

PLANNING
FOR OUR FUTURE



HORSHAM DISTRICT
LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK
TO 2018

Statement of Compliance
(Regulation 28 Statement)

**General Development Control
Policies**

September 2006

This document is printed on environmentally friendly material
Published by Horsham District Council
www.horsham.gov.uk/strategic_planning

CONTENTS

1.	Introduction	2
2.	Consultation under Regulation 25	3
	Section A: Consultees (Regulation 25)	4
	Section B: Parish & Neighbourhood Councils within Horsham District	13
	Section C: Summary of Main Issues raised and Response to the Issues and Options Consultation (Regulation 25)	15
	Section D: Further Consultees (Regulation 25)	48
	Section E: Summary of main Issues raised and responses to the additional Issues and Options Consultation (Regulation 25)	50
	Section F: Additional Consultation undertaken in relation to the Submission Statement of Community Involvement	61
3.	Consultation under Regulation 26	62
	Section G: Local Advertisement	64
	Section H: Consultees (Regulation 26)	65
	Section I: Parish & Neighbourhood Councils within Horsham District Submission Statement of Community Involvement and adjoining Parish Councils	74
	Section J: Additional Consultation undertaken in relation to the Submission Statement of Community Involvement	78
	Section K: Summary of main Issues raised and responses to the Preferred Options Stage (Regulation 26)	79
	Section L: Respondents to Preferred Options with reference number	135
4.	Consultation under Regulation 27	136
	Section M: Local Advertisement	138
	Section N: Consultees (Regulation 27)	139
	Section O: Parish & Neighbourhood Councils within Horsham District Submission Statement of Community Involvement and adjoining Parish Councils	148

STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE
(REGULATION 28 STATEMENT)
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 This Statement of Compliance has been prepared in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004 and Planning Policy Statement 12 Local Development Frameworks.
- 1.2 The Statement indicates the consultation and involvement Horsham District Council have undertaken in accordance with the Regulations (25 and 26) and with the process and procedures outlined in the adopted Horsham District Council Statement of Community Involvement (February 2006).
- 1.3 The Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) was at Submission stage during the preparation of Issues and Options and Preferred Options of the General Development Control Policies document. It was subsequently adopted after independent Examination in February 2006.

STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE
(REGULATION 28 STATEMENT)
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES

2. CONSULTATION UNDER REGULATION 25

- 2.1 Before preparing the General Development Control Policies document, bodies listed on the Consultees Database and Parish/Neighbourhood Councils within Horsham District (set out in Appendix A and B) were consulted. Initial consultation work was undertaken in conjunction with the broad consultation work undertaken on the Core Strategy and Site Specific Allocations of Land documents. It was through these early consultations that issues were raised which helped shape the nature of the General Development Control Policies document.
- 2.2 The organisations listed in Section A and the Parish and Neighbourhood Councils listed in Section B were consulted on planning for the future of Horsham District in the Issues and Options: Preliminary Consultation Document. Following the publication of the Issues and Options: Preliminary Consultation Document, the Council produced a Core Strategy DPD; a Site Specific Allocations of Land DPD and the General Development Control Policies DPD.
- 2.3 A response was received from 683 consultees and the main issues are outlined in Section C. These issues were taken into account when preparing the Preferred Options (Regulation 26) stage of the Core Strategy; Site Specific Allocations of Land; and the General Development Control document. The text in bold beneath each issue indicates how the comments have been, or were, intended to be (in the case of the General Development Control Policies document) taken into account when preparing the next stage of documentation.
- 2.4 In addition to this early work, indicative draft policies were circulated to relevant organisations and individuals who were invited to comment on the policy area that specifically affected their interests. A list of the organisations and individuals can be found in Section D.
- 2.5 Representations from 20 organisations and individuals were received. The main issues raised are outlined in Section E. We have addressed these issues by incorporating the responses outlined in bold in the General Development Control Policies: Preferred Options.
- 2.6 See also Section F which identifies the additional consultation/involvement undertaken in line with the submitted SCI.

STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE
(REGULATION 28 STATEMENT)
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES

SECTION A: CONSULTEES (REGULATION 25)

The groups that are highlighted were sent a copy of the Issues and Options: Preliminary Consultation Document.

The groups not highlighted were sent notification of and information on where to view the Issues and Options: Preliminary Consultation Document.

Organisation	Name
	JAMES PROVEN MEP
	MR W H SORRELL
	SIMON J ARCH
	MR J CLARK
	RICHARD DALES
	RICHARD MAILE
	MR & MRS MORSE
	DAVID ROBINSON
	JOHN GOSS
	FRANCES MAUDE MP
	ELIZABETH LAWRENCE
	MR AND MRS B. A. TAPPY
	MR ADDEY
	NICK DANN
	T.F.B COOPER
4 SIGHT: WEST SUSSEX ASSOCIATION FOR THE BLIND	COMMUNICATIONS OFFICER
A J SALTER & SON	ALAN SALTER
ACERT	MRS M WHIFFIN (GENERAL SECRETARY)
ACTION IN RURAL SUSSEX	TERESA GITTINS
ADAMS HENDRY	DEBRA IVORY
ADAMS HENDRY	ROBERT COLLETT
ADAMS HOLMES ASSOCIATES	MR H RYATT
ADAMS HOLMES ASSOCIATES	CAROLE HAWLARK
ADUR DISTRICT COUNCIL	PETER DAVIES
ADUR, ARUN & WORTHING PRIMARY CARE TRUST	J PARSONS (SNR CONTRACTS MANAGER)
ADVERSANE RESIDENTS ASSOCIATION	MRS J. KERN
AGE CONCERN (HORSHAM)	MRS V JAMES
ALLIANCE ENVIRONMENT & PLANNING	JOY MACCOUGHLAN
ALLIED DOMEQ (SPIRITS AND WINE) UK LTD	
AMBERLEY SOCIETY	MICHAEL TOYNBEE
ANCIENT MONUMENTS SOCIETY	
ANTHONY GREENWOOD	
ANTONY BOWHILL & ASSOCIATES	
APPLIED MATERIALS	CRAIG LOWRIE
ARRIVA SOUTHERN COUNTIES	KEVIN HAWKINS
ARUN DISTRICT COUNCIL	KAREN DOWER
ASB LAW	
ASHINGTON RESIDENTS ASSOCIATION	JOHN BERRY
BARTON WILLMORE	DAVID BRADLEY
BASF PRINTING SYSTEMS LTD	MR R B J FOXLEY
BAULCH GROUP	

STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE
(REGULATION 28 STATEMENT)
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES

Organisation	Name
BAYLEY & WILLMER	PHILLIP WILLMER
BELLWAY ESTATES	REGIONAL PLANNING MANAGER
BERKELEY HOMES (SOUTHERN) LTD	SIMON COLLINS
BERKELEY STRATEGIC LAND	ADRIAN BROWN
BEWBUSH ACTION GROUP	MRS MARILYN SIMPSON
BEWBUSH COMMUNITY FORUM	MR BILL JARVIS
BEWBUSH SCOUT GROUP	MR P TAYLOR
BIBLE SOCIETY (HORSHAM) ACTION GROUP	MRS A BENNETT
BILLINGSHURST BUSINESS ASSOCIATION	MR T ANDERSON (CHAIRMAN)
BILLINGSHURST CHAMBER OF COMMERCE	COLIN LINNEY
BLAKES FARM HOUSE	DR F J COMERFORD
BLUE SKY PLANNING	JONATHON BEST
BOVIS HOMES LTD (SOUTH EAST REGION)	
BOYER PLANNING	DAVID LANDER
BRADBURY'S	PETER BRADBURY
BRETT INCORPORATED	MR S BRETT
BRIGHTON & HOVE CITY COUNCIL	ALAN MCCARTHY
BRIGHTON LESBIAN & GAY SWITCHBOARD	
BRITISH HORSE SOCIETY	MRS PATRICIA BUTCHER
BRITISH WATERWAYS	
BRITISH WIND ENERGY ASSOCIATION	KATIE ADDERLEY
BROADFIELD LIBRARY (MOBILE LIBRARY ONLY)	THE LIBRARIAN
BRUTON KNOWLES	
BRYANT HOMES (WESSEX)	
BSF PLANNING CONSULTANTS	MS J TAYLOR
BT	MS SAVILE (LOCAL LINES FORCASTER)
BUCK BARN RESIDENTS ASSOCIATION	MR V RAZZELL
BUTTERFLY CONSERVATION (SUSSEX BRANCH)	DAVID BRIDGES
C B RICHARD ELLIS	
C/O HORSHAM ROOM TRUST	ANDREW GILMORE
c/o THE ENVIRONMENT	CRAWLEY ENVIRONMENT FORUM
CADIA	PETER FELTHAM
CAMPAIGN TO PROTECT RURAL ENGLAND	MS K GORDON
CARADON TREND	
CENTEX STRATEGIC LAND	ERIC WILSON
CHARLES WADEY & SONS LTD	ALAN N C WADEY
CHASE & PARTNERS	STEPHEN ROSE
CHICHESTER DISTRICT COUNCIL	KEITH MORGAN
CHRIS BLANDFORD ASSOCIATES	GEOFF SMITH
CITIZENS ADVICE BUREAU	PAUL DOLLNER
CIVIL AVIATION AUTHORITY	MRS I BAROLO
CLUTTONS	FAO HAYDN PAYNE & MALCOM CHUMBLEY
COLIN HATCHER FRICS	
COMMUNITY SAFETY BRANCH	PETER HARDY
CONNELLS	ANDY JAMES
CONNELLS LAND & PLANNING	ANDY JAMES

STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE
(REGULATION 28 STATEMENT)
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES

Organisation	Name
COUNCIL FOR BRITISH ARCHAEOLOGY	BOWES MORRELL HOUSE
COUNTRYSIDE PROPERTIES (SOUTHERN) LTD	
COUNTY FIRE HEADQUARTERS	OPERATIONAL PLANNING OFFICER
COURTLEY CONSULTANTS LTD	HOWARD COURTLEY
CPRE - HORSHAM & CRAWLEY	MR N PACKWOOD
CPRE (SUSSEX BRANCH)	MRS E BEENEY
CRAWLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL	TED BERESFORD KNOX
CREIGHTONS PLC	STEPHEN SMALLS
CRICKMAY & PARTNERS	MR T HUCKER
CROUDACE STRATEGIC LTD	PAUL LEMAR
CROWN ESTATE COMMISSIONERS	MR M J GRAVESTOCK
CSA ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING	CLIVE SELF
CUNNANE TOWN PLANNING	MR J BLACKWELL
CYCLIST TOURING CLUB	MR R NASH
D & M PLANNING PARTNERSHIP	JAYNE DEVERELL
DALIA LICHFIELD ASSOCIATES	
DALTON WARNER DAVIS	NIGEL ABBOTT
DAVID HICKEN ASSOCIATES	DAVID HICKEN
DAVID WILSON ESTATES (SOUTH EAST OFFICE)	DAVID BANFIELD
DEFENCE ESTATES	
DEFRA & RURAL TEAM (GOSE)	ANDY CHALMERS
DELUXE GLOBAL MEDIA SERVICES LTD	MIGUEL XAVIER
DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SECURITY	THE MANAGER
DIALOGUE	SEBASTIAN HANLEY
DISTRICT VALUER & VALUATION OFFICER	
DMH	TONY ALLEN
DOUGLAS BRIGGS PARTNERSHIP	LOUISE SHAW
DPDS	DIANNE BOWYER
DPDS CONSULTING GROUP	PETER THAIR / JESSE CHAPMAN
DPDS CONSULTING GROUP	DIANA BOWYER
DRIVERS JONAS	ALISON MCCUE
DTZ PIEDA CONSULTING	MARK JACKSON
DUKES OFFICES	DEREK SCOBLE RIBA CHARTERED ARCHITECT
DUNCAN O'KELLY PARTNERSHIP	DUNCAN O'KELLY
EAST SUSSEX COUNTY COUNCIL	MIKE LANGTHORNE
EDF ENERGY	JOHN PARK (NETWORKS BRANCH)
ENGLISH COURTYARDS	LYNNE BOWYER
ENGLISH HERITAGE (SOUTH EAST REGION)	STEVE WILLIAMS
ENGLISH NATURE	LOUISE HUTCHBY
ENGLISH PARTNERSHIPS	JUDITH SMALLMAN
EUROPEAN MOVEMENT (UK) THE SUSSEX BRANCH	MR S QUIGLEY
EVENING ARGUS	THE EDITOR
FAIRHOLME	JOHN CRABBE
FAIRVIEW NEW HOMES PLC	D CHURCHILL
FED OF SMALL BUSINESSES (SURREY/W SUSSEX)	MR DAVID CANNON, CHAIRMAN

STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE
(REGULATION 28 STATEMENT)
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES

Organisation	Name
FEDERATION OF SUSSEX AMENITY SOCIETIES	ANNABELLE HUGHES
FOREST ENTERPRISE	
FORESTRY COMMISSION	
FPD SAVILLS	D CRAMAND
FPD SAVILLS	JONATHON STEELE
FRIENDS, FAMILIES AND TRAVELLERS	ROB WHITEHEAD
FULLER PIEZER	
G L HEARN	ANTONIA LIU
GAAC C/O BLOOMFIELDS LTD	A P BLOOMFIELD
GATWICK AIRPORT CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE	MIKE KENDALL
GATWICK AIRPORT LTD	TIM LOCKWOOD
GEOFFREY G FRY & ASSOCIATES	G. FRY
GEORGE WIMPEY SOUTH LONDON LTD	DAVID HUGGETT
GMA PLANNING	EMMA RODLEY
GOADSBY & HARDING	PETER ATFIELD
GOVERNMENT OFFICE FOR THE SE (GOSE)	DAVID PAINE
GVA GRIMLEY	VNCENT GABBE
GYPSY COUNCIL FOR EDUCATION, CULTURE,...	MR P MERCER (PRESIDENT)
H J BURT & SON	
HAVEN PRESERVATION SOCIETY	MR N G MCLACHLAN
HBF SOUTHERN REGION	PETE ERRINGTON
HEALTH & SAFETY EXECUTIVE (HSE)	
HEATH COMMON RESIDENTS ASSOCIATION	M. J. GOULD (CHAIR)
HENRY ADAMS & PARTNERS	STEVE CULPITT
HENRY SMITH & SON	J A FARQUHAR
HEVECO MUSHROOMS LIMITED	MARK HOWARTH
HIGH WEALD AONB	ANDREW SHAW
HILL HUMBERTS LEISURE	MARTIN TAYLOR
HILLREED HOMES LTD	SIMON M POTTS
HOME COTTAGE	ROGER BLAKE
HORSHAM & CHANCTONBURY PCT (PRIMARY CARE TRUST)	ANGELA UGUR
HORSHAM & CHANCTONBURY PCT (PRIMARY CARE TRUST)	SARAH CREAMER
HORSHAM CHAMBER OF COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY	PETER BECKHAM
HORSHAM CHAMBER OF COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY (HCCI)	JACKIE WESTCOTT
HORSHAM COUNCIL FOR VOLUNTARY SERVICE	
HORSHAM FIRE STATION	DIVISIONAL COMMANDER
HORSHAM NATURAL HISTORY SOCIETY	MRS S NEELY
HORSHAM VISUALLY IMPAIRED GROUP	MRS M R DANIEL
HUMBERTS	ANDREW BURGESS
HUTCHINSON 3G UK LIMITED	ALASTAIR JEWELL
IFIELD VILLAGE CONS AREA ADVISORY CTTEE	JENNY FROST (SECRETARY)
ITPS	MR K POTTS

STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE
(REGULATION 28 STATEMENT)
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES

Organisation	Name
J & J DESIGN	JOHN SHEPHARD
JESTICO & WHILES	JOHN WHILES
JOHN LYTTON & CO	JOHN LYTTON
JONES DAY	ANGELA TURNER
JONES LANG LASALLE	
JOSEPH SULLIVAN & ASSOC.	JOSEPH SULLIVAN
KATE'S CAKES	TIM BREDEN
KEEP RUSPER GREEN ACTION GROUP	A S J RICE
KEMBER LOUDON WILLIAMS	MR R NIGHTINGALE
KING AND CHASEMORE	
KING STURGE	ANN BIRCHALL
KINGSFOLD RESIDENTS ASSOCIATION	JOHN CROCKFORD
LAING HOMES LTD	STRATEGIC LAND MANAGER
LANDMARK INFORMATION GROUP LTD	JAMES TIPPINS
LANGLEY LANE RESIDENTS ASSOCIATION	MARTIN MAY
LARA	MS C GARFIELD
LENNON PLANNING LTD	DES DUNLOP
LES HUMPHREY ASSOCIATES	
LIDL UK	MICHAEL NEWTON
LITTMAN & ROBESON	JOANNE PEARS
LUCAS LAND & PLANNING	STEPHEN LUCAS
MASONS	K. COOKSLEY
McCARTHY & STONE DEVELOPMENTS LTD	MICHAEL TUCKER
MENCAP SOCIETY (HORSHAM & CRAWLEY)	MR JOHN ROBINSON
MID SUSSEX BADGER PROTECTION GROUP	
MID SUSSEX DISTRICT COUNCIL	JUDITH HEWITT
MILL DENE ESTATE RESIDENTS ASSOC.	PAUL CASTLE
MILLER HUGHES ASSOCIATES	
MINISTRY OF DEFENCE	BRIAN SIMPSON
MOBILE OPERATORS ASSOCIATION C/O MONO CONSULTANTS LIMITED	NORMAN GILLIAN MRTPI
MOBILITY TRUST,SUSSEX	MR G BRIDGE
MOLE VALLEY DISTRICT COUNCIL	DISTRICT PLANNING OFFICER
MONKHOUSE & BANNISTERS	
MONTAGUE EVANS	MS K GULLETT
MORGAN COLE	DANIEL SCHARF
MUNTHAM HOME FARM	D BANKS
NATHANIEL LICHFIELD & PARTNERS	WILL EDMONDS
NATIONAL FARMERS UNION (HORSHAM & STEYNING)	JOHN GARRARD
NATIONAL FARMERS UNION (SE REGION)	MR SANDY ABBOT
NATIONAL GYPSY COUNCIL	MR H SMITH (PRESIDENT)
NATIONAL PLAYING FIELDS	RAYMOND COLE
NATIONAL TRUST	JANE ARNOTT
NETWORK RAIL	CHRIS PRICE, TOWN PLANNER
NEWFOUNDOUT PRESERVATION SOCIETY	C/O JAN O KEEFE
NHS EXECUTIVE SE	HEAD OF ESTATES
NORTH WEST SUSSEX BRIDLEWAYS	T PENDLE
NOVARTIS	
O2 UK	PETER FOSTER

STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE
(REGULATION 28 STATEMENT)
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES

Organisation	Name
ORANGE	NIALL TIPPING
ORDNANCE SURVEY SERVICES	PETER SWIFT
OSBORNE HOMES, GEOFFREY OSBORNE LTD	TONY COX
P J Smith Associates	Peter Smith
P R C	ANDY RIFLEY
PARKER DANN	MIKE PARKER
PAULA ROSA KITCHENS	PETER SPEERS
PEACOCK & SMITH	MALCOLM WALKER
PERSIMMON HOMES SOUTH EAST	PETER COURT (STRATEGIC LAND MANAGER)
PH2 PLANNING UNITED	P HODSKINSON
PLANWARE	MATTHEW CARPENTER
POST OFFICE COUNTERS LTD	DISTRICT MANAGER
POST OFFICE PROPERTY HOLDINGS	L. SIMMONS (TOWN PLANNING MANAGER)
PROPERTY ADVISORS TO THE CIVIL ESTATE	
PROPERTY CONSULTANT	PAUL NEWMAN
PULBOROUGH CHAMBER OF TRADE	TED HENNINGS
RAMBLERS ASSOCIATION	MR J SIMMONS
RAMBLERS ASSOCIATION (COUNTRYSIDE)	MR A QUINELL
RAMBLERS ASSOCIATION (SUSSEX AREA)	MR N SLOAN
RAPLEYS	AIDAN THATCHER
Rapleys LLP	Mr Aidan Thatcher
RAWLISON & BUTLER	
READY & ABLE SPORTS CLUB FOR PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES	MR T BEADLE
RH & RW CLUTTONS	TIM HUTCHINGS
RICHARD STUBBS	
RMC GROUP SERVICES LTD	DEREK WHITE
ROBERT TURLEY ASSOCIATES	FAO AMANDA BROWN
ROFFEY YOUTH CENTRE	MRS CHRISTINE FITZGERALD
ROMANY INSTITUTE	DR KENDRICK
ROUNDBOUT - TALKING NEWSPAPER FOR THE BLIND	MRS D HARTLEY
ROYAL & SUN ALLIANCE	KIERAN FLYNN
ROYAL AND SUN ALLIANCE INSURANCE	
ROYAL COMMISSION ON ENVIRONMENTAL POLLUTION	
ROYAL MAIL, BILLINGSHURST	PETER RUSSELL
RPS GROUP	DAVID CHURCHILL
RSPB	MR A COTTON
RSPCA	MR RICHARD GRAVESTOCK
RTPI	
RUDGWICK PRESERVATION SOCIETY	MR STAN SMITH
RURAL HOUSING TRUST	ANDREW SMITH
RUSPER RESIDENTS GROUP	J CHAPMAN
RUSSEL COOKE SOLICITORS	MR M MASKY
RYDON HOMES LTD	JOHN LONGHORN
SANDGATE CONSERVATION SOCIETY	D. J. FILLISTON MBE
SAVE HISTORIC PULBOROUGH	DR ANDREW TILBROOK

STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE
(REGULATION 28 STATEMENT)
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES

Organisation	Name
SCHENECTADY-BECK	BRIAN GOODCHILD
SCOTIA GAS NETWORKS (SOUTHERN GAS NETWORKS)	JOHN HEYBURN
SCOTTISH & SOUTHERN ENERGY	GEOFF FISHER
SEEDA	
SEERA	MIKE GWILLAM
SHOREHAM HERALD	MR A OLIEFF
SILVERTECH INTERNATIONAL	GORDON ELLIOTT
SMITH'S GORE	IAN SMITH
SOCIETY OF SUSSEX DOWNSMEN	THE SECRETARY
SOCIETY OF TRAVELLING PEOPLE	MR T B O'DOHERTY
SOUTH CENTRAL LTD	ROGER LANHAM
SOUTH EASTERN PLANNING SERVICES	MICHAEL GRAY
SOUTH HOLMES ESTATE RESIDENTS ASSOC.	
SOUTHERN WATER	CHRIS KNEALE
SOUTHWATER ACTION GROUP	MRS B MUNFORD
SOUTHWATER ASSOCIATION OF TRADERS	ANN SWAIN
SPORT ENGLAND (SOUTH EAST)	MICK ANSON
STAMMERHAM AMENITY ASSOCIATION	JOHN MACE
STEYNING CHAMBER OF TRADE	VAL WOOD
STEYNING SOCIETY	MR J HUNT
STORRINGTON CHAMBER OF COMMERCE	MR A BRIEN
STRATEGIC RAIL AUTHORITY	TOWN PLANNING TEAM
STRUTT & PARKER	JOHN WRIGHT
SUNLEY HOMES	
SURREY & NORTH SUSSEX BEAGLES	TOM RYAN
SURREY & SUSSEX NHS TRUST	
SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL	RICHARD EVANS
SUSSEX BAT GROUP	MS SHEILA WRIGHT
SUSSEX CLUBS FOR YOUNG PEOPLE	MR I SCOTT
SUSSEX DEAF ASSOCIATION	DOREEN MILLS
SOUTH DOWNS JOINT COMMITTEE	MARTIN SMALL
SUSSEX ENTERPRISE	LIZ CADMAN
SUSSEX GARDENS TRUST	SALLY WALKER
SUSSEX JAPAN SOCIETY	MR J SIMPSON
SUSSEX POLICE (HORSHAM)	CHIEF INSPECTOR CHAMBERS
SUSSEX POLICE HEADQUARTERS	ASSISTANT CHIEF CONSTABLE
SUSSEX WILDLIFE TRUST	JANYIS HYATT
T.P.C.	
TAYLOR WOODROW DEVELOPMENTS LTD	DAVID EDWARDS
TERENCE O'ROURKE PLC	
TESLA ENGINEERING LIMITED	DAVID CRACKNELL
TETLOW KING PLANNING	TRACY-ANN SCANLAN
THAKEHAM VILLAGE ACTION	JEAN LOCKER
THAMES WATER PROPERTY SERVICES	C/O GEORGIE COOK
THE BELL CORNWELL PARTNERSHIP	G BELL
THE BILLINGSHURST SOCIETY	MR R JORDAN
THE BLACKSMITHS ARMS	JASON HOOPER
THE CHARLES SMITH TRUST	MRS P G SIGGS

STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE
(REGULATION 28 STATEMENT)
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES

Organisation	Name
THE COLLEGE OF RICHARD COLLYER	DR J JOHNSTON
THE COUNTRYSIDE AGENCY	MARK CRESSWELL
THE EARL OF LYTTON	ESTATE OFFICE
THE ENVIRONMENT AGENCY	DEVELOPMENT PLANNING, THAMES OFFICE
THE ENVIRONMENT AGENCY	ERICA GRAY
THE ENVIRONMENT AGENCY	HAMISH WILSON
THE FEDERATION OF SUSSEX AMENITY SOCIETIES (NORTH WEST GROUP)	JANET AIDIN
THE HIGHWAYS AGENCY	HOWARD MOORE
THE HORSHAM SOCIETY	PETER TOBUTT
THE HOUSING CORPORATION	FIONA CRUICKSHANK
THE PLANNING BUREAU	Nigel Pugsley, Planning Assistant
THE PULBOROUGH SOCIETY	ROSEMARY WILSON (HON-SECRETARY)
THE RAMBLERS ASSOCIATION	
THE ROMANY GUILD	MR T LEE (GENERAL SECRETARY)
THE ROYAL AIR FORCES ASSOCIATION	AIR COMMODORE EDWARD JARRON
THE SHOWMEN'S GUILD OF GREAT BRITAIN	GEORGE IRVIN
THE SLINFOLD SOCIETY	ADRIAN SKEETS
THE WARNHAM SOCIETY	MRS M DALES
THE WIGGONHOLT ASSOCIATION	JANET AIDIN
THE WILDBROOKS SOCIETY	MR M O S HAWKINS
THE WOODLAND TRUST	TONY CHADWICK
THOMAS EGGAR	PETER BUSBY
TIDEY & WEBB LTD	
T-MOBILE	ANDREW MADDOCK
TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT	IAN JEFFREY
TRANSCO	PHIL CHALMERS
TRUFFLES	MR P R TOMPSETT
VLH ASSOCIATES	VIC HESTER
VODAFONE LIMITED	NICK GREER
W T LAMB HOLDINGS LTD	THE MANAGING DIRECTOR
WATES RESIDENTIAL	
WAVERLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL	PETER HARTLEY (PRINCIPAL PLANNER)
WEALD VALE ASSOCIATION	GWG MORFEY
WEALD VALE ASSOCIATION LTD	MR G W TRIBE
WEALDEN IRON RESEARCH GROUP	MR J S HODGKINSON, CHAIRMAN
WEATHERALL GREEN & SMITH	J MYCROFT
WEST CHILTINGTON RURAL PRES.SOC	MR G HOWELL
WEST SUSSEX ASSOCIATION FOR DISABLED PEOPLE	MRS L E WILLIAMS
WEST SUSSEX COUNTY COUNCIL	STEVE BROWN
WEST SUSSEX COUNTY TIMES	
WEST SUSSEX GAZETTE	
WEST SUSSEX INVESTMENT	MIKE COGSWELL
WESTBURY HOMES (HOLDINGS) LTD	MR PHIL HULL
WEY & ARUN CANAL TRUST LTD	
WOOLF BOND PLANNING	STEVE BROWN

STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE
(REGULATION 28 STATEMENT)
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES

Organisation	Name
WORTHING & SOUTHLANDS NHS TRUST	
WORTHING BOROUGH COUNCIL	CLARE MANGAN
WORTHING GUARDIAN	
WS PLANNING	MARGARITA BLOEM

STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE
(REGULATION 28 STATEMENT)
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES

SECTION B: PARISH & NEIGHBOURHOOD COUNCILS WITHIN HORSHAM DISTRICT

All Parish and Neighbourhood Councils were sent copies of the Issues and Options: Preliminary Consultation Document.

