ardingly in 2031'. Therefore, many mothers and their children will be trying to turn right, across the traffic coming down College Road, on their way to the local school or to support the local shops. Worse still, mothers will be pushing young children in pushchairs up narrow pavements as the massive trucks from the cement works thunder by, only a matter of feet away.	3				
579	Resident	RH17 6SA	NP233	Traffic calming will help but will not remove this safety issue. I believe it is irresponsible for the Parish Council to consider a development which places more mothers and young people at risk and further disrupts the lives of existing residents while the option exists to build on other sites, such as Butcher's Field. That site would present less safety issues for the mothers and children as they made their way into the village and because of a more pleasant experience, would be far more likely to support the local school and shopkeepers by walking into the village. Developing in Standgrove Field makes it inevitable the mothers will turn left in their cars down College Road and take their custom into Haywards Heath. Surely that cannot be what the Parish Council is intending?	3				
580	Resident	RH17 6SA	NP233	I must stress that I am not against the development of 27 properties in Ardingly. However, I seriously urge the Parish Council to reconsider its decision to make Standgrove Field the site for the development. Instead, transfer your attentions to Butchers Field which would not only provide the right environment for the development but would also provide the new residents with easy access to the village which will in turn result in them becoming more integrated into village life.	3				
581	Resident	RH17 6TD	NP234	I wish to register my support for the Pre-submission Ardingly Neighbourhood Plan and in particular Policy 3 relating to housing and affordable housing,	3			1	
582	Resident	RH17 6TD	NP234	Policy 6 – protecting Local green space and Land East of High Street;	6				
583	Resident	RH17 6TD	NP234	policy 7 relating to allotments,	7				
584	Resident	RH17 6TD	NP234	policy 9 – Heritage Assets,	9				
585	Resident	RH17 6TD	NP234	Policy 14 – Assets of Community Value;	14				
586	Resident	RH17 6TD	NP234	15 relating to shops and	15				
587	Resident	RH17 6TD	NP234	16 relating to Pubs,	16				
588	Resident	RH17 6TD	NP234	Policy 18 – Traffic Management and	18				

589	Resident	RH17 6TD	NP234	19 – car parking.	19				
590	James Philip Strategic & Community Planning Horsham District Council	RH13	NP235	I write to inform you that this District Council has no adverse comments to make at this stage on your draft Neighbourhood Plan and Sustainability Appraisal and would like to take the opportunity to congratulate you on your work so far and wish you well with your endeavours.	No-action Comment			1	
591	Resident	RH17 6TT	NP236	I have just read the plan and broadly support the proposals except for the proposed development of 27 homes on Standgrove Field.	3	1			
592	Resident	RH17 6TT	NP236	I have two main reasons for concern re this development 1. I do not support a development on Standgrove Field. College Road, in my opinion, is a dangerous road with very narrow pavements. Traffic calming alone does not work - speed limits need to be enforced and this just does not happen in Ardingly. I myself had an accident while walking on the pavement with a dog on a lead - the dog was hit by a car that hit the curb and my daughter only last week nearly got hit by a car late at night driving too fast. Young families with children in pushchairs will soon not want to walk up to the village and elderly people will be too far out of the village to walk (and it is uphill) and this will result in more cars on the road as they will choose to drive.	3				
592	Resident	RH17 6TT	NP236	I cannot see that village shops will be more supported as they would choose to drive to Haywards Heath whereas if the development was more central (ie Butchers Field) people would walk. I know - I used to live at the Standgrove end of the village and had to walk with my children every day - it was why we moved to the centre of the village.	3				
593	Resident	RH17 6TT	NP236	2. I have not liked the way that the planning process has been managed by the Parish Council. It has seemed to me that the planning process has become a battle between the two ends of the village - and has divided the village in a way that is not in the right spirit of the community. I am also concerned that the process has not been entirely transparent.	3				
594	Resident	RH17 6UE	NP237	I am broadly supportive of the plan but would like consideration to be given to the following:	No-action Comment	1			

595	Resident	RH17 6UE	NP237	My one comment would be that the identification of space for allotments might be treated in a slightly more concrete manner than "I'm sure that we can find some space somewhere on the college grounds". It's my experience that arrangements like this (which are not identified as a priority by all parties) tend to fall through the cracks somewhat and, as the college stand to gain substantially should the NP be approved, it would be nice to know that they, in turn, are offering their support back to the village.	7				
596	Resident	RH17 6UE	NP237	Many thanks to the parish council for all their hard work.	No-action Comment				
597	Resident	RH17 6TU	NP238	We are a family of five living at 7 College Road, Ardingly, RH17 6TU. Our main concerns regarding the Ardingly Neighbourhood Plan and the development of proposed sites for development are of the affect this will have on the village countryside and also the increase in traffic.	3	1			
598	Resident	RH17 6TU	NP238	We chose to buy a house in Ardingly because it was a small village location, surrounded by countryside. Our children have attended the local school and walk and cycle freely. We are concerned that a development in Butcher's field which on Street Lane would mean a loss of some of this countryside and make cycling and walking along this area to school, the Church and the park, quite dangerous.	3				
599	Resident	RH17 6TU	NP238	With regards to the traffic, living on College Road we already struggle with the speed and high volume of traffic at particular times during the day. Having young children we worry about their safety in crossing this road and wonder if new developments would see any traffic calming being introduced or would we merely see an increase in traffic, problems with parking and congestion.	3 & 18				
600	Resident	RH17 6TU	NP238	We are broadly supportive of the plan for further development in Standgrove, but would stress our concerns regarding the traffic, current lack of any traffic calming or enforcement of the 30 mph speed limit.	3 & 18				
601	Resident	RH17	NP239	I am writing to you, to please do not grant planning permission for the building of houses on the Stangrove field as	3	1			
602	Resident	RH17	NP239	Ardingly village is a very special and unique. It has to fit in and work with the The South of England Show ground, the reservoir, Wakehurst Place and Ardingly College. No other village has to tolerate so much. We are very proud to have such a treasured mixed to live with. This makes the village very very busy, which we all except. This village cannot take any more traffic or building works on this scale.	No-action Comment				

603	Resident	RH17	NP239	The school is running to it capacity and should not be put under pressure or strain.	10				
604	Resident	RH17	NP239	The high street is too narrow already without added traffic. Please go and talk to the people in the high street about the damage to their cars. The cars have their wing mirrors turn in. If you leave them sticking out, they are damaged within hours and the cars already have damage to the bumpers and panels. Please go and have a look.	18 & 19				
605	Resident	RH17	NP239	Ardingly College want to build outside of the village boundary and add this to the village. They are not aloud to build outside the boundary. Ardingly College in the past have been very lucky with their building programs for the colleges buildings, but now there want to sell the land to build houses, this is too much.	3				
606	Resident	RH17	NP239	There is soo much traffic , that during the London to Brighton bike ride they even shut the road in one direct, no other village has to put up with that.	18				
607	Resident	RH17	NP239	The Show ground has an immense amount of comings and goings with traffic.	22				
608	Resident	RH17	NP239	Street Lane is soo narrow with cars parked either side, how can you get all of these lorries along this road. It is boarding on madness.	18				
609	Resident	RH17	NP239	What about all of the noise, mess and dust in such a small village. This will put the village at risk. There is also the safety of the village, people and property. There is a lot of vehicles to build 27 houses. This is a lot house to build in such a small time and area.	3				
610	Resident	RH17	NP239	Ardingly prides itself on its size and green landscape. This would ruin the views and culture of its nature.	3				
611	Resident	RH17	NP239	Also there will be a strain on the water and sewage supplies.	27				
612	Resident	RH17	NP239	I have lived here for 43 years and am very happy, please don't let them spoil our village and put the village and the people at risk, It does seem very ironic that you want to put street carming in, but want to increase more houses in the village. The majority of the village don't want more houses, the Mid Sussex county council have not approved the plans and you still want to go against the village and Mid Sussex county council, why go against the people and majority ??????????????????	3				
613	Resident	RH17 6AN	NP240	I have read the Ardingly Neighbourhood Plan 2013-2031 and I am in favour of all the proposals, if carried out as promised, except for the Housing Supply and Site Allocation Policy.	3			1	

614	Resident	RH17 6AN	NP240	Having said that though, although my strong preference would be for no new developments to go ahead on any of the 'Local Green Spaces' (or even worse on AONB land adjoining/skirting these areas), I do realise that if the ANP doesn't submit a proposed area, then that will leave Ardingly open to developers coming along and building anywhere they like, with no regard whatsoever for the views of the villagers or the impact on the environment.	3 & 6				
615	Resident	RH17 6AN	NP240	So, in light of that ... I GIVE MY SUPPORT TO THE ARDINGLY NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN ... as it stands, which offers Standgrove Field as the 'sacrificial lamb', in the belief that Sweet Shop Field (Land East of the High Street), Butchers Field and those fields to the north and east of Standgrove Field will in return be protected by the Parish Council from developers and further new builds.	3 & 6				
616	Resident	RH17 6TE	NP241	I have read the above mentioned Ardingly Neighbourhood Pre Submission Plan and note you request a response to the draft you have published. The whole spirit of local plans was to be an open and democratic process within a community, without having or showing an extreme bias in favour of any Individual or local Business.	No-action Comment		1		
617	Resident	RH17 6TE	NP241	As this appears to not be the case in the Ardingly Parish Council Pre-Submission Neighbourhood Plan 2013.08.13, please register a loud and clear NO against this plan from me.	No-action Comment				
618	Resident	RH17	NP242	I read with interest the Neighbourhood Plan and I would initially thank you all for your hard work.	No-action Comment		1		
619	Resident	RH17	NP242	There is one comment I feel compelled to make regarding the housing. I am aware that the Parish Council are supporting the development in Standgrove which I have no objections to. However to disregard the development in Butchersfield, I feel is totally wrong for the following reasons; a) It is proposed to build smaller and less expensive houses type of houses.	3				
620	Resident	RH17	NP242	b) It is proposed to build a Scout Hut for the local youth.	11				
621	Resident	RH17	NP242	c) This will release much needed ground for the local School.	10				

622	Resident	RH17	NP242	d) The development is much closer to the local amenities. e) People living here with small children will walk to School rather than drive as I am sure those in Standgrove will do, thus adding to the traffic in College Road. I would also like to point out that the number of local children each year leaving the Primary School are approximately 12 - 15 which will add up to about 240 - 300 over the next 20 years. I am sure that a small percentage of these would love to try and stay in the Village and because the price of a house is out of reach of many youngsters to only build 8 affordable homes over the next 20 years is totally ridiculous.	3				
623	Resident	RH17	NP242	I urge you to think again about Butchers Field and allow this small well planned development to go ahead.	3				
624	Resident	RH17 6SH	NP243	I am not in favour of any building development in Ardingly, I do agree that a few houses should be built but NOT a large site at STANDGROVE FIELD.	3	1			
625	Resident	RH17 6SH	NP243	I think the College should accommodate its workers on site, and I believe it has expanded too fast and spent too much money and has got itself into debt.	21				
626	Resident	RH17 6SH	NP243	I believe HANSON is a dreadful thing for Ardingly to have on its doorstep, the LORRIES are DANGEROUS,	18				
627	Resident	RH17 6SH	NP243	Two years ago Ardingly Reservoir didn't have enough water. Southern England should be a lot more careful of its supply of water.	24				
628	Resident	RH17 6SH	NP243	Butchers Field does seem to be closer to more development, and the School, and the Village Hall, and is on a quieter road..	3				
629	Resident	RH17 6SH	NP243	College Road seems to be a rat run for fast cars. This area is an area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Hanson does not add to that. The Speed of Cars is ATROCIOUS.	18				
630	Resident	RH17 6SH	NP243	Can the School fit in any more children, Can the Surgery cope with any more people.	10 & 12				
631	Resident	RH17 6SH	NP243	I am not in favour of Standgrove Development	3				
632	Resident	RH17	NP244	I am not in favour of the Ardingly Neighbourhood Plan for the following reasons: 1. I think the whole NP process has been hijacked by arguments about the rights and wrongs of building houses in alternative locations in the village. I happen to think that Butchers Field is a better location but it would be a shame if my vote on the NP was based on that rather than the wider content and context of the plan.	3	1			

633	Resident	RH17	NP244	2. I would also like to challenge the assertion by the Parish Council that unless a development site was proposed in the plan one would be assigned to Ardingly by another party. Given that the site which is supported by the Council for development has had its planning application turned down, wouldn't it be more prudent to wait until one or the other had been approved?	3				
634	Resident	RH17	NP244	3. Why does the NP have to be approved this year? Why does it need to be completed in advance of the District Plan, if that could supersede it?	No-action Comment				
635	Resident	RH17	NP244	4. Have conflicts of interest within the Parish Council been declared? Examples: a. Involvement with the college (commercial, personal or otherwise) b. Residential proximity to any of the development areas	No-action Comment				
636	Resident	RH17	NP244	5. Paragraph 2.25 refers to paragraph 3.21, which does not exist.	Text comments				
637	Resident	RH17	NP244	6. Paragraph 4.14 – how vital is the College as a “local” employer? How many Ardingly residents are employed there?	3				
638	Resident	RH17	NP244	7. Paragraph 4.16 – policy 5 Housing Design – what does the phrase “The Neighbourhood Plan requires all developments, including alterations to existing buildings, to take account of the character and scale of surrounding buildings and landscape” actually mean in practice?	5				
639	Resident	RH17	NP244	8. If the development go ahead in Standgrove, what provision will be made for a new Scout Hut in order to free up the necessary additional classroom at St Peter's School? The lease on the existing Scout Hut still has in excess of ten years left on it. If no suitable alternative provision can be made for this facility then presumably the 1st Ardingly Scout Group doesn't have to vacate that site – in which case how would that affect the Standgrove application and, if adversely, why has this site been supported in the NP?	11				
640	Resident	RH17	NP244	9. Policy 12 – Medical Services a. There is no likely site for a GP's surgery, given constraints over availability of land, parking, access and design – unless this is included in both the Standgrove and Butchers Field proposals. b. If no commercial feasibility study has been undertaken – even basic research – why has this been included in the plan?	12				

