

## **Storrington Old Mill Drive Diamond Planning Brief Supplementary Planning Document**

### **CONSULTATION STATEMENT**

This statement has been prepared by the Council in accordance with Regulation 17 and Regulation 18 (4) of the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations, 2004.

#### ***Pre-production Consultation***

On the 17<sup>th</sup> July 2007 the Storrington Action Group, consisting of local Members and a County Council Member, met with the Council before the text of the Draft SPD was produced. No specific comments were received on this early consultation.

On the 9<sup>th</sup> August 2007 also before the text of the Draft SPD was produced the Council consulted with local Members on the proposed matters to be covered by the SPD. It was considered that a joined-up development of the area was a key consideration and that the overall infrastructure situation should be addressed along with an emphasis on enhancing the links between the site and the rest of the High Street shopping accommodation.

On the 6<sup>th</sup> September 2007 a draft of the SPD was presented to the Strategic Planning Advisory Group (SPAG) for consideration. This group is open to all Council Members and acts as an advisory body for the Cabinet Member for Strategic Planning. As a result of discussions at this meeting Members suggested that all development should be expected to achieve a 'very good' rating using the BREEAM method and level 3 or higher using the code for sustainable homes. This was subsequently included in the revised Draft SPD.

#### ***Public Consultation on the Draft SPD***

Following approval by Cabinet on the 27<sup>th</sup> September 2007, the Draft Old Mill Drive Diamond Planning Brief SPD was published for public consultation on the 9<sup>th</sup> November 2007 for a period of six weeks ending on the 21<sup>st</sup> December 2007. The production of the SPD was advertised in the West Sussex County Times.

The following documents were available for public consultation:

- The Draft SPD
- The Draft Sustainability Appraisal/Strategic Environmental Assessment (SA/SEA)
- Comments forms, detailing the consultation procedures

These documents were made available at the following locations:

**Horsham District Council Offices**, Park North, North Street, Horsham, West Sussex (8.45am - 5.20pm Monday to Thursday and 8.45am - 4.20pm Fridays)

**Horsham Library**, Lower Tanbridge Way, Horsham

**Storrington Library**, Ryecroft Lane, Storrington

The Draft SPD and all accompanying documents were also made available on the Council's website.

The persons and organisations that were specifically consulted after the publication of the Draft SPD are shown in **Appendix 1** along with details of how they were consulted.

Comments were received from 16 organisations or individuals in total. **Appendix 2** provides a summary of the main issues raised in the representations received as well as how these issues have been addressed in the final version of the SPD to be adopted.

### **Further Consultation**

An un-manned exhibition was set up in Storrington Library for a two week period from the 26<sup>th</sup> November 2007 until the 10<sup>th</sup> December 2007.

A draft of the SPD, which was amended in accordance with representations received in the consultation period, was presented to the members of SPAG on the 11<sup>th</sup> March 2008 for comments. No specific comments were received from the members of SPAG.

## **APPENDIX 1**

<b>Consultee</b>	<b>How Consulted</b>	
<b>A) Horsham District Council Officers</b>		
Chief Executive	Draft SPD and accompanying documents sent	
Transport Services Manager		
Head of Development Control		
Deputy Head of Development Control		
Head of Housing Services		
Director of Community Development and Leisure Services		
Leisure Services Manager		
Head of Public Health and Licensing		
Principal Environmental Health Officer		
Council Secretary and Solicitor		
<b>B) Statutory Consultees</b>		
Statutory Consultees as detailed in Appendix 3 of the Statement of Community Involvement, however only West Sussex from the adjoining County Councils and Adur from the adjoining District Council's		
<b>C) Development Industry</b>		
Adams Hendry Consulting Ltd.	Miss Emma Barnett	Letter sent with details of how to access documents
Alliance Environment and Planning Ltd	Mr Steven Fidgett	
Barratt Developments PLC	Clive Fenton	
Barton Willmore	David Bradley	
Batcheller Thacker	Mr Nick Ide	