Amberley Parish Council		Mrs C Whittington, The Clerk, 4 The Willows, Amberley Road, Storrington, Pulborough, West Sussex, RH20 4RJ Email: whittingtonbuild@aol.com Tel: 01903 741014
Ashington Council	Parish	Mrs K Dare, The Clerk, Honeysuckle House, London Road, Ashington, Pulborough, West Sussex, RH20 3JR Email: karendare@tiscali.co.uk Tel: 01903 893740
Ashurst Parish Council		Mrs H Roxby, The Clerk, 4 Shooting Field, Steyning, West Sussex BN44 3RQ Email: spc@steyningcentre.fsnet.co.uk Tel: 01903 814802
Billingshurst Council	Parish	Mrs E Berry, The Clerk, Council Office, The Billingshurst Village Hall, Roman Way, Billingshurst, West Sussex, RH14 9QW Email: clerk@billingshurst.gov.uk Tel: 01403 782555
Bramber Parish Council		Mrs A Hyde, The Clerk, Briarburn, Lower Station Road, Henfield, West Sussex, BN5 9UR Email: annehyde@tiscali.co.uk Tel: 01273 491902
Broadbridge Parish Council	Heath	Mrs T Hooker, The Clerk, 2 School Close, Horsham, West Sussex, RH12 4UA Email: bbhpc@tiscali.co.uk Tel: 01403 265748
Coldwaltham Council	Parish	Mrs S Norman, The Clerk, 7 New Place Road, Pulborough, West Sussex, RH20 2JD Email: clerk.coldwalthampc@tiscali.co.uk Tel: 01798 873509
Colgate Parish Council		Mrs E Dunsbee, The Clerk, 11 Chennells Way, Horsham, West Sussex, RH12 5TW Email: colgate.parishcouncil@virgin.net Tel: 01403 269305
Cowfold Parish Council		Mrs J Wright, The Clerk, 117 Acorn Avenue, Cowfold, Horsham, West Sussex, RH13 8RT Email:
Denne Council	Neighbourhood	Mrs W Glanfield, The Clerk, 4 Coltsfoot Drive, Horsham, West Sussex, RH12 5FH Email: wendy@wenmike.fsnet.co.uk Tel: 01403 264014
Forest Council	Neighbourhood	Mrs M Vinall, The Clerk, Church View, 40 Rookwood Park, Horsham, West Sussex, RH12 1 UB Email: fnc.horsham@tesco.net Tel: 01043 269265
Henfield Parish Council		Mr P Hill, The Clerk, Henfield Hall, High Street, Henfield, West Sussex, BN5 9DB Email: office@henfield.gov.uk Tel: 01273 492507
Itchingfield Council	Parish	Mrs J Critchley, The Clerk, 33 Smugglers Way, Barns Green, Horsham, West Sussex, RH13 0PP Email: jancritchley@itchpc.freemove.co.uk Tel: 01403 731596
Lower Beeding Council	Parish	Mrs P Brown, The Clerk, 1 Patchings, Horsham, West Sussex, RH13 5HJ Email: lbpcc@tesco.net Tel: 01403 262179
North Horsham Council	Parish	Mr T O'Hara, The Clerk, Roffey Millennium Hall, Crawley Road, Horsham, West Sussex, RH12 4DT Email: parish.clerk@northhorsham-pc.gov.uk Tel: 01403 750786
Nuthurst Parish Council		Mrs T Rowe, The Clerk, 24 Heron Way, Horsham, West Sussex RH13 6DQ Email: tracyrowe@nuthurstparishcouncil.freemove.co.uk Tel: 01403 249315
Parnham Parish Council		Mrs G Rowe, The Clerk, Pine Cottage, Rackham, Pulborough, West Sussex, RH20 2EU Email: glenysrowepc@aol.com Tel: 01903 744115
Pulborough	Parish	Mrs L Hoff, The Clerk, Parish Council Office, Pulborough Social

STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE
(REGULATION 28 STATEMENT)
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES

Council	Centre, Swan View, Pulborough, West Sussex, RH20 2BF Email: clerk@pulboroughparishcouncil.gov.uk Tel: 01798 87532
Rudgwick Parish Council	Mrs B Kenward, The Clerk, 6 Pathfield Road, Rudgwick, Horsham, West Sussex, RH12 3HS Email: ClerkRudgwick@aol.com Tel: 01403 822678
Rusper Parish Council	Mrs C Sowden, The Clerk, Medlands, Partridge Lane, Rusper, Horsham, West Sussex, RH12 4RW Email: Clairesowden@btopenworld.com Tel: 01293 871164
Shermanbury Parish Council	Ms C Page, The Clerk, 49 Little Oak, Partridge Green, Horsham, West Sussex, RH13 8JY Email: shermanbury@hotmail.co.uk Tel: 01403 711502
Shipley Parish Council	Mrs J Nunn, The Clerk, Rosemary Cottage, Dragons Lane, Shipley, Horsham, West Sussex, RH13 8GD Email: shipley.pc@virgin.net Tel: 01403 741329
Slinfold Parish Council	Ms B Turner, The Clerk, PO Box 360, Horsham, West Sussex, RH13 5GW Email: clerk@slinfoldpc.fsnet.co.uk Tel: 01403 266768
Southwater Parish Council	Mrs C Tobin, The Clerk, Beeson House, 26 Lintot Square, Faribank Road, Southwater, Horsham, West Sussex, RH13 9LA Email: catherine@southwater.net Tel: 01403 733202
Steyning Parish Council	Mrs L Spiers, The Clerk, The Steyning Centre, Fletchers Croft, Steyning, West Sussex, BN44 3XZ Email: clerk@steyningparishcouncil.fsnet.co.uk Tel: 01903 812042
Storrington & Sullington Parish Council	Mrs I Marshall, The Clerk, Sullington Parish Hall, Thakeham Road, Storrington, Pulborough, West Sussex, RH20 3PP Email: storringtonpc@btconnect.com Tel: 01903 746547
Thakeham Parish Council	Mr J Denman, The Clerk, Thakeham Parish Council Office, Storrington Road, Thakeham, Pulborough, West Sussex, RH13 0TR Email: clerk@thakehampc.plus.com Tel: 01798 815305
Trafalgar Neighbourhood Council	Mrs J McMillan, The Clerk, 20 Hillside, Horsham, West Sussex, RH12 1NG Email: julie.andymc@btinternet.com Tel: 01403 264302
Upper Beeding Parish Council	Mrs I Caygill, The Clerk, Ladymeade, Hyde Street, Upper Beeding, Steyning, West Sussex, BN44 3TG Email: upperbeeding.parishcouncil@virgin.net Tel: 01903 810316
Warnham Parish Council	Mr G Benham, The Clerk, Rose Cottage, 33 Ferring Street, Ferring, Worthing, West Sussex, BN12 5JN Email: gerry@benham21.freeserve.co.uk Tel: 01903 245217
Washington Parish Council	Mrs L Quirk, The Clerk, Oakhurst, Harbolets Road, West Chiltington, Pulborough, West Sussex, RH20 2LG Email: washingtonpc@talk21.com Tel: 01798 812332
West Chiltington Parish Council	Mr T Thomas, The Clerk, The Reading Room, Church Street, West Chiltington, Pulborough, West Sussex, RH20 Email: wccclerk@aol.com Tel: 01798 817301
West Grinstead Parish Council	Mrs H Dayneswood, The Clerk, The Parish Office, Village Hall, High Street, Partridge Green, Horsham, West Sussex, RH13 8HX Email: westgrinsteadpc@tiscali.co.uk Tel: 01403 710270
Wiston Parish Council	Mrs A Gordon-Johnson, The Clerk, Wiston Estate Office, Chanctonbury Ring Road, Wiston, Steyning, West Sussex, BN44 3EA Email: agj@ppublicns.wanadoo.co.uk Tel: 01903 812129
Woodmancote Parish Council	Mrs C Warren, The Clerk, Tithe Barn, Brighton Road, Woodmancote, Henfield, West Sussex, BN5 9ST Email: christine@warren5116.fslife.co.uk Tel: 01273 492986

STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE
(REGULATION 28 STATEMENT)
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES

SECTION C: SUMMARY OF MAIN ISSUES RECEIVED AND RESPONSE TO THE ISSUES AND OPTIONS CONSULTATION (REGULATION 25)

The responses were analysed in the order in which they appeared in the document. The text in bold is the Council's response to the issues raised in the Issues and Options consultation document.

General comments on the contents of the Issues and Options document

It was suggested by some respondents that there was not enough emphasis on rural issues and it was felt that there is no reference made to Parish Plans in relation to areas which are proposed for development. There is no inclusion of crime issues in the document.

There were many comments which did not relate to planning matters, these issues, including in relation to crime, will be taken up, if appropriate, by the Community Strategy. The Core Strategy and Site Specific Allocations of Land Preferred Options documents incorporate both urban and rural issues. Parish Plans etc. are an important part of the community involvement process and will be referred to where appropriate.

Protecting and Enhancing the Character of the Environment

Issue 1 – Landscape Character

The majority of respondents supported the approach of landscape character areas with only one respondent stating that it was not considered necessary. Some comments highlighted that any policy would need to be robust in order to be effective.

The Council is proposing to continue to use the landscape character approach as a means to protect and enhance the landscape. The Council is in agreement that any policy will need to be robust and has borne this in mind when developing the Core Policy CP1 of the Preferred Options Core Strategy. The policy has been written to enable appropriate development control policies to be developed which will further protect and enhance landscape character.

Several respondents did, however, raise a concern that the landscape character information set out in the Issues and Options document did not contain enough detail, and it was felt that this could result in small scale but important features being lost as a result of development.

The landscape character details presented in the Issues and Options documentation summarised the results of the full Landscape Character Assessment study. This document, which forms part of the evidence base, contains more detailed information, and development proposals will be expected to take this information into account when drawing up plans. The detail will also, in due course, be incorporated into a supplementary planning document. It is therefore not considered that this level of detail needs to be incorporated into the Preferred Options.

Few specific comments were received about the individual landscape character areas, but the need to protect specific areas of the District was highlighted. One particular landscape that was felt to be under threat was the Low Weald. One final area of concern raised by a few respondents was that fact the Council's aim of protecting and enhancing the landscape did not appear to accord with the allocation of development sites. It was also queried as to how the landscape character areas influenced the selection of development locations.

Whilst the Council wishes to protect and enhance the landscape, a certain level of development needs to be accommodated in the District in the period until 2016, and in these areas the landscape will inevitably be adversely affected. In these cases the landscape character assessment will enable planting and the layout of development to reflect and integrate with the characteristics of the surrounding landscapes.

STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE
(REGULATION 28 STATEMENT)
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES

The Council notes that some landscape areas are felt to be under greater threat from development than elsewhere. The landscape character assessment does not, however, identify which areas should or should not be developed, but is being used as a tool to help inform this decision along with other planning considerations.

Issue 2 – Settlement Coalescence, Local and Strategic Gaps

Respondents generally supported the prevention of settlement coalescence. It was suggested that any policy to prevent suburbanisation should extend across the whole District rather than simply to prevent settlements joining together. Some concern was raised that the proposed development to the West of Horsham would however lead to Horsham and Broadbridge Heath merging, and the separate identity of these settlements was highlighted.

The Council wishes to ensure that the separate identities of settlements across the District are retained. The concern about the development to the west of Horsham resulting in the merging of Horsham and Broadbridge Heath is noted. The Council is not however able to alter the broad location of this development which is set out in the West Sussex County Council Structure Plan. It should be noted that the A24 will continue to separate the two settlements and the Council will work with the community when working up the development proposals in more detail to ensure that the separate character of the two settlements is retained.

Most representations considered that local and strategic gaps should be retained rather than being removed or streamlined. It was felt that the loss of these designations would result in the loss of a layer of protection in these areas.

Some respondents did however support the Council's proposals to streamline strategic gaps and remove local gap designations. It was however noted that any policy would need to be robust. Some site specific comments were made about the strategic gap boundaries including various suggestions for inclusion / exclusion of certain areas. It was also suggested that physical features should be used as a boundary. Finally a query was raised as to why the area of search for development west of Crawley did not accord with the proposed boundary for the strategic gap.

A few respondents considered that local and strategic gap designations were not necessary. It was stated that there was already a presumption against development outside built-up area boundaries and that further designation was therefore unnecessary.

Whilst it is noted that most respondents would wish to see the local and strategic gap designations retained in their current form, the Council does not consider that this is possible as government policy is seeking to reduce local designations. It is however considered that there is still a need for some policy protection to help prevent the coalescence of settlements. The Preferred Options Core Landscape and Townscape Character Policy (CP1) has been written to provide the basis for further development control policies to prevent the coalescence of all villages and towns. The Council has not been able to retain the Local Gap designations but has retained the Strategic Gap designations, albeit on a more streamlined basis. The situation in the area west of Crawley was complicated by the uncertainties involved in this area but will be clarified as a result of the more specific proposal now put forward.

Balancing Protection and Continued Evolution through New Development

Issue 3 – Balancing Protection and Continued Evolution

The issue of how protection of the District's environment and character could be balanced against the need for change in rural and built-up areas received a wide ranging response. Many responses focussed on the environment or design issues, and the comments have therefore been grouped under these headings where appropriate.

STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE
(REGULATION 28 STATEMENT)
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES

Environment

Many responses emphasised the need to ensure that the environment is protected and not lost to development. In particular, there was concern that protection of the environment should not be balanced unfavourably against other criteria such as economic and social need for change, and concern not to swamp areas with development. The effect on wildlife during construction was also a concern.

There was support to ensure the retention and protection of conservation areas, Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty and key landscape characteristics including ancient woodland, hedgerows and Tree Preservation Order's, as well as townscapes. The need to protect biodiversity through policy was also highlighted. There was also a desire to have specific local designations, as blanket protection policies would no longer be required.

The Council is supportive of the need to protect the environment and has sought to maintain the balance between the need for development with protection of the environment as far as possible. The SA/SEA process has been undertaken as part of the process of preparing the Issue and Options and Preferred Options, and this has helped the Council to make informed and balanced policies.

Policy CP1 in the Preferred Options Core Strategy sets the basis for the protection of the environment, and also provides a basis for appropriate development control policies that will protect and enhance biodiversity. This Council will continue to provide a high level of protection for our most valued landscapes and townscapes, particularly those with local or national designations such as Conservation Areas and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

Where development does occur, respondents stated a desire for a policy which specifies that development will only be allowed where it results in benefits to the environment and the local community.