641	Resident	RH17	NP244	10. Policy 17 – broadband a. The bandwidth available on the current broadband infrastructure is already limited and is unlikely to be improved for the foreseeable future. b. Adding more houses, even if only one of the two planning applications goes ahead, will restrict it even if new users are simply added to the existing infrastructure. c. The developers should be obliged to fund an improvement in the underlying technical architecture. d. This should be reflected in the policy in the NP, otherwise it is not sufficiently reflecting the current needs of village residents. Notwithstanding policy 27, it's good that the NP includes reference to "supporting" high-speed broadband but unless the Council has a way of paying for it, it is fantasy.	17				
642	Resident	RH17	NP244	11. Policy 18 – Traffic Management a. Only the "core" of the village is referred to in this policy. b. The problem of speeding and appalling driving practices is prevalent throughout the village, not just in its core. I can provide examples of this, if required, but the policy as such should cover the entire village.	18				
643	Resident	RH17	NP245	I have discussed the proposals with local residents but unfortunately, having tried to view the proposals on the website, it refused to download. However, any measures that reduce the traffic speed on college road will be most welcome so please take this as an endorsement to your ideas. Can I also add that the idea of adding more housing on this road is ridiculous as it will increase traffic flow near the college which is already busy during peak hours.	3 & 18				1
644	Resident	RH17 6UB	NP246	I write to express my support of the Ardingly Neighbourhood Plan	No-action Comment				1
645	Resident		NP247	I would like to let you know I am against the Neighbourhood Plan as they are only putting forward the Standgrove Field for development	3		1		
646	Peter Phillips Asset Manager Highways Agency	RH4 1SZ	NP248	Thank you for consulting with the Highways Agency on the neighbourhood plan. Please note that the Highways Agency has no comments to make on this plan in regard the Strategic Road Network	No-action Comment				1
647	Resident	RH17 6SF	NP249	I am writing to say that I do not agree with the Neighbourhood Plan. It has been well thought out in most respects, but I am very unhappy with the way the site for development has been chosen. It makes no sense and is deeply flawed.	3		1		

648	Resident	RH17 6SF	NP249	Ardingly College have not, at this stage, put Standgrove Field forward for inclusion in the NP. This puts them on a par with East Field, that was, as you will remember, withdrawn from consideration. This means that the allocation by the Parish Council is not valid.	3				
649	Resident	RH17 6SF	NP249	We were told by Planning Aid that the small groups that met to put forward ideas for the shape of the Village as we saw it in the next 20 years, was just the beginning of the long planning process that should be carried out, with the full participation of the whole village. Putting up a few boards with statements on them, does not constitute a proper consultation.	General comment				
650	Resident	RH17 6SF	NP249	Many of the people that I spoke to at that 'consultation' had no idea what it all meant. They did not understand the term SANG. They did not understand what was meant by the choice of Standgrove Field by the PC.	General comment				
651	Resident	RH17 6SF	NP249	The Government has said that decisions should be made by the whole community, not just a few, mostly unelected representatives. The Parish Council has never consulted with the Village as to what they want.	General comment				
652	Resident	RH17 6SF	NP249	The criteria for choosing Standgrove Field is spurious at best (see enclosed document)	3				
653	Resident	RH17 6SF	NP249	As no minutes of the deliberations of the NP Committee have been published, most people in the Village have not got a clue as to what the nature of these discussions might have been and feel totally disenfranchised as a result.	No-action Comment				
654	Resident	RH17 6SF	NP249	Option A Identify Butchers Field for housing Identify Standgrove Field for housing enhance natural beauty Should be A -- B -- Butchers Field would have a significant negative impact, while building on Standgrove Field would only have a negative impact. Hankinson Duckett states: that B would involve considerable loss of local landscape views, from College Road, the footpath along Lodgelands and the High weald Landscape Trail. B is adjacent to a large ancient wood, all of which is protected as such.	Option B 1. Preserve and NP A -- B - Ardingly PC says: building on	General comment			

655	Resident	RH17 6SF	NP249	<p>5. High quality healthy lifestyle +? B+ Should be A +? B +? NP A Ardingly PC says: that BF would have a possible positive impact, while SF would have a positive impact. SANGS does not have to be alongside a development site. It can be resolved by an agreed financial contribution. Where is the proposed SANGS for B?</p>	General comment				
656	Resident	RH17 6SF	NP249	<p>6. Protect outstanding landscape setting B - Should be A -- B -- NP A -- Ardingly PC says: that BF would have a significant negative impact, while SF would only have negative impact. Hankinson Duckett states that development of B would have a significant and detrimental effect on the character of the landscape as a whole. The majority of views are highly sensitive to changes in landscape character as the site forms part of the curtilage to Ardingly settlement and has significant time depth. It forms the separation between Ardingly College campus and the Village. It is considered that development here would have a severe impact on local landscape character.</p>	General comment				
657	Resident	RH17 6SF	NP249	<p>10. Encourage local food 0 B +? Should be A 0 B 0 NP A Ardingly PC says that BF would have no impact, while SF would have a possible positive impact. How can development of one or other site encourage local food ?</p>	General comment				
658	Resident	RH17 6SF	NP249	<p>12. Support local businesses/ tourism 0 B + Should be A 0 B 0 NP A Ardingly PC says that BF would have no impact, while SF would have a positive impact. Apart from financial gain, how can one site or the other do this? Both are popular.</p>	General comment				

659	Resident	RH17 6SF	NP249	<p>12. Reduce impact of traffic/ walking/ cycling B +? Should be A + B -- Ardingly PC says that BF would have no impact, while SF would have a possible positive impact. Development of A would perhaps encourage children to walk to school or the bus stop or to activities within the Village, but B would encourage car journeys as College Road is admitted to be too dangerous to allow children to walk or cycle. (quote from Cllr Chalk at a recent NP meeting: “ No one would allow their children to walk to the Scout Hut if it was relocated to B”) Children would be most likely to be driven to the school or the bus stop from site B. Journeys to work are just as likely to be North through the Village, South. Many local people work in Crawley as or Gatwick. A is half the distance to the Village than B.</p>	NP A 0	General comment				
660	Resident	RH17 6SF	NP249	<p>12. Protect historic environment Should be A - B -- Ardingly PC says that BF would have negative impact, while SF would have no impact. B is an ancient (1066 1456) Assart field that is very much part of the medieval landscape with considerable time depth. It sustains a wide variety of 'at risk' wildlife.</p>	NP A - B 0	General comment				
661	Resident	RH17 6SF	NP249	<p>Middle Lodge land is situated nearer to the village than B and the Lindfield Road could be the subject of Traffic calming with a suitable entrance. It could easily accommodate the 27 houses that Ardingly wants. Because of the tree line in the field, a development here would not impact the High Weald trail in the same way as B. I feel that this option has not been properly looked at.</p>		3				
662	Resident	RH17 6SF	NP249	<p>The land at Bawtry would be perfect for a few houses, with easy access and probably not much opposition. It is within easy walking distance of the Village.</p>		3				
663	Resident	RH17 6SF	NP249	<p>We asked for other sites to be put forward. Here are two that have not been properly looked at.</p>		3				
664	Resident	RH17 6SF	NP249	<p>WHAT IS THE HURRY? POLICY OPTION Development at B would have a significant adverse impact on the traffic situation in Ardingly.</p>		3				
665	Resident	RH17 6SF	NP249	<p>It would have a huge impact on the environment and its biodiversity.</p>		3				
666	Resident	RH17 6SF	NP249	<p>It would have a significant effect on the wildlife of the area. While A has been home in recent years to sheep, B has been full of Deer, Badgers, three kinds of Bats and two kinds of Owls, Sparrow Hawks, Kestrels, Swallows, Grass Snakes and small mammals and large numbers of wildflowers. I have the Sussex University Biodiversity study for Standgrove.</p>		3				

667	Resident	RH17 6SF	NP249	There has been no mention of the footpath that was passed by WSCC in 2011, and is still under appeal. Advice from WSCC states that it would be most unwise to put forward for planning permission, land that was the subject of a planning decision.	3				
668	Gemma Avory South East Water	ME6 5AH	NP250	South East Water has recently put out the statutory Water Resource Management Plan (WRMP) which will cover the period from 2015 to 2040, and the final is due for publication in April 2014. The WRMP identifies the forecast of the supply demand balance in water demand across the company's entire supply region and, working with neighbouring water companies and other third parties, will present options to meet any deficits which are forecast. The Final supply demand forecast in the WRMP will present our preferred options to meet these deficits, and these options could include new groundwater and surface water supplies, reductions in leakage and other demand management measures, as well as cross-border sharing of resources.	No-action Comment	1			
669	Gemma Avory South East Water	ME6 5AH	NP250	The parish of Ardingly is situated within our Water Resource zone 2. Our current dWRMP indicates that, this zones will remain in surplus for until 2020, after which time a few additional groundwater schemes will be required, along with a regional transfer from a neighbouring water company, Peacehaven effluent re-use scheme (by 2025) and improvements to a water treatment works in the area (2016).	No-action Comment				
670	Gemma Avory South East Water	ME6 5AH	NP250	Our WRMP will take full account, in line with statutory guidance, of the planning forecasts of Local Authorities within our region. They have all been contacted and we have a comprehensive forecast, developed by Experian, together with neighbouring companies, of growth estimates in population and households. For the Mid Sussex district in particular, our forecasts include a growth estimate of 4,138 households over the period from 2012 to 2020, 9,312 households over the period from 2012 to 2030, and 14,678 households over the period from 2012 to 2040. We consider that this is satisfactory for the purpose of meeting the requirements of 27 new homes by 203 in the Ardingly Neighbourhood Plan.	3				

671	Gemma Avory South East Water	ME6 5AH	NP250	In the neighbourhood plan there is no mention of the code level the new homes will be built to. Given that the south east is classed as water stressed and there is potential for a deficit in demand without further options we would encourage these homes to be built to at least Code level 4 or higher and to include as much water efficient technologies as possible. We do support Objective 8 in the sustainability appraisal in conserving water and improving water quality and suggest the housing standards could be mentioned in this objective.	3				
672	Resident	RH17 6UE	NP251	Thank you all for your concern and practical ideas for our village. You have worked so hard and considered all angles. We especially like the way you are trying to keep the green fields south of Street Lane as pasture: we don't want to loose our rural identity.	6			1	
673	Resident	RH17 6UE	NP251	It's good to know that you intent that St Peter's School should have a new permanent classroom and grassed play area (at last!). I would like to make a suggestion, which you might have already considered? and which will help to explain the attached plan. (map as an appendix). Could/would the SEAS give or lease to the PC a small strip of land adjacent to the footpath from Street Lane to the Recreation Ground, marked A on the plan, to be used for parking? This would be parking mainly for the residents of Downshire Terrace and for St Peter's School. Also for the Scout Hut users, if the hut were to be re-sited at SH on the plan. This would mean that the residents of Downshire Terrace would no longer park on the footpath and or block Street Lane. They would be able to access their back gardens across the footpath and the rest of us would be able to walk along the Street Lane footpath again.	General comment				
673	Resident	RH17	NP251	This would also mean that none of the present School site would need to be used for parking, which is a very important point, since every possible square meter should be used by the school children. Again, access to the School would be just across the footpath. The east end of this strip of land, adjacent to the Recreation Ground would be an ideal position for the Scout Hut. The area marked B on the plan is a suggestion for a parking place mainly for the residents of the houses with a High Street address which are east of the High Street proper, (numbers 28-52?) who would be able to access their gardens directly from the field. Obviously, this would mean fewer cars parked in the High Street. Hoping all your plans meet with the villagers approval and are adoped in due course.	General comment				

674	Resident	RH17	NP252	I have observed how hard the Parish Council and Neighbourhood Plan committees have worked on these documents. It contains many positive objectives, which I fully support however: NO, unfortunately I cannot support this ANP Pre-submission Document in its present form.	No-action Comment		1			
675	Resident	RH17	NP252	I hope everyone's comments will be considered whether they agree or disagree with the ANP Pre-submission Document. It appears that this consultation period is being used to divide the village into yes/no camps so the information can be used at the pending inquiries. Is this appropriate use of a NP? I felt the leaflet that was distributed was misleading, and confusing. It appears that many residents thought the ANP was linked to the traffic calming and not a potential planning document.	No-action Comment					
676	Resident	RH17	NP252	Policy 3 The comments on the display board as to why Standgrove Field was chosen as the preferred development site are questionable. 'It's adjacent to existing houses,' the same as Butchers Field. 'It will benefit a significant employer in the village,' this should not be a potential planning issue. 'Access to the site is easy,' along a dangerous road. 'Contribute to SANGS if development were approved,' any developer would have to contribute to either SANGS or SAMM. I understand that the owners of Standgrove Field have only said they will commit to 27 houses if the development is turned down at the inquiry. I do not understand how they can be included in this document as it stands now, if they have not committed to it. This document is very misleading as many residents think that BF is now going to be a green space and SF is going to now have a development of 27 houses.	3					
676	Resident	RH17	NP252	I do understand the PC concerns about having two developments but this should now be left to the inquiry to decide. I think many of the village would find this more acceptable in the long term. It is only because of the introduction of SANGS that a decision was not made sooner. I also understand, that while the inquiry is pending it is unwise to put forward any other sites to be included in this plan. I am sure the PC must have been aware of this fact. If this field does get turned down at the inquiry this component of the ANP should go back to the drawing board and we should have a more open discussion on sites, numbers etc with the whole community. The material needs of Ardingly College should not be included in this document; the reference to them being a significant employer in the village is as irrelevant to this document as is AC position in the IB league tables	3					