Bayley and Willmer Ltd	Mr Philip Willmer	
Bellway Estates		
Berkeley Strategic	Mr Adrian Brown	
Berkeley Homes (Southern) Ltd	Simon Collins	
Blue Sky Planning	Mr J Best	
Bovis Homes Ltd (South East Region)		
Boyer Planning Limited	Mr David Lander	
Bradburys	Peter Bradbury	
Brett Incorporated	Mr S Brett	
Network Rail Ltd	Andrew Derry	
Bruton Knowles		
Caldecotte Consultants	Mr Aaron Smith	
CB Richard Ellis	Mrs Phillipa Aitken	
Charles Planning Associates Limited	Mr Carl Patrick	
Chartered Surveyor and Consultant Town Planner	Mr R Maile	
Chris Blandford Associates	Mr Chris Blandford	
Clifford Dann LLP	K Roger-Jones	
Cluttons	Colin Hatcher	
Cluttons	Mr Steve Melligan	
Connells Land and Planning	Iain Berry	
Countryside Properties (Southern) Ltd		
Courtley Consultants Ltd	Howard Courtley	
Crest Nicholson (South East) Limited		
Crest Nicholson (South) Limited		
Crickmay & Partners	Mr T Hucker	
Croudace Strategic Ltd	Paul Lemar	
CSA Environment Planning	Clive Self	
Cunnane Town Planning	Mr J Blackwell	
D&M Planning	Mr Jason Clemons	
Dalton Warner Davis	Nigel Abbott	
David Evison	Mr D J B Evison	
David Hickens Associates	David Hicken	
David Wilson Estates (South East Office)	David Banfield	
David Wilson Homes		
DC Planning Limited	Mr Doug Cramond	
Development Planning Partnership	Mr Ben Stacey	
Development Planning Partnership	Ms Gemma Hotchkiss	
DMH Stallard	Mr Geoff Smith	
DMH Stallard	Mr Chris Barker	
Douglas Briggs Partnership	Louise Shaw	
DPDS	Diana Bowyer	
DPDS South East Region	Mr P Thair	
Drivers Jonas	Miss Helen Sanders	
-	Derek Scoble	
Duncan O'Kelly Partnership	Duncan O'Kelly	
Edwards and Associates	Mr Peter Edwards	
English Courtyards	Lynne Bowyer	
English Partnerships	Judith Smallman	
Enplan	Mr Martin Carpenter	
Fairview New Homes Plc	D Churchill	
G L Hearn	Antonia Liu	
Geoffrey G Fry & Associates	G Fry	

Gerry Lytle Associates Ltd	Mr Ian Davis	
GMA Planning	Emma Rodley	
Goadsby & Harding	Peter Atfield	
GVA Grimley	Vincent Gabbe	
HBF Southern Region	Pete Errington	
Henry Adams & Partners	Steve Culpitt	
	Mr Robert Crawford	
Henry Adams (previously Henry Smith)	Clarke	
Hepher Dixon	Mr Nick Green	
Hillreed Homes Ltd		
HLL Humbert Leisure	Mr Martin Taylor	
Hunter Page Planning Ltd	Mr Guy Wakefield	
Independent Town Planning Services	Mr K Potts	
Indigo Planning	Miss Emma Rodley	
J & J Design	John Shepard	
Jestico & Whiles	John Whiles	
John Lytton & Co	Lord John LYTTON	
Jones Day	Angela Turner	
Jones Lang Lasalle		
Joseph Sullivan & Associates	Joseph Sullivan	
Kember Loudon Williams	Mr R Nightingale	
King & Chasemore		
King Sturge	Ann Birchall	
KLW	Mr Roger Nightingale	
Laing Homes Ltd		
Lennon Planning Ltd	Mr Max Baker	
Leonard Martin	Mr Leonard Martin	
Les Humphrey Associates		
Lichfield Planning	Dalia Lichfield	
McCarthy & Stone Developments Ltd	Michael Tucker	
Michael Cox Associates	Mr S Cox	
Miller Hughes Associates Ltd	Mr Groucott	
Monkhouse & Bannisters		
Mono Consultants Ltd	Carolyn Wilson	
Montagu Evans	Mr Paul Burley	
Morgan Cole	Daniel Scharf	
Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners	Mr Will Edmonds	
National Grid Property Ltd	Tracy Ward	
Osborne Homes, Geoffrey Osborne Ltd	Tony Cox	
P J Smith Associates	Peter Smith	
P R C	Andy Rifley	
Parker Dann	Mr Michael Parker	
Peacock and Smith	Peacock and Smith	
Persimmon Homes South East	Edward Owns	
Persimmon Homes South East	Terry Massingham	
PH2 Planning Ltd	Mr P. J. Hodskinson	
Philip Stone	Mr Philip Stone	
Planning and Regeneration Ltd	Mr Michael Osman	
Planning Consultant	Mr Michael Pickup	
Planning Perspectives	Mr Alister Henderson	
Planning Potential	Mr Robert Scadding	
Planware	Matthew Carpenter	
Prospective Planning	Mr W N Alderton	
Rapleys LLP	Mr Aidan Thatcher	