The Council recognises that there is a need to ensure that development minimises its impact on the environment and communities and the Preferred Options Core Strategy makes provision so that, where appropriate, contributions from landowners and developers will be sought. The strategy seeks to maintain and facilitate the improvement of existing facilities wherever appropriate and to seek new provision to meet needs where possible.

Design

Many respondents considered that elements of design could help protect towns and villages as well as rural areas, but at the same time allowing them to grow and change. It was felt that new development should be in keeping with the existing surroundings in terms of size and scale and it was suggested that there be policies to encourage high quality design including materials, landscaping, road layout, signage, lighting and appropriate use of land. It was also felt that the development could contain features to encourage wildlife.

The Council agrees that design issues can help to enhance developments, contribute to quality of life and also help mitigate any effects of development. Policies CP2 and CP3 of the Preferred Options Core Strategy, provides a basis for the use of sustainable construction techniques and requiring good design and landscaping. It should also be noted that many issues such as siting, layout, design and landscaping are covered by 'saved' policies in the adopted Horsham District Local Plan, which will be replaced by the General Development Control Policies document in due course. In addition, site specific requirements for design are set out in the Preferred Options Site Specific Allocations of Land Document.

STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE
(REGULATION 28 STATEMENT)
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES

It was also considered that development should be designed to meet local needs rather than be a large expansion. It was considered that this will help maintain a settlement's viability and character. There was support for the use of Village/ Parish Design Statements to achieve improved quality of development. Concern was however raised about the re-use of agricultural buildings as exceptions to usual planning policy.

The Council acknowledges these comments and is seeking to meet local needs where these have been identified. The Council must, however, accommodate a certain level of development specified in the West Sussex Structure Plan, to help meet the wider housing needs for the Region in addition to these local needs. The Council is also supportive of the use of Village and Parish Design Statements, and has already provided assistance to communities producing such documents, and has adopted them as supplementary planning guidance. This Council shall, therefore, continue to encourage local communities to highlight the features or elements of character most important to them through Village or Parish Design Statements.

It was felt that more could be made of heritage in the District and concern was raised about the effects of development on listed buildings and the need for enhancement opportunities was highlighted. There was also a desire that permitted development rights be removed for Conservation Areas where there would otherwise be harm to the character of the area.

The Council is aware that the District has a rich and varied heritage and is supportive of the need to protect and enhance it. Consideration of the effects of development on listed buildings and conservation areas has taken place as part of the process of site assessment work leading up to the allocation of sites. Consideration of these sites and areas is also necessary as part of the Development Control process. The Council also has a programme of reviewing designated Conservation Areas and if necessary, Permitted Development rights can be removed as part of this process.

Transport

Other responses highlighted the fact that increased traffic can have a negative effect on the environment. There was desire for the effective use of public transport, as well as footpaths and cycling to balance protection and development. It was considered that there needs to be more emphasis on rural infrastructure, although it was also highlighted that it should be recognised that in rural areas there will be a reliance on the motor car.

These comments are noted and although they are not all specifically relevant to the LDF, they are issues that the Council is acutely aware of and it will endeavour to continue to support the work of local communities, and the County Council, on improving services where possible.

Miscellaneous

There was a desire for competent bodies (statutory and non-statutory) to be consulted on all non routine planning applications.

The Town and Country Planning (General Development Procedure) Order 1995 details the process for planning applications and statutory consultees. Every planning application is dealt with individually and development control officers can choose to expand on these and consult other bodies if desired. The approach towards more significant planning applications is set out in the draft Statement of Community Involvement.

Issue 4 – Enhancing the Rural Economy versus Protection of the Character

In response to how the Council is trying to address the needs of the rural economy, whilst continuing to protect the countryside's essential character and environment, many respondents focussed on the issues of development in the countryside and the need for

STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE
(REGULATION 28 STATEMENT)
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES

caution. Comments have been grouped under headings where appropriate. It should be noted that some of the issues raised in this section have already been covered in Issue 3 of this document.

Existing Businesses

There were representations expressing the desire to encourage appropriate businesses to rural areas and support for the retention of small village schools, shops, pubs and post offices as well as rural industries such as blacksmiths. There was the desire to protect rural industrial estates, including them in the Employment Protection Zones to prevent redevelopment of essential small unit industrial estates and support start-up units.

The Council recognises the need to support local businesses especially in rural areas, however limited by low governmental support and other external support. The Council recognises that it is important to cherish the strong identities of long-established rural communities whilst coping with the dynamics of change.

The Preferred Options Core Strategy seeks to ensure that a range of types and sizes of sites and premises are provided to meet different needs, and that most existing employment areas are retained and renewed to provide improved employment accommodation. The Council seeks to protect and enhance the District's most sustainable and valued 'industrial' areas through their identification as Employment Protection Zones (EPZ) and the application of appropriate policies within these areas, particularly in terms of a sequential approach towards any redevelopment proposals. These EPZs will, however, be in areas with built-up area boundaries as it is considered that redevelopment of industrial land outside a built-up area boundary would in any case be unlikely to meet the Government's sequential approach in the provision of housing.

The Council is also supportive of the use of Village and Parish Plans, and has already provided assistance to communities producing such documents. This Council will, therefore, continue to encourage local communities to highlight the features or elements of character, including local businesses, most important to them through Village or Parish Design Statements.

New Businesses

Business plan requirements were strongly supported by respondents, whereby applicants would have to show a demonstrated need for development and ensure the long term future of land and buildings. Business plans for farm diversification, equestrian developments and conversion of agricultural buildings were in particular supported. Farm diversification was also supported, but it was felt it should benefit the local community not outside interests, and also provide protection from change of use and over expansion. There was also encouragement of rural based businesses and home-based businesses.

The Council is supportive of the need to protect existing businesses in rural areas and has sought to maintain the balance between the need for development with protection of the environment as far as possible. The strategy encourages a more diverse rural economy whilst seeking to ensure that the scale of development and level of activity is compatible with a countryside location.

The Council recognises that there is a need to ensure that development minimises its impact on the environment and on communities and the Preferred Options Core Strategy makes provision so that, where appropriate, contributions from landowners and developers will be sought. The strategy seeks to maintain and facilitate the improvement of existing facilities wherever appropriate and to seek new provision to meet needs where possible.

Environment

STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE
(REGULATION 28 STATEMENT)
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES

Businesses should be looked at more rigorously in the rural areas. There was also concern about noise from development in rural areas.

The economic and social needs of people who live and work in the countryside are recognised and change must be accommodated. This objective must, however, be weighed against the need to protect and, where possible, enhance the countryside's essential character. The Council, in the Preferred Options Core Strategy, recognises the need for the continuing development and implementation of a rural strategy.

Transport

Respondents stated that sporadic development can have disadvantages in traffic terms. It was also stated that provision also needs to be made for safer crossings of roads. Access worries were also raised.

It is recognised that the needs within the rural parts of the District will remain different from the more urban areas where alternative modes of transport are either more available or can be more easily enhanced. The Council will, however, work to ensure that additional car journeys in rural areas are minimised as far as possible.

Miscellaneous

The rural community and economy has changed and is non-recoverable. It was not considered that traditional farming is any longer viable for the District but it was suggested that leisure use is the only alternative.

This comment is noted. Whilst it is accepted that farming has become more difficult for some in recent years it is considered that this used of the land can be maintained and helped by sensitive diversification schemes, where appropriate, and not replaced completely by leisure uses.

Issue 5 – Heveco Mushrooms and Brinsbury Rural Enterprise Centre

Heveco Mushrooms

Generally the responses to this issue related to the current position of the company, as well as potential development which could occur on the existing site, should the company relocate. There were a large number of objections to any future proposals which may include residential development.

There was some concern that the policy proposals in Issue 4 would not be adequate to deal with this situation and that there should not be specific mention of a company/site. There were a small number of people supporting the site either for major employment or for a limited redevelopment to 'tidy up' the site (only in relation to local employment use or very small scale residential development).

The decision to include the Heveco Mushrooms issue within the Issues and Options document was made on the basis that there was some awareness that the company may be seeking to relocate and early discussion with the community would allow time and consideration for an appropriate way forward to be established. There is not a specific policy which relates to the current site at Thakeham in the Site Specific Allocations of Land Preferred Options document as the set of circumstances surrounding the company have not yet been confirmed.

Most respondents were concerned that Heveco Mushrooms do not need to relocate for several reasons; they make a profit and have invested considerably in the site; the company have become part of the community and do their best to protect the environment and the use

STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE
(REGULATION 28 STATEMENT)
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES

fits in with the rural character of the area. It is generally believed that there is sufficient land within the existing sites for the company to expand.

Whilst the company has made investments on the site, it has confirmed that the site no longer provides the opportunities required for it to compete within the modern mushroom market. The nature of the mushroom growing business makes it very sensitive to any building development taking place during operation and redevelopment would not allow all stages of the mushroom growing processes to continue.

Most comments related to the site potentially becoming vacant and that it should not be made available for any other development. Comments related mainly to residential development which would affect road safety and damage the rural character of the area. It was noted that access to the village is poor and the village does not have enough services and facilities to cope with further residential development.

Residential or alternative redevelopment was not included as a specific proposal at this stage as there are significant factors relating to any redevelopment as described above. The main issue is whether the site can or should remain vacant should the company relocate. It was important to gain an early understanding from the community and local residents as to their preferences and concerns and the light of the apparent commercial situation.

Development at Brinsbury

There was some support for this proposal. Many respondents welcomed the recognition of Brinsbury as important and its role as a rural enterprise centre (whether or not Heveco relocated). It was felt that this would help to support growth in the rural economy in the District, with some respondents also feeling that there should be improved recreational and transport facilities in recognition of this growth.

It is acknowledged that there is support for the College at Brinsbury in its role in the growth of the rural economy. The College has been identified in the Site Specific Allocations of Land Preferred Options document (Policy AL21) to provide further support to this role. The provision allows for general enhancement which reflects the nature of the College as a rural enterprise and also allocates land for a mushroom growing facility. A master plan will be required for the whole site.

There were a small number of comments concerned that development at Brinsbury including relocating Heveco would have the impact of a major industrial development and some concern that the academic nature of the college would not work well with a mushroom growing facility on the site. It was suggested as an alternative site for residential development rather than Thakeham as it is closer to nearby services and facilities in Pulborough and Billingshurst.

There are many potential benefits for the College of this type of operation, including potential vocational training, business experience and to work with rural enterprises to develop further courses and new technology. Any development on the site will need to be sensitively designed and provide sustainable transport solutions. The site is not considered suitable for residential development. Development in this area will only be allowed if it relates to agriculture and the rural economy.

Meeting the Needs of Local Communities and Businesses

Issue 6 – Settlement Sustainability Hierarchy

There was a good level of support for the principle of a settlement sustainability hierarchy. It was felt that the approach was straightforward, defensible, gave a clear framework for planning decisions and gave residents some certainty over future scales of development.

STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE
(REGULATION 28 STATEMENT)
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES

There were a limited number of respondents who felt there should be further categories. Amongst the suggestions were;

- the identification of Horsham in a separate category at the top of the hierarchy;
- the identification of the largest villages (Horsham, Billingshurst and Southwater) in a separate category which are able to take major expansion; and,
- the identification of small villages where there is a presumption against development.

There was also a suggestion that those on the rail network should be identified in a distinct category.

The Council wishes to make the settlement sustainability hierarchy clear and simple to use. It is intended to be used as a 'guide' to the most appropriate levels of development for a particular location, assisting in concentrating development in those areas with most services and facilities. There has been a good level of support for the categories and it is therefore felt that just two categories should be identified. It is not felt that identifying more categories will be of any significant benefit. The remaining villages will be within the 'countryside' where more stringent planning controls apply. However, this need not mean that no further development will be allowed as this would be unsustainable and settlements must be allowed some level of natural development, particularly if needed to provide homes for local people.

The remaining comments were mostly specific to individual villages. There was generally support for the removal of built-up area boundaries from the smallest villages but there was concern that this would not enable them to evolve and expand.

The Council continues to propose the removal of the built-up area boundaries from the smallest villages identified in the Issues and Options consultation as they are unsustainable locations for growth. However, this does not mean a complete embargo on development; there may be occasions where development will be possible through the conversion or subdivision of appropriate buildings. There may also be opportunities for minor infill and exceptions housing schemes for local needs.

The majority of the remaining comments related to the inclusion of Thakeham as a category 2 settlement. Most respondents felt that it fulfilled the criteria of category 3 settlements, as it has poor infrastructure, a limited range of facilities and could not be compared with other villages in the same category. It was also felt that the facilities the village does have were under threat.

There were further comments particularly on the inclusion of Partridge Green and Broadbridge Heath in Category 1. It was felt that due to the level of services and access to public transport they were more appropriately included within category 2. Respondents felt these villages had more in common with, for example, Cowfold and Ashington.

For clarification no category 3 was identified in the study. It is stated that a category 2 settlement should have one or more of the following: a primary school, post office, general / food store, doctors / branch surgery, community centre / village hall. They should also have an easily definable form giving the impression of being within a 'built-up' area. Thakeham has a primary school, a village hall and an easily definable form, more than the minimum required to fulfil the criteria. In addition, although not a requirement, the village has a church and a pub. It is therefore not accepted that the built-up area boundary should be removed from the village; however, the Council does acknowledge that there are variations in the levels of services and facilities in the villages within the category and Thakeham is one of the smallest.

The comments on Partridge Green and Broadbridge Heath are accepted and they have therefore been moved to category 2.

STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE
(REGULATION 28 STATEMENT)
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES

Finally a limited number of comments were received about potential impacts on the sustainability of settlements in the future. For example, it was noted that improvements to the A24 could result in some areas being able to accommodate additional housing. Conversely it was commented that falling school roles could impact on the hierarchy.

These comments are noted and the hierarchy will be updated as and when there are any changes.

Issue 7 – Planning Obligations

Approach

There was general support for the approach outlined in the Issues and Options Document. It was stated that the approach should be strictly applied to ensure new and existing communities have sufficient provision of infrastructure, facilities and services. Considerable support existed for requiring developers to meet, or contribute to the provision of infrastructure, facilities and services. Furthermore, support was expressed for the inclusion of crime prevention and health care provision measures within the planning obligations process. Considerable support existed for the approach to be formula based, flexible and transparent. There were also requests for Parish and Neighbourhood Councils to more involved in the Planning Obligation process. Representations indicated support for contributions to be used locally and that obligations should meet identified local needs.