677		RH17	NP252	Policy 4: Many residents of Ardingly would not understand the implications of this policy. It is misleading to infer that this is being included in the ANP as a benefit for our community. All developments that are now proposed in this SANGS area either have to contribute a SANGS or contribute to a SAMM. As this policy is only included to support the owners of Standgrove Field development plan, future development plans and to influence the inquiry, this should not be included in the ANP. I thought the developers of Standgrove Field had already put forward this area as a green space as part of their 37 house development plans if it was to go ahead.	4				
678	Resident	RH17	NP252	Policy 6: I am concerned that by putting forward these two private fields as local green spaces you have united 2/3 of the village to support a development on Standgrove Field, whether they eventually become green spaces or not is irrelevant. By doing this you have united the PC and BF in support of a development on Standgrove Field, therefore aiding Ardingly College's development proposals and influencing the inquiry. Should the ANP be used for this purpose?	6				
679	Resident	RH17	NP252	Policy 7: I do not know whether the allotments need it's own policy as the PC are already obliged to provide these.	7				
680	Resident	RH17	NP252	Policy 11: I do not think this should be included in this document as it is the Scout movement concerns.	11				
681	Resident	RH17	NP252	Policy 21: There is no map included as stated or I have missed it. 'to enhance the College's position as a school and local employer,' I think this statement should be taken out as all the main businesses in the village employ people from the locality. To enhance the College's position as a school, what does that actually mean or are they referring to the money they may get from the proposed development/s. I think AR3 should be kept.	21				

682	Resident	RH17	NP252	1.I would like to point out that both Standgrove and Butchers Field were given both the same development capacity = Low. The position of this field is very prominent and creates a rural setting for the village. There are many views over this field from different points. There are views over the downs which can be seen on a clear day at various points on College Road eg Sumners and Standbridge way. This field was accessed for development as Sensitivity=substantial. The field is a Medieval Assart field dating back to the 1066 - 1499 so this field is very much part of our ancient field patterns and should be acknowledged as such. A footpath was granted across this field in 2011 and is now under appeal. This field has become very important in supporting the wild life of the ancient woodland that borders this site. Development of this field would affect the Ancient Woodland, Field Patterns and wild flower grassland. This is part of AC campus and Planning Policy AR3 should apply to this field as it is still part of MSDC Draft Plan	Sustainability Appraisal				
683	Resident	RH17	NP252	5.We are a rural community crossed by many footpaths. This part of the SANGS is only included in this document to aid AC development plans and I am not aware of this being discussed at any council meetings. If a sang's car park was located here this would only contribute to more traffic on this road which would definitely not create a feeling of well being in this part of the community. Also, if the village was involved with the management and building of a car park for this SANGS would we have to pay for this? By including this in the ANP our PC are influencing the pending inquiry and our PC could be obliged to support any other developments that Ardingly College may put forward in the future.	Sustainability Appraisal				
684	Resident	RH17	NP252	6.This field protects the southernmost boundary and approach to Ardingly and as such is very much part of the integral character of Ardingly Village. Therefore this has been accepted as contributing to its outstanding setting in an area of AONB. A development here would involve loss of the strategic gap between our village and Ardingly College. This field has been in continual recorded agricultural use until 1981 when The Woodard Foundation bought this field. I understand that AC has been approached to lease the field for this purpose but it has been left fallow. This field could be brought back into agricultural use very easily.	Sustainability Appraisal				
685	Resident	RH17	NP252	10. Allotments have not been allocated on this land.	Sustainability Appraisal				
686	Resident	RH17	NP252	12.'Any development may support local businesses'- this statement could apply to any field.	Sustainability Appraisal				

687	Resident	RH17	NP252	13 This section is about impacting on traffic entering the village. Therefore the following quote clearly states Standgrove Field (B) is outside the village boundary. 'As journeys for wider services are likely to be in Haywards Heath' is simply unfounded. There is no evidence base for this statement. When it was suggested that a Scout Hut be placed here, Mrs Chalk pointed out that no one would allow their children to walk down to Standgrove as the road is too dangerous. NP meeting July	Sustainability Appraisal				
688	Resident	RH17	NP252	14. As Standgrove Field is an ancient Assart field dating back to the medieval period surely this makes it part of the historic landscape environment of the village at the southern edge of Ardingly. Therefore a development here would also impact on the village's historic character and setting, creating an incongruous extension to Ardingly by urbanising this part of our rural landscape. MSDC and Ardingly Parish Council have turned down many planning applications, over the past 20 years, for a plot of land directly west of Standgrove Field on the other side of the road.	Sustainability Appraisal				
689	Resident	RH17	NP252	Standgrove Field is no more suitable for a larger scale development than Butchers Field for the above mentioned reasons. Maybe, Butchers Field would be a more sustainable choice of location because of its position within the village.	3				
690	Resident	RH17	NP252	This could be included in the document; no development should be started: Until the Traffic calming project is completed. Until Car Parking in the centre of the village is resolved. Until the over capacity problems of the sewage works are resolved and there is more capacity created. (The lorry movements along Lodgelands to the sewage works have been a nightmare for the residents this summer, adding to the traffic movements in this part of the village.)	3				
691	Resident	RH17	NP252	To conclude: I can only assume that this Pre-submission document has been brought forward to influence the inquiry, to divide the village (butcher Field news letter) and to actively support Ardingly College's development proposals, using tax payer money to do this.	3				
692	Resident	RH17	NP252	The developers of Standgrove Field have not committed to 27 houses, the number stated in the ANP Pre-submission Document and will only commit to the ANP if their proposed development for 37 houses gets turned down at the inquiry or reduced. This important fact is not mentioned in your document and I do not think many residents of the village will be aware of this, therefore Policy 3: must be unsound.	3				

693	Resident	RH17	NP252	The Pre-submission document as outlined could be prejudicial to the inquiry process. No statements of support for any development should be made or decided upon until the planning inquiries are completed and all aspects of this consultation are given full consideration.	3				
694	Resident	RH17 6TE	NP253	I will admit to skim reading, rather than every detail. However, I agree to what I read	No-action Comment			1	
695	Resident	RH17 6UQ	NP254	Housing Policy - I believe Standgrove Field to be the most suitable site for proposed development, because it is on a main road with all utilities to hand. Access to the site is easy from College Road and there are good pavements from the field up into the village. The road is suitable to take extra traffic in the normal flow and visibility is good.	3	1			
696	Resident	RH17 6UQ	NP254	The local green spaces are well set out within the village and assist in keeping the rural nature of Ardingly	6				
697	Resident	RH17 6UQ	NP254	Keeping the strategic gap between Hapstead and Ardingly is very important in order to keep historic features alive and not just in documents.	2				
698	Resident	RH17 6UQ	NP254	Provision of allotments is a very good idea with new houses having such small gardens and people wanting to provide for themselves.	7				
699	Resident	RH17 6UQ	NP254	Strongly agree that 27 houses is enough with some homes being allocated to local families or those with ties to the village. Houses should blend in with village architecture and be low impact on the landscape.	3				
700	Resident	RH17 6UQ	NP254	I like the idea of a village GP Surgery	12				
701	Resident	RH17 6UE	NP255	No comments made	NCM			1	
702	Resident	RH17 6SA	NP256	We would like to know how the Parish Council have come to the decision that Standgrove Field is to be the land used for development. Having attended the Council meeting in Haywards Heath, we were under the impression that this area was turned down for building as an unsuitable site. We realise as do most residents in Ardingly that housing has got to be built in the village, however we feel the only democratic way ahead is to allow the villagers to have a vote on which site should be used.	3		1		

703	Resident	RH17 6SA	NP256	For this to be seen to be fair and honest we suggest the plans in full, which must include the aesthetics' of the houses, size and SANG and the councils plans for traffic congestion for Standgrove and Butchers Fields be displayed in Hapstead Hall and then all residents should be given a chance to vote on which site they would prefer. This would mean the majority of the village would have what they feel is best for thier village. This is called a true democracy!	3 & 4				
704	Resident	RH17 6SA	NP256	We feel under no circumstances should the wishes of Ardingly College have any sway on the decision the village takes on this project. They are a private enterprie who should manage their finances without relying on the village to purchase their spare land to make their books balance. If the College is really interested in the village and would like to play a part in its future, perhaps they should allow Standgrove Field to be used as much needed allotments.	21 & 7				
705	Resident	RH17	NP257	I am emailing to confirm that I do not want building of any type to take place on what the village still call 'sweet shop field'. I would wish that this land is protected as green space.	6	1			
706	Johnathan Lieberman Principal Planning Consultant Boyer Planning	TW1 4BW	NP258	Introduction Background 1.1 This response to the Ardingly Neighbourhood Development Plan Consultation Draft (March 2013) is submitted on behalf of Collingwood Neptune Ltd. 1.2 As a local land promoter, Collingwood Neptune has particular interest in the emerging spatial strategy and housing policies of the area and specifically, the company has an interest in land known as Butchers Field, South of Street Lane, Ardingly. 1.3 As the Parish Council will be aware, an outline planning application for 35 dwellings (including at least 40% affordable housing) together with a Scout Hut and associated parking was submitted to Mid-Sussex District Housing in October 2011 (Council Ref: 11/03383/OUT). The application was refused planning permission in early 2012 and is subject to a current appeal to be heard by way of Public Inquiry in early 2014.	General comment		1		

706	Johnathan Lieberman Principal Planning Consultant Boyer Planning	TW1 4BW	NP258	1.4 As a general point, Collingwood Neptune recognises and supports the fact that Ardingly Parish Council is being proactive in the preparation of their Neighbourhood Plan. However, given the current status of the Mid-Sussex District Plan, we consider that only limited progress can be made in terms of carrying forward the Neighbourhood Plan. Paragraph 184 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that "Neighbourhood plans must be in general conformity with the strategic policies of the Local Plan. To facilitate this, local planning authorities should set out clearly their strategic policies for the area and ensure that an up-to-date Local Plan is in place as quickly as possible. Neighbourhood Plans should reflect these policies and neighbourhoods should	General comment				
706	Johnathan Lieberman Principal Planning Consultant Boyer Planning	TW1 4BW	NP258	1.5 This approach has been supported by the recent decisions in respect to other Neighbourhood Plans that are progressing ahead of the Local Plan: Dawlish Parish Neighbourhood Development Plan was found 'unsound' partly as a result of the draft Core Strategy having only reached the preferred options stage. In this case, the Inspector stated that "...because of its timing in relation to the production of strategic policies, it is not possible to demonstrate that the provision for housing growth is based on an objective assessment of housing requirements. This is a key flaw in the DPNP which cannot be remedied until the Teignbridge District Council's Core Strategy/Local Plan is settled".	General comment				
706	Johnathan Lieberman Principal Planning Consultant Boyer Planning	TW1 4BW	NP258	1.6 It is inappropriate for the Neighbourhood Plan to base its policies on the existing Local Plan (2004) and, whilst the emerging District Plan has been submitted to the Secretary of State, its housing policies are subject to significant objection, with the result that no weight should be attributed to its emerging policies at this stage.1.7 On this basis, we consider it premature to progress with draft version of the Neighbourhood Plan at this current time, until the District Plan's housing policies are adopted. 1.8 Notwithstanding this objection, and to assist in the progression of the Neighbourhood Plan at the appropriate time, these representations provide comment on specific policies of the proposed Neighbourhood Plan.	General comment				
707	Johnathan Lieberman Principal Planning Consultant Boyer Planning	TW1 4BW	NP258	Review of the Consultation Draft Neighbourhood Plan 2.1 The Council's evidence base to support the emerging Neighbourhood Plan includes the following documents, which will be referred to within the remainder of this representation: · Housing Strategy for the Neighbourhood Plan; · Land Availability and Site Assessments August 2013; · Housing Needs Survey Report June 2012; · Draft Sustainability Appraisal August 2013; · Ardingly Landscape Character Assessment July 2012.	General comment				