Rawlinson & Butler	Mr Graham Ball	
RDjW Architects	Mr Tim Hutchings	
RH & RW Clutton	Mr Richard L Stubbs	
Richard L Stubbs	David Beck	
Cemex UK Operations	Mr Olivier Spencer	
Roger Tym & Partners	Mr N Hollands	
RPS	Adam Clennell	
Rural Housing Trust	John Longhorn	
Rydon Homes Ltd	Mr Jonathan Steele	
Savills	Brian Goodchild	
Schenectady-Beck	Mr M Stutchbury	
Scott Brownrigg	Mr Bob Sellwood	
Sellwood Planning	Mr Mark Jones	
Smiths Gore	Roger Lanham	
South Central Ltd	Michael Gray	
South Eastern Planning Services	Mr D Barnes	
Star Planning and Development Ltd	Mr Dale Mayhew	
Strutt & Parker	Mr Brett Moore	
Strutt & Parker		
Sunley Estates Plc		
Bryant Homes South East		
Terence O'Rourke	Mr Martin Miller	
Tetlow King Planning	Tracy-Ann Scanlan	
The Bell Cornwell Partnership	Mr Graham Bell	
The Charles Smith Trust	Mrs P G Siggs	
The D & M Planning Partnership	Mr Anthony Allen	
The Housing Corporation	Fiona Cruickshank	
The Planning Bureau	Nigel Pugsey	
Tidey & Webb Ltd		
Turley Associates	Ms Rachael Gower	
Vail Williams	Mr Ian Barnett	
VLH Associates	Vic Hester	
Wates Residential		
Weatherall Green & Smith	J Mycroft	
White & Sons	Mr Tim Kenny	
White Young Green Planning	Mr Kirill Malkin	
Woolf Bond Planning	Mr J Woolf	
WS Planning	Spencer Copping	
WT Lamb Holdings Ltd		
<b>D) Other Consultees</b>		
All Members of Horsham District Council		Draft SPD and accompanying documents sent
South Downs Joint Committee		
Sussex Police		
Horsham Community Partnership Board (Local Strategic Partnership)		

## **APPENDIX 2**

### **Summary of the main issues raised in the representations received and how these issues have been addressed in the final version of the SPD to be adopted**

#### **General Comments**

Generally representations were supportive of the planning brief, however a number of general comments were raised that can be divided up under the following sub headings:

#### **Old Mill Drive Private Sewers**

A number of representations raised concerns over the Old Mill Drive Private Sewers and how they will be incorporated into any new development that may take place at the site.

#### **Response**

Principle 14 has been reworded to ensure that the private sewer system is recognised and not overlooked in any proposed development of the site.

#### **Development over Petrol Pumps**

Several representations expressed concern over the site boundaries and the fact that part of the site is an existing petrol station and any future development that may involve building on the petrol station would be dangerous because of potential contamination.

#### **Response**

Principle 14 was edited to clarify that any proposal for new development must ensure that the risks of contamination are mitigated before construction can take place.