The Council acknowledges the considerable support for developments to provide sufficient infrastructure, facilities and services to meet the needs of the development. Furthermore, the Council recognises the support for the Planning Obligations process to be formula based, flexible and transparent. Consequently, the Council will continue to pursue and develop the approach outlined in the Issues and Options Document to ensure the delivery of sufficient infrastructure, facilities and services. The Council will also continue to incorporate and monitor the implications of changes to the Planning Obligations process as a consequence of emerging Government guidance.

Provision of infrastructure, facilities and services

It was stated that the provision of infrastructure, facilities and services should keep pace with demand. It was suggested that larger developments should deliver on site provision and smaller developments should provide contributions towards local identified need. It was stated that, with regard to utilities, it is essential that sufficient infrastructure is delivered and in place to serve the proposed development. Representations indicated concern that infrastructure, services and facilities will never materialise and it was suggested that such provision should be frontloaded. In terms of healthcare provision it was stated that healthcare planning obligations should meet an identified need and not lose out to other forms of developer contributions.

The Council acknowledges the concerns expressed in terms of the type of infrastructure, facilities and services and the timing of delivery of these requirements. The Council will, through the proposed approach, attempt to ensure the required infrastructure, facilities and services are delivered in conjunction with development.

Supplementary Planning Document

There was general support for the production of a Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). It was recommended that an SPD should clearly set out criteria for an adequate level of provision of open space, recreation and sport; however, it should not address affordable housing considerations as these should be addressed through the LDF itself.

The Council acknowledges the support for the production of a Supplementary Planning Document, and is committed to the production of this document in support of

STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE
(REGULATION 28 STATEMENT)
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES

adopting the necessary approach towards planning obligations. The document will need to cover the full range of planning obligations, including for affordable housing, but the basic provisions for affordable housing will be set out in the Preferred Options Core Strategy and Site Specific Allocations of Land Preferred Options documents.

Providing for Community, Leisure and Recreation and Tourism / Cultural Facilities

Issue 8 – Community, Leisure, Recreation and Tourism / Cultural Facilities

Community, Leisure and Recreation Facilities

There was general support for proposals to continue to safeguard open space and other community facilities.

It was suggested that the proposals should be amended to reflect the need to extend and enhance existing provision and that facilities should not be kept 'at all cost' if the quality was poor and opportunities exist to enhance and improve other facilities.

Policy CP8 of the Preferred Options Core Strategy reflects this concern, but retains the ability to protect facilities where necessary. An assessment of open space, sport and recreational facilities (which include community facilities) has been conducted and is a background document (Horsham PPG17 Assessment).

There was some concern that small scale and natural green spaces were not protected. Some respondents commented that new developments should incorporate open space and other facilities as standard.

The Horsham PPG17 Assessment identifies a wide range of facilities and highlights where areas should be protected, reviewed or enhanced (including natural green space). It is agreed that the provision of open space and other facilities should be incorporated into new developments (see also Issue 3 – Design).

There were a number of respondents concerned about the lack of facilities for young people in the District with particular communities experiencing the most difficulty (Rudgwick, North Horsham, Broadbridge Heath and Pulborough were highlighted).

This concern is noted; Policy CP10 of the Preferred Options Core Strategy allows provision for specific needs in the community where they have been identified.

Tourism and Hotel Development

There were a small number of comments relating to this subject. The general principle of small scale tourism was supported, particularly if it was sustainable and generated income for the rural economy and in particular, for farmers. There was some concern that the proposals would not be sufficient enough to improve the tourist offer in the District.

The support for the proposal is noted; Policy CP12 of the Preferred Options Core Strategy maintains the balance between the benefits to the local economy of tourism and the impact it can have on the environment.

There was some support for the development of a town centre hotel based on existing business needs and related concerns of the closure of the Kings Head hotel in Horsham Town Centre. It was also, however, suggested that there is no demand for a town centre hotel from hotel operators and that the conversion of an office block to a hotel would be likely to cause parking and access problems and may be costly.

It is agreed that there is little demand at the moment. The Preferred Options Core Strategy does not make specific reference to a Town Centre hotel, but provides for flexibility in allowing for appropriate proposals should they come forward.

STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE
(REGULATION 28 STATEMENT)
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES

Secondary School at Southwater (Land West of Southwater)

Please refer to Issue 16.

Horsham Football Club

Please refer to Issue 17 – Smaller Scale ‘Greenfield’ Site Allocations – Land at Hornbrook Farm/Hilliers, Horsham

Health Care

There were a limited number on comments on this. These mainly related to the proposed care home at Storrington. It was also suggested that not all health care facilities should be protected depending on the circumstances.

The comments relating to the possible new care home on the Glebe Field at Storrington are noted; this particular proposal is no longer being pursued. In relation to the protection of healthcare facilities, Policy CP10 of the Preferred Options Core Strategy allows flexibility according to the identified needs of the community.

The University of Sussex

There were a large number of comments relating to this subject, mainly objecting to the proposal to accommodate a university in this location. It was suggested by most respondents that the University should seek to locate at Crawley.

The University has subsequently taken the decision to locate the proposed new campus at Crawley.

Enhancing the Vitality and Viability of Existing Centres

Issue 9 – Retail, town and village vitality and viability

General

There was general support for the principles and approach outlined in the Issues and Options Document. Considerable support was received for resisting the loss of retail establishments, particularly to residential or office use. It was suggested that town and village centre vitality is broader than just the retail context, and includes the environmental and historic quality of the centre. Furthermore, it was stated that a choice of retail provision is essential in ensuring the vitality and viability of centres. Support was expressed for mixed-use development and the provision of residential development above shops. It was suggested that rural village shops and traditional village centres/shops should be promoted.

The Council acknowledges the general support for the approach outlined in the Issues and Options Document. The Council will continue to promote this approach and philosophy, with particular regard to controlling the change of use of existing retail units, ensuring a mix of retail provision and ensuring the vitality and viability of the District's centres.

Horsham

Considerable support was expressed regarding the approach towards Horsham Town Centre in terms of further retail provision and readdressing the balance of uses throughout the town. The proposal to pursue enhancement of East Street received support, provided the existing retailers are not displaced. There was little support for the Moorhead Drive proposal, although it was acknowledged by some respondents that the proposal would serve the town and disperse shopping trips. However, the requirement for the Moorhead Drive proposal was

STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE
(REGULATION 28 STATEMENT)
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES

questioned by far more respondents and there was considerable opposition to the proposal. Finally, it was suggested that expansion of Tesco should occur, linked to the delivery of the development west of Horsham.

The Council acknowledges the support for the approach and philosophy to be adopted towards Horsham town centre, particularly the desire to control further retail provision and readdress the balance of uses throughout the town. This approach will continue to be promoted through the Local Development Framework process.

The opportunities to address the east west economic orientation of the town as referred to in the document will continued to be examined and explored. However, these opportunities are likely to emerge as identified Council projects as opposed to being progressed through the Local Development Framework process.

It was clear from the representations received that the proposal for Moorhead Drive was a source of considerable concern for local residents. In light of consultation responses and a re-examination of the proposal from an environmental perspective the site will not be carried forward into the Preferred Options stage.

Elsewhere in the District

With regard to Storrington, it was suggested that new retailing establishments should be promoted at the western end of the existing village shops to balance orientation from the Mill Square precinct.

Concern was expressed that the Tesco development at Pulborough will undermine the vitality and viability of the village centre.

These responses are noted are will be taken into account in exploring local initiatives.

Evening Economy

Support was expressed for mixed-use developments. It was indicated that evening economy uses form part of an overall diversity in town centres and, in Horsham, restaurant development should be promoted. Comments were received that further provision of licensed premises is unnecessary. There was generally support for the provision of uses related to the evening economy, but also some comments were received expressing concern over further provision.

The Council will continue to promote a cautious, proactive approach which carefully balances the number of evening economy uses in particular areas and ensures that vitality and viability is not undermined.

Managing Travel Demand and Widening Choice of Transport

Issue 10 - Managing Travel Demand and Widening Choice of Transport

Respondents commented on a wide range of transport related issues. Those relevant to the LDF are discussed below.

Protection of Land for Transport Purposes

There was support for the principle of protecting land for transport purposes including the land required for the A24 improvements and undeveloped former railway track beds. In addition it was suggested that the route of the Wey and Arun Canal within the District be protected from development.

The proposed General Development Control Policies document will include a policy to protect all of these areas of land including the route of the Wey & Arun Canal.

STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE
(REGULATION 28 STATEMENT)
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES

Transport Hierarchy

There was a good level of support for the principle of a transport hierarchy for new development. Conversely it was felt by some that it was too idealistic and was more relevant to commercial development rather than residential. It was also felt by some that commuters and long stay visitors in Horsham Town Centre work in the town and are therefore very important to the local economy.

It is acknowledged that the car will for many remain an essential form of transport in the District; however, it is important that planning policies reflect the need to increase the use of more sustainable methods of travel. The Council wishes to make the hierarchy simple to use; it is intended as a 'guide' and it is considered that it is relevant to all forms of development. For example, in a residential development the needs of pedestrians and those with mobility impairments should be placed first above all other users. The transport hierarchy will be incorporated into a policy within the proposed General Development Control Policies Document.

Park & Ride

Many comments were received on the park and ride schemes proposed in Horsham. A number of the comments related to the two sites proposed and are summarised under those sections within this analysis of representations. Only the principle of park & ride is considered within this section.

Although there was considerable opposition to the sites proposed there was a good level of support for the principle of park and ride. Respondents felt it increased the use of public transport, could meet the needs of long stay visitors and relieved congestion from the town and main entrance routes. Some suggested that additional facilities should be provided on the sites such as toilets and areas for small businesses; it was also suggested that the buses should be free. Those opposing the park and ride strategy described it as costly and under-used. It was considered that Horsham was too small for such a scheme, and it was damaging the businesses within the town as shoppers wish to park centrally and not use a park & ride. There was currently considered to be a surplus of parking in the town and more evidence was requested on the need for further sites.

Park & Ride forms part of the long term strategy for relieving pressure on the town centre. It is predicted that the use of the car will continue to rise; therefore the Council must plan for the long term and ensure that the town does not suffer from a lack of parking and serious congestion. The Park & Ride sites are intended to be used by long-stay users, releasing space in the town for short-stay visitors such as shoppers. Data is currently being collated on the use of the car parks during Christmas 2004, the peak period for use. Although there is currently plenty of parking within the town centre there is no scope for further expansion. Therefore, although a further Park & Ride scheme may not be necessary in the short-term the Council will need to allocate suitable locations and bring them forward as they become necessary and available (for example at Hornbrook Farm / Hilliers).

Parking and Development / Off Street Parking & Demand Management Techniques

There was concern raised over the possibility of restrictions on parking, particularly within the villages in the District. It was felt that it could be damaging to businesses and that rural areas were reliant on the car. Respondents felt that more parking should be provided with residential developments in rural areas and that space was needed in the shopping areas to enable the village shops to prosper.

Rural car parks are currently free, unlike those within Horsham Town Centre, as a result the Council has been examining their usage and if any benefits were to be gained by charging for them. For example, charging could help remove long stay

STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE
(REGULATION 28 STATEMENT)
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES

visitors so that the car parks may be used by shoppers and thereby assisting the villages. The work is still underway and at the time of preparing this response, no decision had yet been made. The concern over parking within new developments in rural areas is acknowledged and the impact of any reduction in spaces will be examined if necessary.

Few comments were received on the proposal for no further public off street parking but at present no proposals will be included in the LDF specifically to restrict their development.

Horsham as a Sub Regional Transport Hub

Few commented on this subject and it was given only limited support. There was a suggestion that District transport hubs were also identified; however, others felt it was unnecessary and would attract further development.

At present it is not proposed to progress this policy approach.

Many comments were received on the need for better public transport and improvements in cycle paths across the District. There were also a number of comments made on the need for better integration of public transport although it was felt this was difficult in rural areas. It was also commented that better public transport to health facilities was needed. Finally, it was felt by many that parking for both Horsham and Pulborough stations was particularly poor. .

These comments are noted and although they are not all specifically relevant to the LDF they are issues about which the Council is acutely aware. We will endeavour to continue to support the work of local communities and the County Council on improving services where possible.

Providing for Development Needs

Issue 11 – Built Up Area Boundaries

As a result of the comments received, a number of built-up area boundaries have been changed and some new amendments made.

The intention of the BUAB assessment work was to ensure that the boundaries were logical, consistent and reflect changing circumstances. In most cases this will not result in further development pressure as there are a limited number of new areas included where this would be possible (excluding the proposed housing allocations). However there is a requirement for further housing across the District and small infill plots contribute a significant number of homes. Through the work undertaken on the settlement sustainability hierarchy it is felt that all the villages and towns included in the BUAB assessment work are capable of accommodating varying levels of development; therefore the definition of BUABs ensures that development occurs in the most sustainable locations. It is not this Council's intention completely to restrict development in the villages and towns with BUABs as this would be an unsustainable position to take.

There was concern raised by a number of respondents about the inclusion of open space, leisure and recreation grounds / buildings, including school playing fields within BUABs. These are highly valued areas and there was significant opposition to any development in these locations. Only in exceptional circumstances will development of open space and recreation land etc. be considered. There is no intention that all areas with BUABs should be available for development; areas of open space and recreation land are vitally important to the health and well being of the residents of these towns and villages. However, in most cases the areas considered for inclusion relate more to the built area of the town or village than they do to the countryside beyond. It is considered that their inclusion in the built-up area may be of

STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE
(REGULATION 28 STATEMENT)
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES

benefit to a number of organisations as it will allow for improvements to be made to facilities, particularly buildings, as the sites are no longer considered to be part of the 'countryside' to which the more stringent countryside policies apply.

Issue 12 – Urban Housing Potential and Housing Delivery Strategy

Previously Developed Land (Urban Housing Potential)

Comments were made on both this issue and the actual Urban Housing Potential Study that accompanied the Issues and Options Consultation Document. As a result of concerns over deliverability of sites the Urban Housing Potential study has been updated and a number of the identified sites have been removed; in addition some further sites have been added.