708	Johnathan Lieberman Principal Planning Consultant Boyer Planning	TW1 4BW	NP258	Policy 3: Housing Supply and Site Allocation. Housing Supply 2.2 The overall housing target for the Neighbourhood Plan can only be informed by the District Plan once it has been found sound by an Inspector following an Examination in Public. The proposed District Plan housing requirement is subject to a significant level of objection and, in accordance with National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) policies, should be afforded limited weight on this basis.	General comment				
709	Johnathan Lieberman Principal Planning Consultant Boyer Planning	TW1 4BW	NP258	2.3 Collingwood Neptune has made objections to the District Plan regarding the proposed housing requirement, raising concerns with regards to the evidence base. Specifically, the objection highlighted that the Council's Local Housing Assessment (LHA) is now out of date and can no longer be relied upon for the purpose of informing an objective assessment of housing need. The LHA has not been updated to take account of the Census 2011, more recent population projections within the CLG 2012 based and 2011 based Interim Sub-National Population projections and more recent household formation rates within CLG 2011 based Interim household projections. In addition, objectors have identified serious shortcomings with the West Sussex Strategic Housing Market Assessment (Updated 2012) on the basis that the SHMA uses evidence contained within the LHA as the starting point (which as described above has serious problems).	General comment				
710	Johnathan Lieberman Principal Planning Consultant Boyer Planning	TW1 4BW	NP258	2.4 It is our view that the District Council will need to update its evidence base to take on board objectors comments and that following an update, it is likely that a significantly higher requirement for both market and affordable housing will be needed in the District and the village areas. Until such an assessment is made, it is not possible to determine whether the proposed housing requirement for the District and Ardingly addresses National Planning Policy Framework guidance in so far as it has been planned positively or whether it meets objectively assessed housing needs.	General comment				
711	Johnathan Lieberman Principal Planning	TW1 4BW	NP258	2.5 We are therefore of the view that it is currently premature to put forward a local housing target when the District Plan has yet to be adopted.	General comment				

712	Johnathan Lieberman Principal Planning Consultant Boyer Planning	TW1 4BW	NP258	2.6 The Neighbourhood Plan's housing requirement appears to be primarily informed by the findings of the Parish's Housing Needs Survey Report which identifies a need for 19 affordable and 3 market houses.	General comment				
713	Johnathan Lieberman Principal Planning Consultant Boyer Planning	TW1 4BW	NP258	2.7 Whilst Housing Need Surveys are useful in uncovering concealed households, the findings of such surveys needs to be assessed in the context of the wider housing requirements; to include the overall housing requirement for the District (taking into account the findings of an up to date Strategic Housing Market Assessment) and affordable housing needs as identified on the Common Housing Register.	General comment				
714	Johnathan Lieberman Principal Planning Consultant Boyer Planning	TW1 4BW	NP258	2.8 As at September 2013, the District Council's Common Housing Register identified that there were 79 people on the waiting list with a local connection to Ardingly, suggesting that the current housing target put forward in the Plan is significantly higher than the evidence base suggests.	General comment				
715	Johnathan Lieberman Principal Planning Consultant Boyer Planning	TW1 4BW	NP258	Site Selection 2.9 The draft Sustainability Appraisal tests two potential housing sites (Option A identifies Butchers Field (MSDC ref 495) and Option B (identifies Standgrove Field (MSDC ref 187) for housing.	3				
716	Johnathan Lieberman Principal Planning Consultant Boyer Planning	TW1 4BW	NP258	2.10 The Parish has relied, in part, on the findings of the Ardingly Landscape Character Assessment to help inform its site selection process. This assessment splits the village into 25 character areas and makes an assessment of each separate area.	General comment				
717	Johnathan Lieberman Principal Planning Consultant Boyer Planning	TW1 4BW	NP258	2.11 We note that Standgrove Field is a distinct area in its own right (character area 10: Standgrove Place Northern Slopes) whilst Butches Field forms part of a much larger area identified as character area 16: Munnion Road Western High Weald. The Assessment concludes that character area 10 has substantial sensitivity, moderate landscape value and low capacity to accommodate development, whilst character area 16 is judged to have substantial sensitivity and landscape value and negligible/low capacity.	3				

718	Johnathan Lieberman Principal Planning Consultant Boyer Planning	TW1 4BW	NP258	2.12 Butchers Field is separated from the remainder of character area 16 by an existing tree belt along the southern boundary and is a distinct character area in its own right. This is an important consideration in the context of the site's suitability for development.	3				
719	Johnathan Lieberman Principal Planning Consultant Boyer Planning	TW1 4BW	NP258	2.13 A Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) was prepared by Catherine Shelton Associates to support the outline planning application on the site. The report concludes that <i>"the proposal would comply with the relevant saved policies insofar as they relate to design, landscape and visual issues. The application scheme has been underpinned by a detailed landscape and visual impact assessment which has influenced the scheme design and layout to ensure that the features of value on the site are retained including the trees and hedgerows. The proposed development would be an attractive and well-mannered scheme which would be assimilated into the landscape framework on the site. An appropriate scheme of landscape design/mitigation measures would also be delivered as part of the development so that views towards the site are protected and enhanced and that opportunities are taken to enhance the nature conservation value of the site through the creation of a range of habitats"</i> .	General comment				
720	Johnathan Lieberman Principal Planning Consultant Boyer Planning	TW1 4BW	NP258	2.14 The LVIA finds that the development would not result in any material adverse long term or significant impacts on the appearance of the area and would be in keeping with and integrate with the character of the area. The existing tree belt/hedgerow and established planting along the southern boundary of the site would provide an appropriate buffer between the built up area (including development on the application site) and the landscape to the south.	General comment				
721	Johnathan Lieberman Principal Planning Consultant Boyer Planning	TW1 4BW	NP258	2.15 In summary, we consider that the supporting evidence demonstrates that the site has the capacity to accommodate the development proposed and there is scope to provide landscape mitigation.	General comment				

722	Johnathan Lieberman Principal Planning Consultant Boyer Planning	TW1 4BW	NP258	2.16 We would make the following comments on the draft Sustainability Statement in respect to the proposed housing sites (Site A: Butchers Field (BF) and Site B: Standgrove Field (SF): 2.17 It is noted that the overall conclusions of the Draft Sustainability Appraisal is that both site A & B are possible options (in our view, the Sustainability Appraisal should have assessed the social, environmental and economic benefits associated with the delivery of a high housing requirement). 2.18 However, notwithstanding this point, for the reasons above, we submit that Butchers Field is a more sustainable development option that would assist in the delivery of the Parish Council's stated objectives. Table 2 below provides a summary of our conclusions.	Sustainability Appraisal				
723	Johnathan Lieberman Principal Planning Consultant Boyer Planning	TW1 4BW	NP258	Table 1 - Comments on Draft Sustainability Appraisal Site Comparison	Sustainability Appraisal				
724	Johnathan Lieberman Principal Planning Consultant Boyer Planning	TW1 4BW	NP258	Please see Appendix A with tables (5 pages)	No-action Comment				
725	Johnathan Lieberman Principal Planning Consultant Boyer Planning	TW1 4BW	NP258	2.19 We note the minutes from a Parish Meeting held on the 30th July 2013 where potential allocated sites were discussed (Appendix 1). At page 3, it is stated that <i>"Further discussions were held regarding the two remaining sites (Standgrove and Butchers Field) and it was felt that as Standgrove site was owned by Ardingly College and an important employer in the village, this site was most likely to pass a referendum and be least objectionable"</i> .	3				
726	Johnathan Lieberman Principal Planning Consultant Boyer Planning	TW1 4BW	NP258	2.20 Each site should be treated on its merits and, accepting that development is required in the AONB due to the shortage of alternative sites within the village, we are of the view that Butchers Field is a suitable and deliverable site to accommodate development over the plan period. The supporting information submitted alongside the planning application confirms this point.	3				
727	Johnathan Lieberman Principal Planning Consultant Boyer Planning	TW1 4BW	NP258	2.21 We therefore submit that Policy 3 is amended to include Butchers Field as an allocation once the housing requirement for the District, and in turn villages, has been agreed.	3				

728	Johnathan Lieberman Principal Planning Consultant Boyer Planning	TW1 4BW	NP258	2.22 We object to the designation of Butchers Field as a Local Green Space. NPPF at paragraph 77 identifies that the Local Green Space designation will not be appropriate for most green areas or open space. The designation should only be used: · Where the green space is in reasonable close proximity to the community it serves; · Where the green area is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty, historic significance, recreational value (including as a playing field), tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and · Where the green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land.	6				
729	Johnathan Lieberman Principal Planning Consultant Boyer Planning	TW1 4BW	NP258	2.23 As the NPPF states, Local Green Space designation will not be appropriate for most green areas or open space. We have not seen any evidence which shows that the site is demonstrably special to the local community. The site is bounded by significant vegetation along its boundaries and is a typical agricultural field within this part of West Sussex. It is in no way exceptional or special that it should be designated as a Local Green Space and we therefore contend that the proposed designation is not justified. We therefore recommend its deletion.	General comment				
730	Johnathan Lieberman Principal Planning Consultant Boyer Planning	TW1 4BW	NP258	2.24 We support both policy objectives. The outline planning application on Butchers Field makes provision for a new scout hut and associated parking, which would allow the primary school to expand and provide for additional parking.	10 & 11				
731	Johnathan Lieberman Principal Planning Consultant Boyer Planning	TW1 4BW	NP258	Conclusions - 3.1 Collingwood Neptune recognises and supports the fact that Ardingly Parish Council is being proactive in the preparation of their Neighbourhood Plan.	No-action Comment				
732	Johnathan Lieberman Principal Planning Consultant Boyer Planning	TW1 4BW	NP258	3.2 However, given the current status and uncertainty with the Mid-Sussex District Plan, Collingwood Neptune consider that it is currently premature to progress the draft plan until such a point as the District Plan has been adopted	General comment				

733	Johnathan Lieberman Principal Planning Consultant Boyer Planning	TW1 4BW	NP258	3.3 We have identified issues with the evidence based to support both the District Local Plan and the Neighbourhood Plan to include the housing requirement evidence. We submit that there is likely to be a higher requirement within the District which will in turn have an impact on the level of provision in the village areas.	3				
734	Johnathan Lieberman Principal Planning Consultant Boyer Planning	TW1 4BW	NP258	3.4 We have queried the assumptions made in the Draft Sustainability Appraisal in respect to the assessment of Standgrove Field and Butchers Field. We put forward that Butchers Field should be the preferred housing site. Consequently, Collingwood Neptune objects to the omission of Butchers Field as a housing site and recommend that it is included to ensure an adequate supply of housing in the Parish over the plan period to help address local housing needs.	3				
735	Johnathan Lieberman Principal Planning Consultant Boyer Planning	TW1 4BW	NP258	3.5 We object to the sites allocation as a Local Green Space and recommend its deletion. It has not been demonstrated that the site is demonstrably special to the local community.	6				
736	Resident	RH17 6RZ	NP259	The biggest thing is the proposal to put 27 houses on Standgrove field. Although I have felt this is not a good location for houses, it is certainly a better bet than Butcher's Field. It is also better than than the 35 or so houses in the earlier proposal.	3	1			
737	Resident	RH17 6RZ	NP259	To my mind the biggest plus of putting houses on Standgrove field would be if it also resulted in some redesigning of College Road at the point of entry to help slowing traffic down.	18				
738	Resident	RH17 6RZ	NP259	The less good thing is that it further straggles the village (which Butcher's field would not..!).	3				
739	Resident	RH17 6RZ	NP259	However, I have always felt that we could accommodate more houses much better by using the some of the showground land just north of Gower's pit and St Peter's School. Much more central , less visually disruptive. (I realise also that it may be impossible as I assume the SEAS are unwilling to part with it.)	3				

740	Resident	RH17 6RZ	NP259	Another location for housing which would be less visually disruptive is the field between Lower Lodge and Middle Lodge on the west side of the Lindfield road. Again, a big plus could be the extension of the traffic calmed area down the dangerous bend on the Lindfield Road. (I realise that this also may be impossible as I assume it is outside the permissible area for building, though I have an idea (from village gossip!) that the owner of the land may be willing to part with it.)	3				
741	Resident	RH17 6RZ	NP259	Other parts of the village plan I like. It seems to point a positive way forward.	No-action Comment				
742	Resident	RH17 6UN	NP260	I entirely support Policy 3 and the proposed allocation of residential development on Standgrove Field as it is important for any village to plan for continuing growth.	3			1	
743	Resident	RH17 6UN	NP260	I was however surprised to see that Policy 3 states only 2 & 3 bedroom houses to be built. Whilst I can understand the need to provide smaller dwellings in the village it does seem a little restrictive on future families who may also wish to stay within our beautiful village. Surely a more balanced range of house sizes would have been more appropriate?	3				
744	Resident	RH17 6UN	NP260	I also support the protection of land at Butchers Field, Street Lane from development through its identification as a Local Green Space under Policy 6. This field provides an important outlook over the surrounding countryside from Street Lane to the South Downs National Park and reinforces the rural character of our village, somewhat differently, from its very centre. At the same time, Street Lane, unlike College Road is entirely unsuited to taking any more traffic.	6				
745	Resident	RH17 6UN	NP260	I am pleased to see and support the recognition which is given in the Neighbourhood Plan to the important role played by key local employers and attractions in the village, in particular, Wakehurst Place, the South of England Showground and easily its biggest employer Ardingly College. All of these support the village and contribute to its unique character.	21, 22 & 23				
746	Resident	RH17 6TD	NP261	I still feel that land belonging to the South of England Showground would be more suitable for development. It is recognised that this suggestion has already been dismissed. Land in this site is not so scenically beautiful and would not infringe so much on landscapes.	3			1	
747	Resident	RH17 6TD	NP261	I would also like to raise the issue of fracking and the reality that this issue has not been discussed including any impact on Ardingly village.	No-action Comment				