#### **Air quality**

There were concerns that after careful measuring in Storrington over the past year levels of pollutants in this central location are amongst the highest in the district. It stated that the main source of these pollutants is likely to be the traffic and suggested that in terms of air quality, and ultimately public health, any redevelopment within the town centre should have regard to existing statutory planning guidance on air quality and ensure that all possible steps are taken to reduce traffic related pollution.

#### **Response**

It was agreed that potential developers of the diamond should be aware of the current situation regarding air quality in the town centre and the existing statutory guidance. However, it was considered that the poor air quality rating is likely to be traffic related and one of the main objectives of the planning brief was to enhance the links between the diamond site and the High Street shopping area. These enhanced linkages would help to mitigate the effects of local and short car trips around the town centre by giving people the opportunity to move around the town centre more effectively on foot.

The text was edited to show awareness of the current air quality situation and how new development can aim to mitigate its contribution through enhancing the pedestrian links with the rest of the town centre.

#### **Chapter 1: Introduction**

It was suggested that the site information sub heading should reflect the fact that Storrington acts as a 'services hub' for a wider catchment of parishes in addition to the towns' population.

It was also felt, that there could be scope for a towns event space in the primary objectives stating the importance of links between the site and the High Street. Within the secondary objectives it was suggested that point two states ‘offer the potential to enhance’ rather than ‘protect’ the viability of existing local shops and that the third point is given more weight in terms of blending the development with the environment using innovative but proven techniques.

It was considered that there was a need to show emphasis on the need for any development to be aspirational and look beyond the diamond itself by clearly setting out from the beginning the need to enhance the linkages between the site and the rest of the town centre.

#### **Response**

The site information sub heading was edited to reflect Storrington as a ‘services hub’ for a wider catchment of parishes in addition to the towns’ population

It was agreed that the links between the site and the rest of the town should be emphasised and the introduction and primary objectives were edited to reflect this.

Point two of the secondary objectives was changed accordingly and it was felt that, point three had sufficient detail for an objective, and that the issues raised are reflected in principle 9.

### **Chapter 2: Vision**

There were suggestions that the potential Storrington has for becoming a key ‘jumping off’ point for visitors to the planned South Downs National Park increasing the need for visitor’s facilities should be reflected in the vision.

#### **Response**

It was felt that as the status of the proposed South Downs National park is still being considered and Storringtons role is still as yet unidentified coupled with current need for new town centre development to address local needs it would not be appropriate to include reference to the National Park in this document.

### **Chapter 3: Principles of Development**

#### **Principle 1: Landscape and Townscape Character**

There were suggestions that to maintain a sense of place new development should consider the historical nature of the site which contained the Old Bine Mill from which its name derives.

#### **Response**

Consideration given to the historical nature of the site was accepted and has been included in the principle. Reference to the protection of historical features and archaeology of the site has also been included in Principle 8.

#### **Principle 2: Town Centres**

Representations generally supported this principle

#### **Response**

No change

#### **Principle 3: Retail**

Representations and comments generally felt that the principle should be more specific in the range and types of retail units that are to be encouraged at the site. It was also felt that adequate space should be provided for farmers markets and other community events.

#### **Response**

The supporting text of the principle was edited to include more specific examples of retail units. The provision of space for farmers markets and other community events has been reflected in Principle 6.

**Principle 4: Residential**

Representations generally supported this principle.

**Response**

No change

**Principle 5: Other Uses**

Representations generally supported this principle.

**Response**

No change

**Principle 6: Public Spaces**

It was generally agreed that there should be provision made for a public events area for community events and farmers markets.. It was also felt that consideration should be given to signage providing directions to the rest of the town.

**Response**

The supporting text was amended appropriately to include the above points.

**Principle 7: Design**

Comments suggested that future development should be in keeping with the rural village atmosphere.

**Response**

It was felt that the principle adequately reflected this suggestion and no changes were made.

**Principle 8: Building Retention**

Representations generally supported the principle but suggested more detail was needed. One representation proposed amendments to the principle to include ‘and Archaeology’ in the title and provided suggestions to amend the rest of the text accordingly to protect possible archaeological remains at the site.