There were mixed opinions expressed about the study. Although the actual methodology was not significantly challenged there were differing conclusions drawn about the results. Some felt that the study over-estimated the housing potential of previously-developed land (pdl) and as a result respondents proposed additional greenfield sites for development. Others felt that there had been an under-estimate as there had been a considerable number of homes completed on pdl in the last 2 years and that this was set to continue.

There were various site specific comments made; these are analysed in the Urban Housing Potential paper. In addition there were concerns over the development of commercial sites for residential purposes. It could result in the loss of employment sites and increasing travel to work times. It was also suggested that a more flexible approach to the development of pdl in the countryside should be taken, allowing more residential development in some exceptional cases.

The Urban Housing Potential Study has been updated following the consultation exercise and is available on request. It is not accepted that we have over estimated the level of development potential on pdl. There has been a considerable amount of development on pdl in the last couple of years and it is anticipated that this will continue. Due to the nature of the sites, many of which are small infill developments, it is not easy specifically to identify them. Additional development on 'reserve' greenfield sites has been identified, should there be a shortfall in the completion of homes on pdl; however, there will be careful monitoring of the situation and they will only be released if a shortfall occurs.

In response to the concern over the development of employment land and premises, the Council acknowledges that this is a matter which requires a careful balance and is preparing policies that seek to protect certain areas, where appropriate.

Finally, it is not considered appropriate as a general rule to release rural previously-developed sites for residential development; however, a flexible approach will be taken in exceptional circumstances particularly if the scheme involves significant environmental or community benefits.

Overall Housing Strategy

Additional comments were submitted on the overall housing strategy for the District. There was no in principle objection to the development of pdl, but it was stressed by many that the Council must ensure housing delivery is achieved. It was also felt that the plan must have regard to the emerging South East Plan and that housing figures must be flexible. It was suggested by some that further greenfield sites should be allocated to accommodate potential shortfalls resulting from a potential undersupply of pdl and uncertainty over the delivery of the land west of Crawley Strategic Housing Development. Conversely others felt that we must not over-supply housing as the Council has a good track record of housing delivery; allocating further greenfield land will only result in more developers pushing for further housing releases.

Finally, there were further sites suggested that could be a source of varying types of housing.

STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE
(REGULATION 28 STATEMENT)
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES

These comments are noted and the support for the strategy is welcomed. Horsham District has a very good track record in delivering housing during the plan period 1997 - 2004. The Core Strategy and Site Specific Allocations of Land Preferred Options documents propose sites for housing development that not only fulfil the requirement set out in the Structure Plan but allow for further greenfield development should deliverability of pdl not be achieved. There are also allowances for further expansion of the strategic housing location west of Horsham if that is deemed necessary, particularly as a result of the work on the South East Plan. Housing delivery will be carefully monitored.

A number of alternative sites for housing and other development were put forward as part of the Issues and Options consultation process. These were listed in Appendix B of the Analysis and Response to Representation document which was produced as a background document for the Preferred Options consultation. The Appendix listed each site and a brief description of the reasons for not including the site in the Preferred Options documents.

Issue 13 – Land West of Crawley: Strategic Location
--

Horsham Crawley Strategic Gap

A considerable number of comments were received indicating that development West of Crawley would be detrimental to the Horsham-Crawley Strategic Gap. In addition, there was opposition towards the expansion of Crawley towards Horsham. It was also suggested that indicating a revised Strategic Gap, with the potential of development occurring within it to deliver the Strategic Location, was misleading to the public regarding the future planning of the area

Traffic and Highway Infrastructure

It was suggested that solutions to transport implications should be identified early and sufficient highway and transport infrastructure provided. Indeed, it was suggested that the development would have a significant impact on the M23. Concern was expressed about the likely increase in traffic levels and about access onto the existing road infrastructure as a consequence of the development. With regard to the Structure Plan requirement for a relief road to accompany the development, concerns were raised relating to the archaeological and ecological impact and whether the relief road is required to support the development. It was suggested the development could be delivered without the relief road, or that it could be delivered in conjunction with a second runway at Gatwick. Conversely, it was indicated that the relief road could ease pressure on the existing road network.

Other sites suggested

In terms of sites suggested as alternatives if the feasibility work established that West of Crawley is undeliverable the following sites were suggested: south of Broadbridge Heath; south of Crawley; land East and North East of Crawley; land south east and east of Crawley; and development opportunities within Crawley. Conversely, several comments suggested that the land south east and east of Crawley should not be considered for development.

Gatwick

A considerable proportion of representations stated that the delivery of the Strategic Location is depended on the expansion of Gatwick. However, a significant number of representations indicated that the potential expansion of Gatwick does not preclude development. Concern was expressed that if Gatwick expansion precludes development West of Crawley no contingency options have been identified. It was suggested that if a second runway were to be built a relief road would be essential.

STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE
(REGULATION 28 STATEMENT)
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES

Utilities

It was stated that the water main in the area is of sufficient size to meet demand; however, there is a need to plan for additional need. Furthermore, it was indicated that it would be preferable if the development were serviced by a new sewage treatment works.

General

There was notable support for the approach adopted in the Issues and Options document. Conversely, it was stated the approach adopted within the Issues and Options Document was misleading in terms of the likely delivery of West of Crawley. However, concerns were raised that no contingency options had been identified in the document if West of Crawley was to prove undeliverable. Furthermore, some representations indicated that a surplus of sites should be identified to ensure housing delivery. However, to a lesser degree it was suggested no contingency options should be identified. Furthermore, the Strategic Location allocation should remain West of Crawley and not be transferred to alternative parts of the District.

Several comments were made relating to potential objectives and principles that should be applied when planning for the development including: ensure the protection of environmental and archaeological designations; sustainability should be considered; need to balance economic development and rural protection; loss of greenfield land should be minimised; noise and visual pollution should be considered; and development should include a provision of commercial development. Furthermore, it was suggested inadequate facilities, services and infrastructure exist to support development. In addition, support was stated for further studies to examine the deliverability and feasibility of Land West of Crawley.

Concerns were expressed that the proposed approach is not in conformity with the Structure Plan and some indicated conformity is essential. Furthermore, it was indicated that the focus for development should be land West of Crawley. Indeed, it was suggested the Strategic Location should be brought forward as a priority post-2006. There was also objection to the Strategic Location being developed whatsoever. Finally, several representations stated that a study should be undertaken to explore the opportunities within the Gatwick Diamond sub-region to accommodate further development.

Site specific

A number of site specific comments were received relating to the West of Crawley including; the southern half of the area of search is not affected by noise contours; West of Bewbush has good road access; West of Bewbush relates well to the existing settlement; West of Bewbush has the ability to accommodate neighbourhood development. Comments were also received indicating that development West of Bewbush is inappropriate and needs to be fully justified. Conversely, it was suggested that development West of Bewbush is inappropriate and that the development should be West of Ifield and phased for 2006 onwards. Objections were raised against the 'rejection' of the development West of Crawley and that West of Bewbush is suitable for accommodating the development.

The numerous comments received regarding the approach outlined in the Issues and Options Document have been invaluable in terms of determining the future approach for planning for West of Crawley and highlighting the social, economic and environmental issues that need to be encapsulated within planning for the Strategic Development Location. Fundamentally, however, in light of consultation responses, particularly from BAA and the Government Office for the South East it is clear that the Council adopting a stance that precludes development West of Crawley until the second runway issue is resolved is unacceptable. Therefore, the Council in the 'Preferred Options' Document is now indicating its preferred location for accommodating the Strategic Development Location West of Crawley for consultation

STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE
(REGULATION 28 STATEMENT)
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES

taking into account the social, economic and environmental issues raised through the consultation on the Issues and Options Document. That provision addresses the specific issues about particular locations within the wider area, including west of Ifield and west of Bewbush.

Issue 14 – Land West of Horsham Strategic Location

There were a large number of comments made on the principle of the development, its location, scale and impact. The majority of respondents strongly objected to the proposals. There were also a large number of comments relating to the Sussex University proposal but due to the subsequent decision by the University to locate in Crawley these have not been considered in detail. A smaller number of comments were received on the proposed new railway station, but again due to the decision not to progress development adjacent to the railway these are not analysed in detail here; however they have all been noted should this issue be relevant in the future.

The largest number of concerns related to the impact of any development on Broadbridge Heath, particularly its character and the separate identity it has from Horsham. It was stated that it has a strong sense of community and will be swamped by the development which, will double the size of the village. There was also considerable concern that the character of Horsham is being lost as it expands and that development will result in the coalescence of Horsham with Broadbridge Heath. There were a large number of objections to the scale of the development; most felt that if there must be some development within Broadbridge Heath it should only be in the form of minor infill sites. In addition there were objections to the proposal for 1,250 homes rather than the 1,000 stated in the Structure Plan and the potential for construction to commence before 2011.

In contrast there were more limited numbers who supported or partially supported the development in this location. It fulfils the Structure Plan requirement, is concentrated enough to support good transport links and would result in a mixed-use development providing many services and facilities to the wider community.

The concern over the coalescence of Horsham and Broadbridge Heath and the impact on the character of these areas is acknowledged by the Council. It is acutely aware of the strength of feeling against the development and the impact it may have on existing communities. It acknowledges that the character of particularly Broadbridge Heath will be affected; however, it is hoped that through consultation with the community measures will be put in place to minimise any negative impacts. There will be opportunities for the community to input their ideas into the proposed development for example though suggesting facilities, such as allotments and playing fields, which they would wish to see as part of a scheme.

On the issue of 'over-provision', the figure in the Structure Plan is not a maximum figure and the actual provision must relate to the proper master planning of the area. The Examination in Public Panel did not rule out an increase if it were needed, stating that the assessment of this location should have regard to this possibility so that sufficient flexibility exists and that Horsham District Council also needs to consider beyond 2016. It is felt that this scale of development is necessary in order to secure the required infrastructure as part of the initial development. A new junction on the A24 is essential and we are looking to provide 40% affordable housing, as well as the range of other community facilities.

A large number of respondents stated that the development should be in the form of an urban extension of Horsham and not extend beyond the A24, in line with the Structure Plan Examination in Public Panel's comments. Many respondents suggested that an alternative site for the strategic housing location should be Rookwood Golf Course. It was felt that the course was underused and loss making and that development of the site would keep the housing within the boundaries of the A24 therefore not impacting on the countryside beyond.

STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE
(REGULATION 28 STATEMENT)
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES

There were also those who objected strongly to the idea of developing the course stating that it was a good course and that there would be a significant impact on the nature reserve.

As set out in paragraphs 4.26 – 4.29 of the Site Specific Allocations of Land: Preferred Options document, due to the requirement for a new junction onto the A24 it is not possible to contain development solely to the inside of the A24. In the interests of proper planning it is therefore more appropriate to plan for development in both locations. In addition the Council has also undertaken a further examination of the potential for the golf course to accommodate the strategic housing location. Details of the work are set out in paragraph 4.32 – 4.40 of the Site Specific Allocations of Land: Preferred Options document. In summary it is felt that the course would be extremely difficult to access, much of the development would be isolated from Horsham and it would result in the loss of a popular golf course. In addition there would be considerable environmental impacts from a development, including development in part of Warnham Nature Reserve, the loss of a significant number of mature trees and the need to cross a particularly wide flood plain to connect the residents of the new housing with the town. The area has been managed for its biodiversity and development would be very damaging.

Rookwood Golf Course is very popular with well over 40,000 rounds played every year. The financial surplus achieved from golf fees, catering and shop sales when all operating costs have been taken into account averages £35,000 every year. This surplus supports other leisure services, such as the adjacent Warnham Nature Reserve. The Council therefore does not consider the area a suitable alternative to the proposed development west of Horsham.

There was significant concern expressed over the damage to flora and fauna that this development would cause to land within the proposed sites and adjacent land / woodland. There were objections to the loss of the countryside / greenfields and any increase in noise and pollution. Noise reduction measures were requested. It was also stated that the impact on the environment as well as archaeological and industrial heritage must be investigated and that High Wood and the edge of the river be protected. Finally many were concerned that the area was prone to flooding and that this would be worsened by increased runoff due to the development. There was also concern over the capacity of the sewage works, its ability to cope with the development and any resulting pollution. It was suggested that a buffer zone should be established around the wastewater works to avoid sensitive development being located too close.

Throughout the planning of this proposed development we will be working with Southern Water and the Environment Agency. We are aware that some of the land is liable to flooding and as a result will not be suitable for development. In addition the River Arun and surrounding drains have been surveyed and estimates of the extent of the flood plain should global warming result in an increase in the level of water have been made. Again development will not be located in the sensitive locations. Southern Water will also be working with the Council to ensure that the development does not pollute the river, that the wastewater works can cope and that there is sufficient water supply to the development. This may require significant funding from the developers. The wastewater treatment works will need to be extended to accommodate all of the development proposed and improvements are planned to meet the higher standards set by the Environment Agency. The area currently proposed for development is not within the area identified by Southern Water as being significantly affected by smell nuisance from the works.

In addition to this work surveys have and will be undertaken to identify the most sensitive areas in terms of ecology.

There were concerns and comments made in relation to services and facilities provided alongside the new development and key requirements such as the need for many affordable homes and open space. Among the others mentioned was the good access to sporting

STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE
(REGULATION 28 STATEMENT)
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES

facilities although additional facilities for the local football and cricket teams were requested. There were queries as to whether there were sufficient employment opportunities for residents and about provision for school places, the police, fire service and care for the elderly. There were concerns over water shortages and the ability to deal with waste. There were also many objections to the development due to the lack of a local hospital and A&E department. It was felt that there were few facilities for residents to the east of the A24 and that promised facilities are not guaranteed. Finally it was commented that all schemes should include crime prevention measures.

There were also many comments received on the transport and highway network. Some felt the development would increase the need to travel and result in greater congestion, there were objections to the proposed highway network and concern that it would lead to increased traffic through Broadbridge Heath and Warnham. It was also felt that the residents of the area would be too car dependent and that building new roads was unsustainable, costly and environmentally damaging. Major changes and improvements are needed to make the development successful; improvements to the A24 and traffic calming measures were requested for a number of areas. It was suggested that land to the east of the A24 would provide the most sustainable option in terms of potential access to public transport networks. Development could also impact on the wider motorway network. Finally, there were a number of requests for improved footpaths and cycle networks to link the development with the surrounding town and the countryside beyond and concern over the impact of the development on existing public rights of way.