748	Resident	RH17 6TD	NP261	Whilst broadly supportive, I am still left with reservations.	No-action Comment				
749	Tony Cook Head of Planning East Sussex County Council	BN7 1EU	NP262	Under delegated powers, I hereby submit the views of East Sussex County Council as Mineral Planning Authority. East Sussex County Council as mineral planning authority, has responsibility to maintain provision for aggregates in East Sussex. Policies for aggregate provision are set out in our adopted Waste and Minerals Plan for East Sussex, South Downs and Brighton & Hove.	No-action Comment	1			
750	Tony Cook Head of Planning East Sussex County Council	BN7 1EU	NP262	Minerals make an important contribution to the development of the economy. It is important that there is an adequate supply of aggregate materials to serve the building industry and the construction of necessary infrastructure. The Plan Area has historically had low levels of land-won aggregates production and has relied heavily on imports and marine landings in recent years to meet construction demands. The Ardingly Rail Depot is of strategic importance to East Sussex because crushed rock from the West Country is imported to this site and then moved on by road to serve markets in our Plan Area.	20				
751	Tony Cook Head of Planning East Sussex County Council	BN7 1EU	NP262	Policy 20 in the Ardingly Neighbourhood Plan proposes a restriction on HGV traffic movements and supports an alternative use as a long term aim. The Policy as drafted would be prejudicial to the consideration of minerals safeguarding as part of the new WSCC Minerals Plan on which East Sussex County Council will have views. The County Council accordingly objects to Policy 20 as drafted	20				
752	Resident	RH17 6SD	NP263	I do not see why it is necessary to include new houses in the NHP. Is there some law stating we have to provide more houses? I believe the village is full and has no need nor availability for new houses.	3	1			
753	Resident	RH17 6SD	NP263	· If there is a need, why are there so many houses unsold in the village? Just look at the low cost properties next to the Ardingly Inn as an example. If they are not selling why would other low cost houses sell?	3				
754	Resident	RH17 6SD	NP263	· I do not see why the APC believes that people have a right to live in this village. I moved here because it was a peaceful, quiet, picturesque village. Adding more houses to it will go a long way to spoiling that look and feel – the one which so attracted me here in the first place. You are spoiling this village beyond recognition. Is this desired or even necessary?	3				

755	Resident	RH17 6SD	NP263	· If it is necessary to add new houses to the village I see no reason why Standgrove was chosen as the site in question. I was there when this was discussed by the APC and didn't hear any single compelling reason for Standgrove to be selected, yet the vote was unanimous. This seems entirely strange and unnatural to me.	3				
756	Resident	RH17 6SD	NP263	· Your NHP speaks of protection for the countryside and yet you suggest destroying an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty in order to build houses. This is both contradictory and disingenuous.	3				
757	Resident	RH17 6SD	NP263	On the plus side · I believe the ideas for traffic calming for the village are good – College Road in particular is regularly a place where cars speed.	18				
758	Resident	RH17 6SD	NP263	· I've seen people in Turners Hill and in Crawley Down regularly out with speed cameras recording the traffic and I really think this has helped. I commute through these places every day and since their work, these places are now areas where people consciously slow down and obey the speed limits. I feel this is something the APC should do.	18				
759	Resident	RH17 6SD	NP263	Finally, I live in Lodgelands opposite Standgrove, so I'm fully expecting you to disregard my issues and not answer my questions. Please do have the courtesy to respond and answer them though as I am seriously interested to know the answer. My disagreement with the NHP is not a case of NIMBY – I am fully opposed to any development anywhere in our (presently) lovely village.	No-action Comment				
760	Resident	RH17 6RS	NP264	The quick, professional production of the document is commended. But it is too long, technical and open to interpretation to be fit for all its purposes. Sir Humphrey would approve, and no doubt that is one ambition. But if another is the instigation of interaction with the community leading to a democratic consensus, it fails. How many will read and digest it? A succinct summary is a must, if common ownership and respect are to be achieved.	General comment				1
761	Resident	RH17 6RS	NP264	My personal feelings are that we are being manipulated by government. On the assumption that resistance is now futile, other than through the ballot box, I will just say that the sacrifice of Standgrove Field is a great shame.	3				
762	Resident	RH17 6RS	NP264	There is evidence of an increase in anti-social behaviour, in the widest sense. If the population is to grow, it might be helpful if the ambition of security, tranquillity and an unpolluted environment were declared policy.	General comment				

763	Resident	RH17 6RS	NP264	Is this an opportunity to put down a marker in respect of oil/gas exploration?	General comment				
764	Resident	RH17 6RS	NP264	Should there be a commitment to maintaining the established cultural identity of the community?	General comment				
765	Resident	RH17 6RS	NP264	If there is an opportunity to actively pursue broadband improvements, this should be a policy.	17				
766	Resident	RH17 6RS	NP264	The monitoring process should be stronger. This should include a programme of dialogue with the community to assess concerns, maintain awareness and report progress, and commitment to give early notice of any risk of significant deviation from policies. The ANP should represent a living project.	General comment				
767	Resident	RH17 6RS	NP264	'Sustainable' needs to be defined – at the moment, it presents as a weasel-word. The word is potentially the drawbridge to our castle.	General comment				
768	Resident	RH17 6RS	NP264	'Take account of' in Policy 5, seems too weak.	5				
769	Resident	RH17 6RS	NP264	Typo in caption on page 46. Problems with use of apostrophes throughout (Fellow's, hairdressers).	Text comments				
770	Resident	RH17 6SA	NP265	I live opposite Stangrove Field in Erthingliegh on College Road. I was just wondering if there was any reason that our garden was not included as a possibility for Housing Allocation. We have two large plots which would provide ample space for two houses.	3	1			
771	Resident	RH17 6SA	NP265	Apart from that I think the Neighbourhood plan looks great! I'd have to say I'm not over the moon at the thought of mass building on such a beautiful meadow at Stangrove but it would be hypocritical of me to complain as I'd like to build on my own land (if only to reduce the time it takes me to do the mowing!)	3				
772	Resident	RH17	NP266	I would like to support the implementation of the proposed Ardingly Neighbourhood Plan. By doing so, I trust that future generations will be able to live in a rural community protected from over-expansion and increased traffic.	No-action Comment			1	
773	Resident	RH17	NP267	I support the Neighbourhood Plan as drafted. I am particularly thankful of all the hard work that was put into it.	No-action Comment			1	
774	Resident	RH17	NP268	I support the Neighbourhood Plan as drafted	No-action Comment			1	

775	Resident	RH17 6UB	NP269	I am broadly supportive of the plan and agree with most of the proposals. I do however note that there is no mention of Street Lane, the hazards caused by parking here especially right opposite a junction, caused by the lack of double yellow lines. Also the state of the road over the reservoir combined with the level of traffic and the speed of traffic using this as a cut through to the M23.	18 & 19			1	
776	Resident	RH17 6RS	NP270	No comments made	NCM			1	
777	Resident	RH17 6UN	NP271	A good plan.	No-action Comment			1	
778	Resident	RH17 6UN	NP272	I applaud the Paish Council for taking into account the many and diverse views and interests of village residents. Well done, and thank you	No-action Comment			1	
779	Resident	RH17 6SH	NP273	I am disappointed that once again the definition of "the village" relates purely to the core of the village and not the whole area within the village boundary.□	No-action Comment	1			
780	Resident	RH17 6SH	NP273	Policy 3 - I find it quite astonishing that the need for the College to generate value from a surplus piece of land should be considered an important factor by the Parish Council when deciding that the field at Standgrove should be the only allocated site for houses. I personally am against this development as it extends the built up boundary of the village quite significantly south on College Road, whereas Butchers Field has always appeared to me to be a natural infill site. I cannot help but think after looking at the list of committed individuals who worked on the neighbourhood plan that this is biased and a case of NIMBY.	3				
781	Resident	RH17 6SH	NP273	Policy 24 - it is disappointing not to see a proposal for a footpath or cycle path to the reservoir as is suggested in policy 24 for a cycle route to Wakehurst Place from the South of England Showground	24				
782	Resident	RH17 6SH	NP273	Policy 21 - it is my view that whilst the college may be an important source of local employment the traffic going to and from the college contributes significantly to the traffic problems within our village boundary	21				

783	Resident	RH17 6SH	NP273	Policy 18 - Again disappointing that the scope given to the authors of "The Ardingly Traffic Appraisal" was to concentrate on the core of the village (section 7) although in the Introduction (Section 1) it is mentioned that the study was intended to cover the whole parish but focus on the core of the village. I have not been able to see any consideration of traffic problems experienced outside of the core of the village with the exception of Bingham's Green. I believe that by implementing traffic calming measure in the core of the village it will compound the issues we have with speeding vehicles in the 50mph zone of College Road as people drive south and leave the 20mph zone for all the reasons listed in the report as to why the environment needs to change to enforce the 20 mph zone, until the width of the road significantly narrows after the turning to the reservoir. Narrow pavements are not an issue because there are no pavements and pedestrians literally risk their lives every time they use this stretch of road.	18				
784	Resident	RH17 6AN	NP274	Overall I agree with this document. However, I strongly object to the extension (not refurbishment) of the Pavilion as it is likely to be impact on other viability of facilities already within the village (namely the Church Centre).	13	1			
785	Resident	RH17 6TR	NP275	I have read the plan in detail and it seems eminently sensible to me in all particulars. As regards housing, whilst I do not particularly want further development in the village, I accept that there is a need. On which basis, the proposals for Standgrove look appropriate,	3				
786	Resident	RH17 6TR	NP275	particularly with the area behind being set aside as protected green space.	6			1	
787	Resident	RH17 6UJ	NP276	Looks to have been a well balanced and well researched document which seems to take in the villages needs and a projection for development over the next 20 years.	No-action Comment			1	
788	Resident	RH17 6UJ	NP277	Policy 3 . the policy states two and three bedroom houses. this is fine for the affordable element of the development but the other 19 houses needs to be a mix of housing which reflects village life. this is also supported by the village survey and the housing needs survey. I am otherwise totally in support of the NP.	3			1	
789	Resident	RH17 6TS	NP278	Policy 3 - Housing. In agreement with the site & no of houses proposed provided that the development does not take on the appearance of a cramped, claustrophobic & over-developed version of Bolnore/Lower Villages.	3			1	

790	Resident	RH17 6TS	NP278	Policy 18 Traffic Management. Do not agree with the proposed road width reductions. Agree traffic needs to slow down & that more green verges should be created where possible.	18				
791	Resident	RH17 6RS	NP279	I object to any housing development at Standgrove or Butcher's Field as Standgrove will attract additional traffic and the Village does not have sufficient infrastructure to support either development.	3		1		
792	Resident	RH17 6RT	NP280	In common with others i appreciate the time that has been taken by the working party for the draft plan. I have serious misgivings regarding the 'volte face' regarding the refusal of planning permission on Standgrove field. Permission was refused by the Parish and local Authority on genuine planning grounds and pressure from the Community and outside Groups. I understand the issue has gone to appeal. If we as a village change our mind, we are essentially accepting that our issues no longer stand.and i fear that will give power to the Developer's argument to overturn the original decision. We could end up with far more housing than the neighbourhood plan has suggested. Any past and future decisions made by the parish could be challenged as we have set a precedent. For this reason sadly i cannot accept the plan.	3		1		
793	Resident	RH17 6TU	NP281	I am totally against large scale development on Standgrove Field as I believe any development in Ardingly should be small scale and balanced within the village. Development on Standgrove would be a 'bolt on'; it would not only reduce the vital strategic gap between Ardingly College and the built up area of Ardingly, but also be detrimental to the cohesion of Ardingly as a settlement and thus negatively impact on Ardingly's 'sense of place'.	3		1		
794	Resident	RH17 6SD	NP282	I think we are offering far more than we need to, and much earlier than we need to, just to do a "favour" for a "friend". There are a number of issues that should be addressed before we should consider expansion: - Transport links - School Capacity - Traffice Issues - General issues, including consideration of the number of power cuts, and the flooding that has been persistent on College Road for the last decade or more. CClearly the area is already struagling to cope.	10 & 18		1		
795	Resident	RH17 6SD	NP282	There is no real centre to the village, with inadequate parking.	No-action Comment				

796	Resident	RH17 6SD	NP282	One Post Office and a Baker does not constitute reasonable retail outlets for a village of this size, forcing people on to the road or public transport. The recommended plan not only extends the boundaries of the village, but is an unreasonable distance to expect children to walk for school buses, etc. This will likely cause even more cars to use the busy thoroughfare.	3, 10, 15 & 18				
797	Resident	RH17 6SD	NP282	Finally, I think any major building project should not spoil the beauty of a village to passing visitors. If it is necessary, a site should be chosen that is accessible, but behind the facade of the village, so at least the traditional and historic appearance of the village is retained. This is our heritage.	3 & 9				
798	Resident	RH17 6RT	NP283	No comments made	NCM			1	
799	Resident	RH17 6RT	NP284	Although I am not in favour of any large scale building projects in Ardingly, I support the Village Plan's preference for the development of the Standgrove site over the Butchers Field site if there proves to be a necessity to support either one or another.	No-action Comment			1	
800	Resident	RH17 6UR	NP285	No comments made	NCM			1	
801	Resident	RH17 6RT	NP286	I am not in favour of any further development in the village, but if forced to choose between the two sites under threat of more housing, I would rather that Standgrove be chosen.	3			1	
802	Resident	RH17 6RT	NP286	I fully support the proposal for Butchers Field to become adopted as a green space as it forms an intrinsic part of the character and landscape of the village.	6				
803	Resident	RH17 6UH	NP287	I support the neighbourhood plan which agrees with keeping Butcher's Field, Recreation Ground, Oaklands as local green space	6			1	
804	Resident	RH17 6UH	NP287	and that any development should take place on Stangrove field.	3				
805	Resident	RH17 6UF	NP288	No comments made	NCM			1	
806	Resident	RH17 6RT	NP289	I am particularly supportive of the proposal to designate certain areas of the village as 'local green space' safeguarding against future development.	6			1	