**Response**

It was felt that the preservation of archaeological remains should be part of this principle and the supporting text was edited to reflect this..

**Principle 9: Sustainable Construction and Materials**

Representations were generally supportive of this principle. However one comment suggested that the principle could be strengthened with the inclusion of ‘at least’ before ‘a very good rating using the BREEAM method.’ It argued that by setting ‘very good’ as a minimum standard it would reflect a more progressive approach to achieving high standards of design.

**Response**

The proposed amendment was agreed and added to the text accordingly.

**Principle 10: Infrastructure and Access**

In general representations centred on the issue for the potential of partial or complete pedestrianisation of Old Mill Drive. Generally comments were worried about the potential increase in traffic congestion closing Old Mill Drive may bring to an already busy section of roads.

**Response**

It was felt that by potentially closing or partially closing Old Mill Drive and enhancing the links with the site and the rest of the town centre there is the potential to cut down on local and short car journeys by encouraging travel around the centre by foot and at the same time enhancing the vitality, viability and economy of the town. One of the main causes of congestion is the effect of the through traffic, which invariably travels through the High Street and not on Old Mill Drive. Any proposal for development



however is required to provide a transport impact assessment. These comments have been reflected in the supporting text.

#### **Principle 11: Parking Facilities**

A number of comments suggested that parking provision should be considered as part of an overall parking management scheme for the area and that other modes of transport should also be considered. One comment thought it necessary to include reference to the County Councils maximum car parking standards. Another comment suggested that any reduction in car parking numbers would be a retrograde step and would have a detrimental effect on retail trade in the village.

#### **Response**

The supporting text was amended to ensure that parking provision is considered as part of an overall parking management scheme. Reference to the County Council's maximum parking standards was agreed and written into the text accordingly.

It was felt that there were already sufficient guidelines within principle 11 to ensure that parking facilities will not be reduced.

#### **Principle 12: Community Facilities**

Representations generally support this principle with emphasis on the provision of new community facilities especially public toilet facilities. However, it was felt that substantial and central community facilities should be a requirement in the design and planning of the site stating that the brief covers the residential and commercial aspects that should be considered by any prospective developer but fails to reflect the opportunity to provide enhanced community facilities in the centre of the town.

#### **Response**

The principle sets out a framework that encourages the creation of new central community facilities reflecting the current need. Although it is felt that this should not be a requirement in development proposals it has been highlighted in the text that it will be highly encouraged and looked on favourably.

#### **Principle 13: Public Transport**

Generally comments supported the principle stating that public transport at the site is currently minimal.

Suggestions were made to amend the first paragraph of the supporting text as there is an implication that any development that is submitted alongside a Travel Plan would be granted permission..

It was felt unnecessary to use cycling as an example of widening of transport choice unless walking and public transport was also included in the wording. It was also suggested that the term 'investigated' is vague and should be replaced with 'adequately addressed.'

#### **Response**

The rewording of the first paragraph of supporting text was agreed and included accordingly.

Walking and public transport was included alongside the cycling example in the text and the word 'investigated' a change was agreed and it was replaced by 'adequately addressed'.

#### **Principle 14**

It was suggested that there needs to be further detail in the supporting text to reflect some of the sensitivities involved with the site such as the location of the site in a sensitive ground water area.

#### **Response**

The supporting text was rewritten to incorporate the environmental sensitivities at the site.

**Principle 15**

Comments were generally supportive of this principle. It was felt that any new development in the area should seek the ‘Secured by Design’ status to ensure that all architects and construction companies are working towards designing out crime. There were also suggestions that CCTV could be installed into new development and that good design could ensure that people felt safe walking around the site at night.

**Response**

It was felt that the principle sets out adequate scope for the prevention of crime through design at the site. However, it was agreed that proposals should be encouraged to achieve ‘Secured by Design’ status and the supporting text was amended accordingly.

**Chapter 4: Conclusion**

There were no representations made on this chapter

**Response**

No change