There were a number of site specific transport and access issues raised; these will be dealt with on an individual basis should development in this location proceed. As part of the more detailed master planning of the proposed development the Council will consider in detail the needs of the communities affected. We have already received information on the need for health, education and potential library provision and further work will be done in conjunction with West Sussex County Council and the Primary Care Trust. It must however, be stressed that the provision of hospitals and A & E departments is outside of the control of the District Council. We will consult with communities further to ensure that any facilities and services are provided where possible.

The Council will also continue to work with the relevant transport and highways providers to ensure that the highway network is efficient and that the use of the private car is kept to a minimum. In preparing the detailed master plan, work will focus on creating good linkages by foot, bicycle and vehicles including public transport between any new development and the existing built areas. In particular there are opportunities for good links with the existing bus network.

Issue 15 - Land north of Broadbridge Heath

There were also a number of comments relating to the proposed allocation of land to the north of Broadbridge Heath. There were mixed views with some considering the site suitable for development and others feeling it was ad hoc and unrelated to the village. Some felt that the development should be built before the strategic housing location and others felt that in addition to the strategic location developing this additional site would be too much and damage the character of the village. There was concern that the development would be made more unsustainable as many services and facilities would be concentrated to the south of the village in the longer term.

In addition to these more fundamental concerns respondents also commented on potential flooding problems in the area, increased traffic flow on Guildford Road, poor access and the high value of the site ecologically and as open space with well used footpaths.

As a result of the comments received and a decision to concentrate on development to the south of Broadbridge Heath and East of the A24 this site is not being considered further in this round of the Local Development Framework. There would be access

STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE
(REGULATION 28 STATEMENT)
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES

issues without the improvements proposed as part other major development and the parallel development of this land would complicate the delivery of appropriate infrastructure as well as social integration.

Finally a number of additional site specific comments were made. Land to the west of Broadbridge Heath was proposed for development in preference to the sites suggested as well as land at Christs Hospital School and land south of the railway to the south of Horsham. It was also suggested that some of the proposed development area could be used for a high tech business park and that Tesco's should be able to expand.

It is not considered that the alternative sites fulfil the Structure Plan definition of the strategic development location. The other comments are noted.

Issue 16 – Secondary School at Southwater

There were a large number of objections to the proposal; however, there were also a limited amount of support providing that the development of the school did not lead to further housing development at Southwater. Other support was given as it was felt that the school would bring long term benefits to the community.

There is no allocation proposed for residential development to the west of Southwater. The support for the principle of the school is noted; it could potentially have benefits to the community in terms of access to sporting and recreational facilities and other community uses. There may also be an opportunity to enhance provision of facilities for young people as a result.

The majority of comments listed key objections to the site. The main concerns related to the understanding that the school would not be viable as there are falling school rolls and the County Council would not be able to support the building of the school in financial terms. There were a number of respondents concerned that the school would affect choice (in relation to the single sex schools). Broadbridge Heath was referred to as being a more suitable location for the school, rather than Southwater.

It is acknowledged that primary school rolls are falling, whilst there is limited new development. However, the school will be required as the school population grows as a result of development within the north part of the District and the nature of the school will be determined as and when appropriate. The funding for the school would be explored when necessary through the appropriate educational processes. The site in Southwater was identified as there are potentially enough pupils locally to have a substantial local catchment area.

Other comments related to impact on the local environment (ancient woodland, listed building, recreation value, habitat, loss of farmland and flooding,) as well as potentially building in the Strategic Gap. There were a number of people concerned over increase in traffic at school times.

It is acknowledged that there will be some impact on the environment; however, these concerns will be addressed if the requirement to bring forward the school is confirmed. It is intended that the 'streamlining' of the Strategic Gap takes account of the potential requirement for the school in this location.

Issue 17 – Smaller Scale 'Greenfield' Site Allocations

A range of comments were made about the small greenfield sites suggested as possible development locations in the Issues and Options documentation. Most of the comments that were made related to specific sites, but there was also some more general comments relating to the development of small greenfield sites more generally.

General small sites comments

STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE
(REGULATION 28 STATEMENT)
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES

Several comments noted that the proposals for small scale greenfield allocations totalled 813 dwellings, and queried why there was an oversupply from the identified need of 550 homes set out in the West Sussex Structure Plan.

The Council notes this comment. Whilst the County Council stated that there is a need for 550 homes on greenfield land, it also set a target of 4010 homes to be built on previously developed land. The urban housing potential study that was undertaken by this Council identified that there was likely to be a potential shortfall from this target, and in order to meet the total housing requirements that the Council must accommodate, the shortfall may need to be met through making additional provision on small greenfield sites.

There was also a feeling that development should only take place in the most sustainable settlements, specifically the category 1 settlements identified by the Council. Billingshurst and Pulborough were both suggested as locations for development. Development at villages with railway stations was also suggested.

The Council agrees that the vast majority of development that takes place should be in the most sustainable locations possible. There are, however, occasions where smaller settlements need development to help meet an identified local need, for example affordable homes for local people. Development has therefore been proposed outside the category one settlements to help meet these needs, or to allow the continued gradual evolution of settlements.

Some respondents stated that they supported all the proposed locations for development provided that they are what local people want. It was also felt that the developments should not be detrimental to the character of the existing settlement and the surrounding area. The need to provide affordable smaller homes was highlighted. It was also felt that developers should be asked to make contributions to help meet the needs generated by new housing development.

The Council has tried as far as possible to locate development where there is an identified need. Policies in the Local Development Framework documentation aim to ensure that the development protects and enhances landscape character and that contributions are made to local services and facilities.

Windacres and Summerfold – Rudgwick

Most comments made concerning the development proposals in Rudgwick were not site specific, and considered the implications for development in the village more generally. Although some respondents accepted the need for development in the village, it was generally considered that the proposed developments are not sustainable. The village was felt to be too small with limited services and facilities to support the proposed level of development. Specific concerns were raised about development increasing traffic levels, and adversely affecting the village's character. Another major concern was the impact of development on drainage and water supply. The fact that the village has experienced loss of water supply in recent summers was highlighted and it was felt that new development would add to this problem.

Site specific comments received about Windacres included a comment that the elderly accommodation proposed did not provide sufficient justification for development. Conversely, another comment stated that the site should not be limited to a development providing accommodation for the elderly. The need to protect the existing trees on the site as well as the mature hedgerow on the site boundary in the event of development on the site was also highlighted. Specific comments about development at Summerfold also included the need to retain existing tree cover and undertake an ecological survey.

The concerns over the level of development in Rudgwick are noted. The Council considers, however, that the village has some capacity to accommodate further

STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE
(REGULATION 28 STATEMENT)
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES

development and the elderly accommodation will help to meet identified need. It is also anticipated that the development will help to maintain the vitality of the village, particularly with the element of mixed use development that is proposed. The concerns with the water supply are also noted and further consultation is being undertaken with Southern Water in relation to these problems.

It is acknowledged that there are concerns about the total amount of housing proposed for the village. This is noted, but as a consequence of the development of land to the south (formerly Churchman's Meadow), it is not thought that the land at Summerfold and Windacres Farm will be defensible from development in the long term. It is therefore considered that a comprehensive planned development will be preferable, and it is intended that the development be phased to ensure that the development at Summerfold is phased for a later part of the period, before 2016.

Land at Hornbrook Farm / Hilliers, Horsham

Respondents commented on the various different aspects of this proposal as well as the principle of development in this location.

i) Park & Ride

Many comments were made on the issue of park & ride in general; these are analysed in the 'Managing Travel Demand and Widening the Choice of Transport' section of this report. In summary it was considered that there was no justification for the park & ride, that Horsham was too small and that the existing facilities were underused. There was also support for park & ride in the town as it relieves congestion and eases pressure on parking spaces freeing them for shoppers. In relation to the Hornbrook / Hilliers site it was commented that development of this site is being led by a need for Park & Ride sites, overriding other policy considerations; it was the wrong site for such a scheme and will increase traffic on the roads. It was also felt that as there was no bus lane between the site and the town centre there would be no advantage to be gained by using the park & ride.

The Park & Ride strategy is summarised in the 'Managing Travel Demand and Widening the Choice of Transport' section of this report. The Council continues to feel that this site on a main access route into the town is the most appropriate location available for park & ride. In addition its use for this purpose can also be combined with other uses of the site.

ii) Football Stadium

There was both support and opposition for the proposed football stadium. The identification of a site was welcomed, enabling Horsham Football Club to expand and cater for many different users; it was felt that the impact on neighbours would be limited and that sharing the park & ride would work well. In contrast some felt the club would have a negative impact on for local residents. It was felt that the Club should not have sold its ground and that it should seek to share with other clubs in the area. It was also suggested it could be located within the land west of Horsham development or at the Hop Oast Site. There were objections to the development on a greenfield site in a sensitive location in landscape and environmental terms. The area acts as a buffer between the edge of the town and the AONB.

Horsham Football Club has been unsuccessful in seeking another site for many years and their current site no longer meets their needs. There are no opportunities to share sites locally due to the facilities required and other proposals have been unsuccessful. The club wishes to expand to provide further facilities for both the club and community; it continues to be felt that this site is the most appropriate. It could also be combined with the use of the park and ride and is within walking distance of much of the town. Concerns over floodlighting and noise are acknowledged and will be dealt

STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE
(REGULATION 28 STATEMENT)
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES

with in more detail at a later stage in the process. It is not felt that the development would be in a particularly sensitive location in terms of landscape; however, again minimising its impact will be considered in more detail at a later stage.

iii) Residential Development

There were many objections to the proposed residential part of the scheme. It was felt that the site was in a sensitive rural location, exposed and development would impact on the adjacent AONB. The river is considered the natural boundary of the town and development should not extend beyond it; development will affect the character of the area and proposals have been refused there and on the Hilliers site in the past. The land is considered to be at risk from flooding and there were objections to the development on a greenfield site in a sensitive location in landscape and environmental terms.

It is accepted that there are many constraints on development in this location and the layout of the housing will take these into consideration. There will also be further work on the extent of the flood plain and ecological surveys will be undertaken.

In addition to these comments on it was also felt that access was poor and that there will be an increase in traffic on an already dangerous road. There was concern over the impact on neighbouring roads, the lack of safe cycle routes and footpaths and a few objections were raised to the extension of the Riverside Walk. Local residents were particularly concerned about the impact of the scheme on their homes, character of the area, amenity and the safety of the overhead power lines.

Detailed reasoning for the retention of this site in the Site Specific Allocations of Land: Preferred Options is set out in paragraph 4.48 of that document. In summary it is felt that only a comprehensive approach to development including land both sides of the road is acceptable and will achieve the many community benefits described.

The Plough, Lower Beeding

Relatively few comments were received concerning the proposals for development at this location. Some stated that the development was not in a sustainable location, although others were more supportive as it would help meet an identified need. Other respondents highlighted the need for the development to help fund improvements to the village, notably the traffic and local services. The need to take into account ecological considerations was also highlighted.

The Council notes the comments regarding the sustainability of the settlement, but the development at this location has been proposed to meet an identified local need, and there is local support for this development. The comments regarding traffic and other considerations are noted and this has been reflected in the wording of Policy AL13 of the Preferred Options Site Specific Allocations of Land document.

Merios Farm, Ashington

Relatively few comments were received about the proposal for the development of this site. Although a few respondents stated that the development should take place in a more sustainable location either outside or within the village, most comments were concerned with the need to ensure that the development brought about improvements to community facilities or affordable housing. Concern was raised about the impact of the development on Rectory Lane, and the need to consider ecological issues as part of any development was also raised.

Whilst the Council acknowledges the comments relating to the sustainability of Ashington as a settlement, the development of this site is small scale and could help meet affordable housing needs and contribute to the continued vitality of the village, and there is a level of support for this development. The concerns about affordable

STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE
(REGULATION 28 STATEMENT)
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES

housing and impact on Rectory Lane and the environment are noted and have been addressed through Policy AL7 of the Preferred Options Site Specific Allocations of Land document.

RMC Engineering – Washington

Whilst the number of comments received in relation to this site was relatively limited, those that did comment stated that the site was not a sustainable location for housing as it is too far from services and facilities. It was also felt that if the housing is needed to help bring about the country park, then the housing should be built after 2016 as the sand workings will not be available for this purpose until that time. Concern was also raised about the potential for contamination. The need to consider ecological issues, particularly the presence of bats and reptiles as part of any development was also raised.

The concerns over the sustainability of the site are noted, but it is emphasised that the proposal for development on this site is solely to enable the bringing forward of the proposed Country Park. It is hoped that by enabling the development of this site prior to 2016 some elements of the Country Park can be developed at an earlier phase. The sensitivity of the site is recognised and as a consequence Policy AL18 recognises the need for the development to be built to a very high standard. In addition, the possibility of contamination on the site has also been noted and is discussed in the Preferred Options Site Specific Allocations of Land document.

RAFA – Storrington

Again, relatively few comments were received regarding the proposals for development of this location. Those that did comment considered that it was in an unsustainable location and also raised concern about its sensitive location adjoining a SSSI and next to the Sussex Downs AONB. It was highlighted that English Nature will need to be consulted due to the fact that the site adjoins a SSSI. It was also questioned whether the use of the existing site could be intensified.

Development on this site is required to meet the identified expansion needs of the RAFA site. Although the site is a reasonable distance from the centre of Storrington, the residents of this site will be part of the retirement care home complex and therefore car usage to Storrington village centre is unlikely to be an issue. Concerns about landscape and the stability of the sand pit SSSI to the south are noted and are addressed in Policy AL15 of the Preferred Options Site Specific Allocations of Land document.

Forge Way – Billingshurst

The main issue raised in relation to this site was confusion as to why there was consultation taking place on the site when there was already a planning application for development on the site. It was also felt that the current recreation use should be retained on the site.

Although a planning application had been submitted for this site, at the time of the Issues and Options consultation, it was not known whether permission for development on this site would be granted. The consultation was therefore to enable discussion about the site in the longer term if the application was not permitted. The site has now been allocated for development in Policy AL8 in the Preferred Options Site Specific Allocations of Land document, in accordance with the decision on the planning application, but pending the outcome of the inquiry about ‘village green’ status for the site.

School Site and 1997 Local Plan Allocation I1 – Barns Green

The proposals for redevelopment and amalgamation of the school site received a number of comments. Most respondents were not in favour of amalgamating and relocating the two

STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE
(REGULATION 28 STATEMENT)
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES

schools, although subject to further consultation, the County Council stated that it would like to see the infant and junior schools operating on the same site.