807	Resident	RH17 6UE	NP290	I think that the parish council have been incredibly pro-active in creating the NP and applaud them for this. I think that they have made some sensible and logical decisions in the face of a very emotive subject. My main worry about the process stems from my own experiences in working with organisations who work to government targets and is this: yes, the suggested housing allocation has been catered for, yes green spaces have been nominated for protection in perpetuity BUT what happens when the goalposts are moved and we are told that the housing allocation has been readjusted to 57 from 27. What steps will the parish council take to prevent this from happening?	3	1			
808	Resident	RH17 6UP	NP291	Future housing plans should avoid greenfield sites and should not impact on the agriculture that is associated with the village. Every effort should be made to maintain the rural character of the village and its surrounds.	3 & 6				1
809	Resident	RH17 6SN	NP292	Excellent	No-action Comment			1	
810	Resident	RH17 6UQ	NP293	No comments made	NCM		1		
811	Resident	RH17 6UF	NP294	No comments made	NCM			1	
812	Resident	RH17 6UP	NP295	I believe that Standgrove Field is the most appropriate site for residential development in the village and support its allocation for that use.	3			1	
813	Resident	RH17 6UP	NP295	The proposed traffic calming measures are also sensible. I would like to see more done to reinforce the village's sense of identity to make through traffic more aware that it is entering a village and needs to slow down. This might be done by defining the entrance/exit points of the village on the three main roads into the village with a "gateless gateway" similar to that in Lindfield on the approach from Ardingly. But NO MORE ROAD SIGNS on College Road please!	18				
814	Resident	RH17 6UH	NP296	I agree with the protection of Local Green Spaces as outlined in Policy 6.	6			1	
815	Resident	RH17 6UH	NP296	I also agree that Standgrove Field is the better location for housing development.	3				

816	Resident	RH17 6TT	NP297	<p>If the plan covers the period to 2031, why does it seem that it's being rushed through? I am suspicious.</p> <p>As a young person, I am concerned that my future in the village is being shaped in a way over which I have no control except this vote. Housing development arguments won't help me with my employment, social or community needs in Ardingly. I feel that I am not being represented by people who are acting objectively.</p>	No-action Comment		1		
817	Resident	RH17 6RZ	NP298	I am concerned that the Plan has chosen Stangrove Field as the only possible site to provide additional housing in the village.	3		1		
818	Resident	RH17 6RZ	NP298	I believe that a development on Stangrove Field will increase traffic through the village, especially during the school runs to St Peter's School/Pre-School as the development is not near the centre of the village and the walk up College Road is unsafe for mothers with young children or prams. The increased traffic would also add to the problem of parking near the school during the school run and lack of parking in the centre of the village.	10 & 18				
819	Resident	RH17 6AN	NP299	I live in Ardings close and I do not. Want houses built on the surrounding area from we're I live not only will it destroy the wildlife and the landscape but the supposed area falls were I live and the road would have to come though my property and I say not happening	3		1		
820	Resident	RH17 6TD	NP300	I am completely in support of the draft plan and the sustainability appraisal. I am particularly supportive of the areas that have been selected for local green spaces as I believe it is important to protect these area , particularly the area east of the High Street.	6	1			
821	Resident	RH17 6TD	NP300	The choice of Standgrove field as the preferred site for future development is appropriate as this would have the least impact on the village and would actually improve things	3				
822	Resident	RH17 6RS	NP301	No comments made	NCM		1		
823	Resident	RH17 6RT	NP302	We feel that the Stangrove Road site would be the right place to build, as it has access directly onto a main road and traffic would not necessarily have to go into the village. We would support this Stangrove site as it will give priority to local residents, it is a small village and young people are having to move away from the village as the housing in this area is not affordable.	3	1			

824	Resident	RH17 6TU	NP303	I don't agree that Standgrove Field should be identified as the preferred site for a single large housing development in the ANP. The financial benefits to a private organisation, as referred to in 4.14, should not influence a decision to select a preferred site for housing development.	3		1		
825	Resident	RH17 6UP	NP304	I support all the policies in the document It seems to try and set the right balance between the need for housing, the need to retain the heritage, the need to have growth in the village and encourage economic activity as well as the need to respect the environment.	3 & 9			1	
826	Resident	RH17 6UP	NP304	Sometimes that balance is upset when the noise levels from one of our key assets (the show ground) disrupts the peace and quiet especially at the weekend when most people on the village are enjoying bei in the village	22				
827	Resident	RH17 6UQ	NP305	We do not need any more housing estates.	3		1		
828	Resident	RH17 6UQ	NP305	We do not want more cars coming into Holmans for the school. If the scout hut is moved and replaced by another classroom it will be terrible for cars round here. We live in Holmans and it is mayhem here twice aday and sometimes more when the school has things on. When the school was built it should have had its entrance away from a small residential road.	10 & 11				
829	Resident	RH17 6SF	NP306	I do not support building on Standgrove Field	3		1		
830	Resident	RH17 6TY	NP307	No comments made	NCM		1		
831	Resident	RH17 6TY	NP308	No comments made	NCM		1		
832	Resident	RH17 6UJ	NP309	The plan looks the best compromise for housing given the minimal impact on the centre of the village and good road access.	3			1	
833	Resident	RH17 6UJ	NP309	In the sustainability section I would like to see more importance given to retaining agriculture on the land surrounding the village to ensure that the distinctive feel and character of the area outside the built-up area is maintained. Otherwise this will easily be eroded.	Sustainability Appraisal				
834	Resident	RH16 2QX	NP310	No comments made	NCM			1	

835	Resident	RH17 6TY	NP311	I am not in favour of the Butcher's Field planned development. Without significant investment in village infrastructure (including widening the already squeezed roads and further disruptive works to add power, telephone and drainage this site is not capable of containing further development. The Standgrove development already has good access and I feel it likely that most traffic into this site will approach from south of the village which will mean it will not further congest the village roads. Service infrastructure to this area is already in place and it is located not far from the water treatment works (probably not a great sales point for prospective buyers)	3		1		
836	Resident	RH17 6TY	NP311	With regards to traffic calming measures. The village is already a bottleneck. The bottleneck is 100% due to residents parking outside their homes and exacerbated by HGV's visiting the roadstone site at ludicrous hours and at speeds higher than the limit.	18				
837	Resident	RH17 6TY	NP311	Further off road parking needs to be provided.	19				
838	Resident	RH17 6TY	NP311	With regard to affordable housing the village is near capacity, in terms of percentage of total occupancy of the village, when compared with other local villages. Why is Ardingly being targeted for so much development?	3				
839	Resident	RH17 6UE	NP312	Good news to protect parts of the village from development so that it remains village and its' identity	6			1	
840	Resident	RH17 6TA	NP313	I suggest that the short part of Street Lane opposite the Ardingly Inn that leads into the High Street by Hapstead Hall, should be pedestrianised. This area could have benches, tables etc and become a focal centre for the Village. This would have the effect of moving traffic to the main Junction of College Road/Lindfield Road/High Street, which with the measures proposed, would significantly slow traffic down by the additional volume of traffic flowing through. This has proved to be effective and not too disruptive when the road is closed for the duration of the Ardingly show. It would also stop lorries and coaches who follow sat nav instructions coming up Street Lane and trying to turn sharp right or left by the Ardingly Inn to join once again the High Street. This has already resulted in the demolition of part of my garden wall by a coach in the past.	18	1			

840	Resident	RH17 6TA	NP313	The Junction of the end of the High Street/Lindfield Road/College Road, needs to be monitored and controlled more effectively. I have witnessed over the years a number of very near misses from vehicles turning at that point. In addition the number of lorries from the Hanson depot is increasing, the size of the lorries is increasing and when fully loaded and they turn at that junction, they are leaving large tyre marks. Our house shakes when the Hanson trucks go past at anything less than 5mph. In summary, I support the plan.	18				
841	Resident	RH17 6RP	NP314	On the whole I am in favour of the proposals in the Neighbourhood Plan. I am concerned that the development of Standgrove Field will visually extend the village boundary. Particularly if it is developed in a linear fashion fronting the road. I would prefer housing to be clustered at the end nearest the village.	3	1			
842	Resident	RH17 6RP	NP314	As far as the Sustainability Report, it seems common sense to aim for all of the objectives. However I am somewhat puzzled about the statement that the village water supply is fed from an aquifer at Selsfield Common. As far as I am aware it is fed from a service reservoir at Selsfield Common which is in turn fed by Barcombe Water Treatment Works and Weir Wood Treatment Works. Perhaps this could be clarified in time for the final report.	Sustainability Appraisal				
843	Resident	RH17 6UP	NP315	Green space and agricultural land should not be used for housing without investigation of the way it will impact on the village and its ability to continue its role as part of the rural community.	6			1	
844	Resident	RH17 6RP	NP316	I am not at all supportive of any plan to urbanize and over develop our village at either Butchers Field or Standgrove Field. I would refer you to correspondence grounds and reasons previously submitted to the local PC and to the Local Authority that in detail give the objections to these ridiculous development proposals. The bigger plan being put forward gives our village plenty of time to develop more realistic plans around any development the VILLAGE consider necessary and appropriate over time. That currently being proposed for both Standgrove Field and Butchers Field should simply be dismissed and I cannot believe our own PC are not more vociferous against this.	3		1		
845	Resident	RH17 6TY	NP317	No comments made	NCM		1		

846	Resident	RH17 6TY	NP318	I appreciate that a great amount of work has gone into the plan, which I am grateful for, and am broadly supportive of the plan. However, I am concerned about the decision to support development in Standgrove Field as opposed to Butchers Field. I feel that Standgrove Field development would increase the traffic problems on College Road, as (as a parent on College Road), it is not safe walking with young children on the narrow pavements, and therefore it is highly unlikely that residents of a new development would walk rather than drive to the local amenities, including the school.	3				
847	Resident	RH17 6TY	NP318	This will therefore exacerbate the traffic problems at the school. Whereas development at Butchers Field, being in the centre of the village would allow walking to all the local amenities. It also has the benefit of mature trees which could to some extent disguise the development from the road. However, I would only be supportive of a development in Butchers Field if the road at that point, and pavements could be widened to make it safer for walkers.	10 & 3			1	
848	Resident	RH17 6TD	NP319	I found both documents to be clear and well presented. I am in broad agreement with most of the content and support the plan.	No-action Comment			1	
849	Resident	RH17 6SD	NP320	I understand the importance for land development. What I cannot comprehend is the choice of location. Black and white- an area of outstanding natural beauty with ancient woodland with wild protected flowers growing including primroses. Is this really a place to destroy?	3		1		
850	Resident	RH17 6SD	NP320	I went to St Peter's school 14 years ago and the school had to have an extra hut built as it was full to capacity, where are the new children planning to go? I could go on and on but my points have been gone over and over in the meetings. I feel the people reaping the benefits on this build would only be the people involved with the college, and I don't need to go into this. The potential new inhabitants would be living in an area that does not have the support so again no benefit factors for them.	10 & 3				
851	Resident	RH17 6RR	NP321	I do not want any houses being built on Standgrove Field. This is going to cause us a lot of noise and pollution with the lorries going in and out and the noise will disturb us and all the wildlife. The college have enough grounds to build on right out of our way and not on our doorstep.	3		1		

852	Resident	RH17 6SA	NP322	I choose to live in Ardingly because it is a real small English Village. Had I wanted to live in a large village that could well end up connected to Haywards Heath then I would have chosen to live elsewhere which would probably be much cheaper. College Road is so busy with traffic from Ardingly College and Hansens that to increase that with more dwellings would be intolerable.	3		1		
853	Resident	RH17 6AN	NP323	I vote for building on Standgrove Field	3			1	
854	Resident	RH17 6UH	NP324	like the report especially policy 6	6			1	
855	Resident	RH17 6AN	NP325	Totally Agree	No-action Comment			1	
856	Resident	RH17 6UR	NP326	The policy on Ardingly Reservoir should include the aspiration for a new public footpath along the western edge running north from the recreation centre to the road. This would enable walkers to circumnavigate the reservoir and greatly enhance its amenity.	24			1	
857	Resident	RH17 6UR	NP326	The ANP should identify to the need improve the enjoyment of local outdoor spaces by encouraging villagers minimise the frequency for garden fires, particularly in times of warm weather when neighbours may wish to be enjoying their own garden space. The lighting of fires during summer at frequencies up to twice a week should be discouraged in the strongest terms and the ANP should propose a guideline of not more than one per month or one per two months.	General comment				
858	Resident	RH17 6UH	NP327	I am in full support of the Neighbourhood Plan.	No-action Comment			1	
859	Resident	RH17 6UB	NP328	All positive & well considered but have significant concerns regarding additional housing in & around the village	3	1			
860	Resident	RH17 6UB	NP328	& the new car park.	19				
861	Resident	RH17 6RT	NP329	I fully support the Neighbourhood plan.	No-action Comment			1	
862	Resident	RH17 6TX	NP330	No comments made	NCM			1	
863	Resident	RH17 6UR	NP331	No comments made	NCM			1	
864	Resident	RH17 6TX	NP332	I agree with the traffic calming proposals, but not to a 20 mph speed limit. I do not think this is necessary.	18			1	

865	Resident	RH17 6UD	NP333	My wife and I are supportive of the plan. There are a number of issues facing the village and difficult decisions have to be made which will not appeal to all. We think that overall the plan provides a balanced approach going forward and may we thank those involved for their time and energy in drafting it.	No-action Comment			1	
866	Resident	RH17 6TY	NP334	We leave on College Road and fully support the traffic calming proposal, cars and lorries often travel at high speed far exceeding the existing speed restrictions. We have young children who are often scared due to this high speed whist walking along the footpath to school and Village centre.	18			1	
867	Resident	RH17 6TU	NP335	I do not agree with the proposal to site 27 new homes on College Road as this will increase even further the demands for the road system to take greater numbers of cars both South and North and since traffic speed, congestion and frequency is already a huge problem on the road, this will surely only add to it, especially considering the types of homes that are being proposed are 'starter homes' suitable for young families and since there is a proposal to further develop and promote St. Peters, it makes sense to locate the new homes to the North-West by Butchers, one of the original sites. Adding a further 27 homes on College Road will be catastrophic to the safety of road users and pedestrians and further considering that there will be more young children walking along College Road to the school, this is a disaster in the making.	3	1			
868	Resident	RH17 6TU	NP335	I do not agree with siting a Railway Station in Ardingly as yet again this will increase traffic both North and South on College Road and will also impact on the natural beauty and aural ambiance of our village. I have no doubt that this is no more than a cynical exercise to gain Central Government funding and to increase the capacity of the local authority to tax us yet again with further parking charges and fines.	20				

869	Resident	RH17 6TU	NP335	I have serious issues with speeding problems along College Road and have personally addressed these to one of the main culprits, Hanson and received a positive reply but qualified by an issue with the drivers not being employed directly by Hanson so as sub-contracted drivers they have very little power to enforce any action against drivers. Our efforts are pretty pathetic in the face of a 30mph speed limit that is not enforced in any way shape or form and with further suggestion of reducing it 20mph, this will be regarded as a joke by drivers of HGV's and probably most others as they all realize that this is not policed, nor are there any funds available to do so. I propose that we as private citizens police this ourselves and those that are willing to have speed cameras installed on their property are encouraged to do so with financial incentives if necessary and evidence can be presented on a regular basis to our local constabulary in order for them to make prosecutions against offenders.	18				
869	Resident	RH17 6TU	NP335	This will be extremely successful and would surely mark Ardingly out as a village with initiative that will not take kindly to such deliberately dangerous and insidious lawbreaking. A 20mph speed limit on College Road will be as unsuccessful as 30mph has been until or unless it is policed and people are prosecuted.	18				
870	Resident	RH17 6TU	NP335	One area that needs swift addressing is the issue with Broadband access which is quite pathetic and is now a decade behind areas on our doorstep. I appreciate that we are rural but that doesn't mean that we need to be Neanderthal and with the current lack of initiative to do anything constructive apart from any developments be 'in keeping' with the local infrastructure, we will remain without access to the ability to keep up with or take advantage of even basic technological advances for business and leisure pursuits and this will become more noticeable as the years roll on.	17				
870	Resident	RH17 6TU	NP335	Something has to be done now and endless consultations, studies and focus groups will leave us in a void, swallowed by a black hole of legislation and committees whilst Haywards Heath, Burgess Hill, Cuckfield, Wivelsfield and other local communities all join the Superhighway, leaving us in a field still farming with an ox and plough! We need a commitment to implement this by 2015 and that will be too long for people like me that rely on superfast telecoms systems but I realize the level of infrastructure that is required and what it will take to deliver it, but if we want to, we can deliver it.	17				
871	Resident	RH17 6TU	NP335	I support the other proposals and strongly support having a local GP practice and	12				

872	Resident	RH17 6TU	NP335	also allotments as many more people are now interested in being self-sufficient and either don't trust our food chain or can't or won't pay extortionate prices for organic produce.	7				
873	Resident	RH17 6TU	NP335	I am glad that there are initiatives in place and a committee willing to put the time and effort in for all of our benefit. Thank you.	No-action Comment				
874	Resident	RH17 6TY	NP336	No comments made	NCM			1	
875	Resident	RH17 6TD	NP337	I support this neighbourhood plan. Stangrove field is a sensible proposal especially as there is a nearby road already in existence. I would like to thank the Parish council for all their hard work.	3			1	
876	Resident	RH17 6TD	NP337	I also support the creation of local green spaces as put forward in policy 6	6				
877	Resident	RH17 6SH	NP338	The proposals are extremely selfish in that they only address the centre of the village, and will put even more danger into the areas on the edge of the village. We live at the southern end of college road, near Hansons, which is already the most dangerous part of the village when it comes to traffic risks, ie 1) Narrow Road, very hard for a car and a lorry to pass, extremely hard for two lorries to pass. 2) No footpath, and in some areas very hard to get off the road quickly. 3) No lighting. 4) Very close to Hansons, with lorries turning frequently. 5) Blind dip just south of Hansons, and between Hansons and the reservoir turning. 6) An unbelievable 50mph speed limit, despite being within the village boundary, with a significant proportion of cars and motorbikes exceeding this limit.	18		1		
877	Resident	RH17 6SH	NP338	Making the centre of the village a 20mph zone will just make people drive faster before they arrive at the zone, or after leaving it. The proposal might make more sense if the speed limit when entering the village from Haywards Heath was reduced to 30mph, but as it stands it is a complete joke, and I object to the plan as it has been scoped deliberately not to address the needs of everyone in the village, but only the majority at the centre, and it will make the part of the village where we live more dangerous.	18				
878	Resident	RH17 6UH	NP339	No comments made	NCM			1	
879	Resident	RH16 2QY	NP340	Despite the Government's much trumpeted "Localism", there still seems to be too much direction from the Centre, i.e. we have to provide this or take into account that. True localism should mean that what we decide is the end of it - no appeals, no public enquiries. It's our village, only the villagers should make the decisions. However, within the imposed constraints the Plan seems to be a generally good one.	No-action Comment			1	

880	Resident	RH17 6TT	NP341	Our main concern is if the village infrastructure is able to cope with more people ? Otherwise we support the remaining plan priorities on the list .	No-action Comment	1			
881	Resident	RH17 6UG	NP342	No comments made	NCM			1	
882	Resident	RH17 6UJ	NP343	I am very impressed by this wide-ranging and well thought out plan. I think it balances well the need to preserve the character of the village and f the exceptional natural landscape surrounding it with the needs of present day society. I welcome the proposal to limit new housing development	3			1	
883	Resident	RH17 6UJ	NP343	and to safeguard the future of Butchers Field.	6				
884	Resident	RH17 6SQ	NP344	No comments made	NCM			1	
885	Resident	RH17 6AN	NP345	Although it would be preferable to have no further development, we appreciate that further housing is needed and therefore support the plan as is.	3			1	
886	Resident	RH17 6UE	NP346	No comments made	NCM			1	
887	Resident	RH17 6TD	NP347	I want to thank the members of the APC for their hard work and commitment to the ANP which has produced a commendable plan.	No-action Comment	1			
888	Resident	RH17 6TD	NP347	With regard to Policy 6, Local Green Spaces . Item 4.2. I would like the description of Land East of High Street as quoted in the plan as . . . ' a popular walking area and has a special enclosed character'. . . to be extended to include the fact that it borders ancient woodland and Ardingly Conservation Area (East) which contains listed buildings.	6				
889	Resident	RH17 6TD	NP348	I support this neighbourhood plan. Stangrove field is a sensible proposal especially as there is a nearby road already in existence. I would like to thank the Parish council for all their hard work.	3			1	
890	Resident	RH17 6TD	NP348	I also support the creation of local green spaces as put forward in policy 6.	6			1	
891	Resident	RH17 6UH	NP349	In agreement of Local Green Spaces, etc	6			1	

892	Clare Gibbons Development Manager Southern Water	BN1 9PY	NP350	Southern Water is the statutory sewerage undertaker for Ardingly. Southern Water has a statutory duty to serve new development, and is committed to providing the right wastewater infrastructure in the right place at the right time. The adopted Ardingly Neighbourhood Plan and Mid Sussex's adopted District Plan, will inform Southern Water's investment planning. Adoption provides the planning certainty required to support investment proposals to Ofwat, the water industry's economic regulator. Investment proposals are prepared every five years through price review process. The next price review is in 2014. Ofwat's price determination will fund the investment programme in the period to 2020. There will be another price review in 2019, covering the investment period 2020 to 2025.	3		1		
893	Clare Gibbons Development Manager Southern Water	BN1 9PY	NP350	Strategic infrastructure, such as extensions to wastewater treatment works, can be planned and funded through the price review process, and co-ordinated with new development. However, Ofwat takes the view that local infrastructure, such as local sewers, should be funded by the development if this is specifically required to service individual development sites. To this end, the principle is that new development needs to connect to the sewerage system at the nearest points of adequate capacity. This may require off-site infrastructure if the nearest point is not located within the immediate vicinity of the site. Southern Water would take future income from customers into account, so that the developer would only need to fund a proportion of the total cost.	3				
894	Clare Gibbons Development Manager Southern Water	BN1 9PY	NP350	Please find following our response in respect of your specific policies. We hope that you find our response useful and that it will be taken into account when drafting the next version of the Neighbourhood Plan. We would be grateful if you could keep us informed of any future progress.	No-action Comment				
895	Clare Gibbons Development Manager Southern Water	BN1 9PY	NP350	Policy 2: A Spatial Plan for the Parish (page 26) Policy 2 directs new development to within the boundary of the built up area of Ardingly Village and where development proposals are outside the built up area, they must be able to demonstrate the exceptional circumstances that justify their impact on the AONB.	2				
896	Clare Gibbons Development Manager Southern Water	BN1 9PY	NP350	Paragraph 21 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that "Planning policies should recognise and seek to address potential barriers to investment, including.....any lack of infrastructure, services.....". Although the Parish Council is not the planning authority in relation to wastewater development proposals, support for essential infrastructure is required at all levels of the planning system.	2				

897	Clare Gibbons Development Manager Southern Water	BN1 9PY	NP350	Accordingly, Southern Water is unable to support Policy 2 as being sound. The following proposed wording would make the Policy sound: Should the need arise, development for essential infrastructure will be supported in special circumstances, where the benefit outweighs any harm or loss and it can be demonstrated there are no reasonable alternative sites available.	2				
898	Clare Gibbons Development Manager Southern Water	BN1 9PY	NP350	Policy 6 - Global Green Spaces (page 31) Southern Water understands Ardingly Parish Council's desire to designate Local Green Spaces, so that they are protected. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) grants a high level of protection to designated Local Green Spaces. However, paragraph 88 of the NPPF explains that special circumstances exist if the potential harm of a development proposal is clearly outweighed by other considerations.	6				
899	Clare Gibbons Development Manager Southern Water	BN1 9PY	NP350	Southern Water considers that 'very special circumstances' exist in relation to provision of essential water and sewerage infrastructure (e.g a new pumping station), should the need arise, in order to serve new and existing customers. This is because there are limited options available with regard to location, as the infrastructure would need to connect into existing networks. Although the Parish Council is not the planning authority in relation to wastewater development proposals, support for essential infrastructure is required at all levels of the planning process.	6				
900	Clare Gibbons Development Manager Southern Water	BN1 9PY	NP350	Accordingly, we propose the following additional text to Policy 6 (new text underlined): Proposals for any development on land will <u>normally</u> be resisted. <u>Should the need arise, development for essential infrastructure will be supported in special circumstances, where the benefit outweighs any harm, and it can be demonstrated there are no reasonable alternative sites available.</u>	6				
901	Clare Gibbons Development Manager Southern Water	BN1 9PY	NP350	Policy 8 - Biodiversity (page 32) Southern Water understands Ardingly Parish Council's intention to protect and maintain the rich natural features of the High Weald. However, we can not support the current wording of policy 8. This is because it could create barriers to statutory utility providers, such as Southern Water, delivering its essential infrastructure required to serve existing and planned development allocated in the District or Neighbourhood Plan.	8				
902	Clare Gibbons Development Manager Southern Water	BN1 9PY	NP350	There are limited options available for the location of new water and sewerage infrastructure (e.g a new pumping station) due to the need to connect into the existing sewerage system.	8				

903	Clare Gibbons Development Manager Southern Water	BN1 9PY	NP350	Paragraph 116 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) established that development should be permitted in designated areas in exceptional circumstances where it can be demonstrated that the proposal is in the public interest. This approach is further supported by paragraph 118, which describes the principle that development should be permitted if the benefit outweighs any harm.	8				
904	Clare Gibbons Development Manager Southern Water	BN1 9PY	NP350	Provision of sewerage and water supply infrastructure would be in the public interest, as it would serve both existing and new development. Utility infrastructure should therefore be permitted within designated areas in exceptional circumstances if no reasonable alternative site is available.	8				
905	Clare Gibbons Development Manager Southern Water	BN1 9PY	NP350	Although the Parish Council is not the planning authority in relation to wastewater development proposals, support for essential infrastructure is required at all levels of the planning system.	8				
906	Clare Gibbons Development Manager Southern Water	BN1 9PY	NP350	Accordingly, we propose the following additional text to policy 8: <u>Should the need arise, development for essential infrastructure will be supported in special circumstances, where the benefit outweighs any harm or loss and it can be demonstrated there are no reasonable alternative sites available</u>	8				
907	Clare Gibbons Development Manager Southern Water	BN1 9PY	NP350	New policy on the provision of infrastructure We could find no policies to provide for new or improved infrastructure to support development. The National Planning Policy Framework outlines the importance of achieving sustainable development and paragraph 177 states that 'It is equally important to ensure that there is a reasonable prospect that planned infrastructure is deliverable in a timely fashion...For this reason, infrastructure and development policies should be planned at the same time, in the Local Plan'.	General comment				
908	Clare Gibbons Development Manager Southern Water	BN1 9PY	NP350	Although the Parish Council is not the planning authority in relation to wastewater development proposals, support for essential infrastructure is required at all levels of the planning system.	General comment				

909	Clare Gibbons Development Manager Southern Water	BN1 9PY	NP350	On this basis, we propose an additional policy as follows: <u>New and improved utility infrastructure will be encouraged and supported in order to meet the identified needs of the community. New and improved utility infrastructure will be encouraged and supported in order to meet the identified needs of the community. New residential and commercial development will be permitted only if sufficient infrastructure capacity is either available or can be provided in time to serve it.</u>	General comment				
910	Resident	RH17 6RT	NP351	I would like to register my support for the Ardingly Neighbourhood Plan	No-action Comment			1	
911	Resident	RH17 6UB	NP352	The report seems to consider a single site is preferable where as all the advice in Appendix A of the original assessment seems to point towards multiple small sites so that construction can be staggered over the 20 year period, this also seems the most sensible option - "small scale incremental growth". I feel there are quite a number of small potential development sites within, or in close proximity of the built-up area that could be utilized for this purpose, for instance the land to the rear of Brittan House which seems to have been completely omitted from any consideration, and yet could produce the site for all our affordable housing on one very sustainable site.	3				1
912	Resident	RH17 6UB	NP352	It seems that of those respondents to the original survey requiring "affordable housing" the vast majority are single people, as such why are we looking at a development for 2/3 bed houses when 1 bedroom flats or starter homes are what is needed. Looking at the figures a reasonable breakdown on needs suggest 6 No 1 Bed flats and 2No 2 bed semi detached would provide adequate affordable housing to service the requirement.	3				
913	Resident	RH17 6UB	NP352	Though I completely disagree in the choice of the Stangrove site, if it is put forward as the agreed site then the proposal for allotments to be "in discussions with the College" is extremely weak and should be a prerequisite to putting this site forward for adoption.	3 & 7				
914	Resident	RH17	NP353	A comprehensive plan that addresses all key issues for the village. It is clear that a great deal of work has gone into this and those responsible for that are to be thanked.	No-action Comment			1	

915	Resident	RH17	NP353	My comment in that the plan address the need for traffic calming etc, but there is also a need to ensure that paths, rights of way, bridal paths etc are properly maintained, especially away from the centre of the village. There are important facilities for recreation but also for moving around the village. It is good to see the Wakehurst/Ardingly cycle way proposed but we also need to consolidate those paths that already exist.	26				
916	Resident	RH17 6UQ	NP354	No comments made	NCM			1	
917	Malcolm Smith The Rail Estate on behalf of the Bluebell Railway	N1 9UU	NP355	Thank you for your recent email which forwarded Mid Sussex District Council's alert to the public consultation on your Pre-Submission Ardingly Neighbourhood Plan. We welcome the opportunity to offer comments on behalf of our client, Bluebell Railway Plc. The principal objective of the Bluebell Railway continues to be the preservation and operation of the reinstated railway along a section of the former Lewes & East Grinstead line. Founded in 1959 and based at Sheffield Park station, the Bluebell Railway was the world's first standard gauge heritage railway to run scheduled passenger steam services. With its other restored stations at Horsted Keynes and Kingscote, together with regular special events and services such as the Golden Arrow Pullman, its museum and carriage works, the Bluebell Railway is a significant visitor attraction to the District. As you know, the Railway has this year completed and celebrated its longstanding project of reaching East Grinstead, which has become its new northern terminus and interchange with the national rail network.	25				1
917	Malcolm Smith The Rail Estate on behalf of the Bluebell Railway	N1 9UU		As indicated in your draft Neighbourhood Plan, the Bluebell Railway has a long-term aspiration to go west from Horsted Keynes and reinstate the former Ardingly branch line, which closed to passengers in 1963. While a single track remains west of Ardingly to serve the Rail Depot at the former Ardingly Station, the tracks east of Ardingly were removed after line closure (including the Sheriff Mill Viaduct), but the disused railway corridor remains safeguarded. Most of the disused railway corridor west of Station Approach towards Ardingly is in the ownership of Bluebell Railway, while Network Rail controls the existing track to the west of the Rail Depot. Paragraphs 4.74 and 4.75 of your draft Plan give a helpful brief outline of the background, identifying that the route for the proposed extension would be safeguarded by proposed Policy DP17 in the Submission Draft District Plan.	25				

917	Malcolm Smith The Rail Estate on behalf of the Bluebell Railway	N1 9UU		The Plan rightly indicates that the operational Bluebell Railway is currently outside the Ardingly Parish boundaries; but the proposed reinstated branch line from Horsted Keynes to Haywards Heath would utilise the safeguarded route inside the Parish boundaries westwards from a point near Lower Sheriff Farm until it reaches Copyhold Junction and the Brighton Main Line. We note that DP17 is appropriately listed as a relevant District Plan policy in para. 2.33 accordingly — strategic policy support which is a continuation of the robust provision in the adopted Local Plan Policies R14 and AR2, among others.	25				
917	Malcolm Smith The Rail Estate on behalf of the Bluebell Railway	N1 9UU		The support for the Bluebell Railway listed amongst the Community Views (para. 2.10) registered during the Parish Council's initial consultations is welcome. In recognition of this, and the opportunity of the proposed western extension, your draft Policy 25: Bluebell Railway complements, and is in general conformity with, Policy DP17. This in turn indicates very welcome support for the reinstatement of the railway link within Ardingly Parish.	25				
917	Malcolm Smith The Rail Estate on behalf of the Bluebell Railway	N1 9UU		In that it encourages the rural economy and the sustainable use of previously developed land, Policy 25 is also considered to be an appropriate and positive response according with the expectation expressed in Section 3 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF, para. 28) that Neighbourhood Plans should "support sustainable rural tourism and leisure developments that benefit businesses in rural areas, communities and visitors, and which respect the character of the countryside ... supporting the provision and expansion of tourist and visitor facilities in appropriate locations ..." The Parish Council's support in Policy 25 for a possible reinstated station at Ardingly is also noted (subject to consideration of traffic access and car parking); as is the proposed support for retention of the historic Victorian station building as an 'Asset of Community Value' (Policies 25 and 14).	25				
917	Malcolm Smith The Rail Estate on behalf of the Bluebell Railway	N1 9UU		Regarding the Ardingly Rail Depot site itself, we have noted your Neighbourhood Plan Policy 20 which supports the refusal of any development proposals at the Depot that would increase vehicular access beyond that granted in 2010, when the Hanson works was upgraded. Also noted is Policy 20's support for proposals to secure the long-term use for the site as a station, and support for retaining the station building, currently used as offices by Hanson.	20				

917	Malcolm Smith The Rail Estate on behalf of the Bluebell Railway	N1 9UU		The current <i>West Sussex Minerals Local Plan (2003)</i> safeguards the Depot for minerals processing, and forms part of the statutory Local Development Plan for the purposes of development management. This designation is recognised within the Submission Draft District Plan. We understand that consultation on, and preparation of, a new Minerals Local Plan (to coincide with the Neighbourhood Plan period up to 2031) will be undertaken by the County Council in 2014, with adoption programmed for early 2016. Policy safeguarding for the Depot for minerals processing is therefore likely to continue until at least 2016.	20				
917	Malcolm Smith The Rail Estate on behalf of the Bluebell Railway	N1 9UU		Regarding the route safeguarded for reinstatement of the railway link (within both the adopted 2004 Local Plan and the submission District Plan Policies Map), as you know in 2010 Hanson gave a Unilateral Undertaking to West Sussex County Council which provided that for so long as the company leased the depot, any future planning applications they might make for the site would not prejudice the reinstatement of the railway link towards Haywards Heath.	20				
917	Malcolm Smith The Rail Estate on behalf of the Bluebell Railway	N1 9UU		The Undertaking (registered as a land charge with the local planning authority) is underpinned with reference to adopted Local Plan policies R14, AR2 and HK3 that currently safeguard the route " <i>or any successor policy(s) providing for the safeguarding of the Reinstated Railway Link</i> ". Accordingly, the Undertaking will continue to be effective with reference to District Plan Policy DP17 when adopted, which, as a successor policy, provides for the safeguarding of the reinstated railway link to Haywards Heath via Ardingly. If adopted, your proposed Neighbourhood Plan Policy 25 could also be regarded as a relevant successor to Local Plan policy AR2 in this regard.	20				
917	Malcolm Smith The Rail Estate on behalf of the Bluebell Railway	N1 9UU		Bluebell Railway is currently preparing feasibility work on the proposed western extension, as time and resources allow. The first phase would most likely be the laying of a single track from Horsted Keynes to Ardingly (via Lywood Tunnel), stopping just short of the eastern boundary of the land leased by Hanson, near Avins Farm crossing overbridge. This would require the erection of a new bridge traversing Station Approach and High Wood stream, by way of replacement of the original viaduct removed in the late 1960s. Some initial discussions have taken place with the District Council and local landholders on the reinstatement of the line, and, as any definite proposals emerge, Bluebell Railway will be pleased to engage with Ardingly PC as part of the planning consultation process.	25				

917	Malcolm Smith The Rail Estate on behalf of the Bluebell Railway	N1 9UU		In summary, Bluebell Railway welcomes the publication of your draft Neighbourhood Plan, and recognises local residents' desire to preserve and enhance the predominantly special rural character and distinct identity of Ardingly Parish. In the tradition of Bluebell's track record of authentic restoration of the line and stations from Sheffield Park to East Grinstead, the restored western extension and associated infrastructure would aim to be historically sympathetic where possible — subject always to practical considerations or requirements for the safe operation of the Railway.	25				
917	Malcolm Smith The Rail Estate on behalf of the Bluebell Railway	N1 9UU		I trust this is helpful. The vision of your emerging Neighbourhood Plan is a positive statement of the value that the Parish Council and people of Ardingly Parish have for its future as a sustainable community. On behalf of Bluebell Railway, we wish you success with the Plan and hope that local people will be able to reflect further support for the Railway within their responses to your consultation draft.	General comment				
918	Demographics Work Group	RH17	NP356	The Demographics work group has discussed Policy 3: Housing Supply and Site Allocation. The work group recommends that Policy 3 should be revised to state that: “the affordable element of the development should be identified for 2 and 3 bedroomed homes” in accordance with the findings of the Housing Needs Survey of June 2012. If viable, an element of shared ownership will be supported as there are no such homes in Ardingly parish. The local connection requirement will apply to both types of tenure. Although some need has been identified for single person accommodation, there is already a substantial element of 1 bed accommodation in the parish and there is a higher turnover of smaller units as identified in the briefing note from MSDC Housing Officers in February 2013. Thus the supply of affordable housing will be increased by the turnover of existing housing. Existing 1- bed units: Social housing (Affinity Sutton) - 28 units Priceholme (private trust) - 22 units Hett Close (Hyde Housing Assoc) - 4 units . Further accommodation for elderly single people is available at Turnpike Court.	3				1
919	Demographics Work Group	RH17		The work group recommends that the remaining 19 dwellings to be provided through Policy 3 should comprise: “a mix of housing types, with some dwellings suitable as homes for retirees”. This reflects the findings of the Village Survey which identified most support for family homes for sale followed by homes for retirees and then small homes for sale.	3				

920	Demographics Work Group	RH17		In a village it is important to create a balanced community and this will best be achieved by a choice of house types including family and starter homes. We are mindful of the fact that family homes of a range of sizes will encourage support for St Peter's Primary School which presently caters for a proportion of children from outside the parish.	3				
921	Demographics Work Group	RH17		We cannot see any evidence for the statement in the Neighbourhood Plan that the market element of the scheme should comprise only two and three bed homes. This might be appropriate for a small development such as that to rear of Britten House. However in the case of the allocation identified in Policy 3, it is felt that a mix of housing will be more in keeping with the site's location on the edge of the built up area and more reflective of a village community.	3				
922	Demographics Work Group	RH17		Para 4.9: The last sentence is misleading. It should be rephrased to state: "This view has since been evidenced by the Ardingly Neighbourhood Plan Village Survey which identified support for 16 to 30 new homes to be built over the next 20 years. The Housing Needs Survey 2012 identified a need for delivering smaller affordable dwellings within the parish."	Text comments				
923	Demographics Work Group	RH17		Local Connection In respect of comments from the Housing Officer in relation to the 100% local connection requirement of Policy 3, it is proposed that this will apply to only 10% of the existing affordable housing stock. It should be noted that Ardingly has a significantly larger proportion of social housing than Mid Sussex and nearby villages.	General comment				
925	Demographics Work Group	RH17		Similarly the definition of local connection hierarchy will only apply to the 8 affordable units to be provided, again only 10% of the affordable housing stock.	General comment				
927	Demographics Work Group	RH17		Neighbourhood Plans provide the opportunity for communities to identify what is important to them and prepare plans that are locally distinctive and add value. The requirement for all affordable homes allocated through the Neighbourhood Plan to be restricted to those with clear local connections is entirely consistent with this and takes into account our location within the High Weald AONB. The issue of affordable housing has been addressed in a number of Neighbourhood Plans such as Lynton and Lynmouth, Much Wenlock, Upper Eden and Allendale.	General comment				
						48	100	194	15