Many felt that the proposal to locate the new school on the I1 site would lead to problems with road safety as the site is on the edge of the village, and Two Mile Ash Road is narrow with poor visibility. It was also felt that the school would not be in a central location.

Concerns were also raised about the proposals for housing development on both the sites. A major concern was the unsustainability of the village due to its lack of facilities and lack of public transport. The scale of development was also thought to be too high. Concerns were also raised about the possibility of flooding on the I1 site due to the proximity of the river, and the need for a flood risk analysis before any development was highlighted. The need to consider ecological issues was also highlighted.

This Council recognises the concerns of the local community in relation to the number of services in the village and the proposals to amalgamate the infant and junior schools. It is however considered that development in the village will help to maintain the existing services and a proposal would be in line with the County Council comments that it would be beneficial to see the schools placed on one site. Although the I1 site is further from the village centre than the infant school it is much closer to the village centre than the existing junior school. The concerns over traffic are noted, however, and the location and access to any primary school will need to be determined prior to any residential development on the site. It also proposed to phase the development by virtue of the need to construct the new school before any development can take place on the existing site and this will enable the village to grow at a more gradual rate and housing to become assimilated into the settlement.

Silverdale or Lodge Hill – Coldwaltham

Relatively few comments were received concerning proposals for development in Coldwaltham. Some concern was raised over the sustainability of the proposals, and whether affordable homes should be built in an area which has no services and facilities. Where a preference was made for development on one of the two sites, it was felt that the Silverdale site would be preferable. The Lodge Hill site was thought to have potential for protected species and it was also queried whether development of this site had more to do with planning gain rather than being in strict accordance with planning policies.

The comments in relation to Lodge Hill and Silverdale are noted. As any development in Coldwaltham would be to meet local needs only, the Council considers that this can be provided through an exception site policy, and consequently the allocation of one of these sites is not needed.

East of the A24 – Horsham

Few objections were raised in response to the proposal to develop this site, although some concern was raised about its relatively isolated location and the impact of road noise on the development. If the site is developed it was considered that contributions should be sought towards the library service. Ecological considerations were also raised as it is possible that the site could have potential for bat species. The line of trees across the site is also considered to be significant and it is considered that they should be protected.

The comments in relation to the issues of noise and the ecological considerations affecting the site have been noted, and requirements to address these issues have been incorporated into Policy AL11 Preferred Options Site Specific Allocations of Land document.

Buchan Park, Crawley

STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE
(REGULATION 28 STATEMENT)
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES

A large number of comments were received in relation to this site nearly all of which were opposed to development. Included in the responses was a petition against the development. Key concerns raised included the sensitive location of the site in landscape terms (the site adjoins the High Weald AONB). There was also concern that development of the site would erode the gap between Horsham and Crawley. Another key concern regarding the proposal for development on this site was biodiversity. A number of respondents highlighted the importance of this area for conservation, highlighting its proximity to the SSSI, and it was stated that the site was likely to meet the criteria for SNCI designation in the future.

Other concerns raised in relation to development on the site included the difficulty of accessing the site and the impact of noise and air pollution from the road on any development. The impact of the development on pollution, crime and increased pressure on services and facilities was also raised.

The Council has noted the comments that were submitted in relation to this site. Whilst many of the issues such as the impact of noise and pressure on services and facilities could potentially be overcome as part of any development, the importance of the site for nature conservation, and its potential for designation as a Site of Nature Conservation Importance was of particular concern for this Council. As a consequence of the comments the proposal to develop this site is not being progressed.

Pound House – Upper Beeding

A large response was made to the proposal for development on this site. Most representations opposed the development. This included petitions from nearby residents who opposed the development. The key concerns raised were the possibility of flooding on the site. It was also highlighted that the drainage in Pound Lane is already poor and it was considered that the development of this site could worsen this situation.

It was also felt that development of the site would have an adverse impact on the landscape character of the area, and concern about the impact on the listed building to the south of the site was also raised. Impact on the local road network was also a concern, in particular the narrow Smugglers Lane to the south of the site.

This site was proposed primarily in order to provide housing to meet local needs and any development of this site therefore needs a high level of local support. The high number of responses from local residents opposing this development has demonstrated that the level of public support needed for this type of development is not present, and the Council does not therefore consider that it is appropriate to continue with this development proposal as part of the Preferred Options. It may be capable of coming forward as an ‘exceptions’ scheme.

Moorhead Drive – Horsham

A large number of responses were received in relation to this site. Nearly all, including three petitions, were opposed to development on the site. Development on the site was not believed to be appropriate as it would have a negative impact the surrounding landscape, and damage the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty in which the site would be located. Concerns were also raised that development on this site would narrow the strategic gap between Horsham and Crawley.

Respondents also questioned whether there was the need for a park and ride facility at the Moorhead Roundabout location. It was felt that there was already sufficient provision in Horsham, and it was also considered that at this location most traffic would be bound towards Crawley rather than heading into Horsham. It was suggested by some that if it was needed it should be located between the railway line and the A264. The need for a supermarket in the north east part of the town was also questioned, as it was felt that there was already sufficient provision both in terms of local stores and the larger supermarkets in the south of Horsham and at Broadbridge Heath.

STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE
(REGULATION 28 STATEMENT)
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES

In addition to these main comments other concerns raised about the development of the Moorhead Drive site were the effects of an increase in traffic, possible increase in crime levels, increased light pollution and the adverse effect on the ecology of the area.

The Council acknowledges the comments that were submitted in relation to this site. Whilst many of the issues such as the impact of traffic could potentially be overcome the impact of the development on the landscape and in particular the AONB designation has resulted in this proposal not being progressed. The effect on the Strategic Gap is also an important consideration.

In relation to the comments submitted regarding the proposal for a Park and Ride in the North Horsham area, it is considered that a Park and Ride site does not need to be progressed in the North Horsham area at this stage. Notwithstanding this the Council will continue to seek a further park and ride site in the area, if necessary. More detail in response to the Council's Park & Ride strategy is summarised in the 'Managing Travel Demand and Widening the Choice of Transport' section of this report.

Forest Road – Horsham

Whilst there was some support for the development of this site, others were concerned that development on this site should not take place as it is in the High Weald AONB. Other responses stated that if development on the site does occur there is a need for an ecological survey. It was also suggested that any development should provide funds to help enhance the riverside walk.

Due to the potential for the development to adversely impact the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and the Strategic Gap, the Council will not be progressing this site in the Preferred Options.

Many other sites have been suggested for development through this consultation exercise. These are summarised in Appendix B; some sites are considered appropriate for development and more details are included in the 'Site Specific Allocations of Land: Preferred Options'.

Issue 18 – Affordable Housing

Approach

Considerable support was expressed for affordable housing remaining affordable in perpetuity. Furthermore, support existed for the Policy approach outlined in the Issues and Options document, particularly if need can be demonstrated. It was indicated that affordable housing provision can be delivered with a flexible and enabling planning approach. Extensive support existed for the provision of more affordable housing, and it was acknowledged that there is a current undersupply. Furthermore, representations stated the importance of a variety of housing types under the affordable housing umbrella, particularly key worker housing. Support existed for affordable housing to meet local needs primarily. It was suggested the Council should identify ways which planning can address the shortfall in affordable housing supply. It was stated that affordable housing provision is essential for the area's economic sustainability.

Concern existed regarding mixing private and affordable housing and that the integration of the two housing types does not work.

The Council acknowledges the considerable support for the provision of affordable housing and the support for a mix of affordable housing types, particularly key worker housing. Furthermore, the Council accepts that the planning process is the key mechanism for delivering affordable housing, and consequently, the Council will continue to promote the approach outlined in the Issues and Options Document.

STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE
(REGULATION 28 STATEMENT)
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES

Threshold

Considerable support existed for the introduction of a lower threshold for the requirement of affordable housing, although it was stated any threshold should be justified. It was suggested that the threshold for brownfield land should be higher as costs of development are higher. A considerable number of comments indicated that the lower threshold for the requirement of affordable housing will make development unviable. Consequently, it was suggested that developers will continue to propose developments below the threshold. It is also suggested the proposed policy approach is not in conformity with Government Policy.

The Council acknowledges the balance in the representations made regarding the proposed threshold in terms of some support for the threshold to achieve more affordable housing against concerns it will make development economically unviable. However, the Council believes the proposed threshold is justified in housing needs terms, and that the approach has sufficient flexibility to ensure maximum affordable housing provision from developments without undermining their economic viability. A study into affordable housing viability has recently been commissioned.

Delivery

Support exists for new market housing to subsidise affordable housing. Representations supported commuted payments and emphasis on developers to deliver affordable housing. The provision of affordable housing spread throughout a development was supported. It was stated that the Housing Needs survey should be used to identify housing type need.

Concern existed that affordable housing actually means smaller houses not cheaper. It was suggested a more flexible approach to affordable housing type provision is required. It was indicated that the onus on developers to provide affordable housing is inappropriate.

In terms of the delivery of affordable housing the representations highlight the difficulties of delivery, which to a large degree the Council also acknowledges. However, the Council will continue to pursue the delivery of affordable housing as a proportion of development, or through commuted payments. This approach has to be adopted in light of the limited opportunities that exist more broadly to deliver affordable housing.

Issue 19 – Gypsies and Travellers
--

General

There was considerable support for the proactive approach for dealing with the Travellers and Gypsies issue, as outlined in the Issues and Options Document. It was suggested that Policy should be harmonised County wide, or a central Sussex coalition should be formed. Furthermore, it was indicated that a clear timetable for action would be beneficial. The undertaking of the need assessment was generally supported, but it was indicated that traveller and gypsy need should be considered separately. The comments acknowledged the difficulty of site identification.

The Council acknowledges the general support for the proactive approach adopted in the Issues and Options Document. The Council will continue to promote and develop this approach in an attempt to meet the District's traveller and gypsy need and give the Council greater ability to take enforcement action against further unauthorised encampments. The Council is satisfied that the need assessment was essential in meeting the objectives of this approach and believes the assessment is a comprehensive and robust study of a challenging issue.

General site

STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE
(REGULATION 28 STATEMENT)
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES

Comments suggested that traveller and gypsy sites should be located well away from residential areas or established settlements. However, some comments indicated that sites should be located close to existing settlements to access infrastructure, facilities and services. A considerable number of comments were received indicating that noise and visual impacts should be kept to a minimum.

The Council acknowledges the comments relating to the provision of traveller and gypsy sites, and will take these into account as the work on identifying needs progresses.

Site Specific

In terms of site specific representations the comments were; make temporary use of land identified within the possible Gatwick second runway safeguarding; expand the Cousin Copse site; consider Shoreham Cement Works as a site; object to a site at Tower Road, Colgate; and that there are no further sites required in Upper Beeding.

With regard to the site specific comments received it remains clear, that if required, site provision identification will be challenging and require extensive site assessment analysis.

Issue 20 – Employment Sites and Employment Protection Zones

Strategy

Considerable support was stated for the introduction of Employment Protection Zones (EPZ). EPZ need to be flexibly implemented it was stated. There was minimal support for not introducing EPZ.

The Council acknowledges the considerable support for the introduction of Employment Protection Zones (EPZ). The Council will continue to promote the introduction of EPZ and develop further the evidence base for their designation.

General

Some representations stated that the introduction of EPZ should balance economic development with the protection of rural character/greenfields, and balance site protection with economic viability and the provision of employment and residential development. It is suggested small and medium sized businesses should be encouraged and that smaller employment sites should be protected. Finally, it was stated that the policy approach needs to outline criteria to establish economic viability.

With regard to the representations received indicating that the introduction of EPZ should be a balance between ensuring economic development and protection of the countryside, the introduction of EPZ seeks to achieve this balance through protecting the District's most valuable commercial sites and not precluding the redevelopment of others where appropriate.

Site specific

Support was expressed for the inclusion of; Daux Road, Billingshurst; Gillmans Industrial Estate, Billingshurst; Huffwood Trading Estate, Billingshurst; Foundry Lane, Horsham; Mackley Industrial Estate, Small Dole; Station Approach Industrial Estate, Pulborough; and Eagle Industrial Estate Billingshurst. A representation was made that the Eagle Industrial Estate Billingshurst should be excluded as an EPZ. Furthermore, it was suggested Nightingale Road EPZ could be better utilised, perhaps for commuter parking or residential development.

With regard to the comments received relating to those sites, which are proposed to be designated as EPZ the Council considers that only boundary amendments may be

STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE
(REGULATION 28 STATEMENT)
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES

required. In addition, after further examination and assessment work the Council intends to include the Eagle Industrial Estate as an EPZ in the Development Control Policies document.

Methodology

The methodology for identifying EPZ was questioned in light of no obvious analysis having been carried out on the amount of employment land required and employment opportunities.

The evidence base for the identification of the EPZ was comprehensive and robust, but is being developed further and refined to ensure that those commercial sites proposed are the most appropriate for designation.

Employment Allocations - General

Representation was made that commercial self-build should be encouraged, and there should be a mix of freehold and leasehold premises. There was support for a mix of commercial premises to meet a range of economic and employment objectives and support for mixed-use commercial and residential development. Concern existed that insufficient consideration had been given to loss of existing employment sites and the need to provide a greater range of employment sites. Opinion was divided regarding economic growth between support for growth and concern that economic growth equates to greater development pressure. Finally, it was stated that additional commercial development is required and clarification is needed regarding how the Council will meet its small site employment provision.

The Council acknowledges the comments received regarding employment land provision and related issues. The Council is seeking to achieve a balance to ensure continued economic prosperity and delivering the Structure Plan employment land allocation against preventing unsustainable economic growth and related development requirements. The Council's approach as outlined in the Issues and Options Document acknowledges the importance of a variety of premises, particularly small and medium business provision.

Site Specific

i) Chantry Industrial Estate, Storrington

The comments relating to the proposal for Chantry Industrial Estate included; development would equate to erosion of the rural character; constitute inappropriate development adjacent to the AONB; increased traffic levels would occur; result in an inappropriate level of development; and that access arrangements are unlikely to be suitable. There was support for the proposal, provided the site's proximity to the AONB is respected.

The proposal for Chantry Industrial Estate will not be pursued through the Local Development Framework process as a consequence of the consideration of the consultation responses and a re-examination of the planning considerations surrounding the development.

ii) Henfield Business Park, Small Dole

The proposal for Henfield Business Park was subject to notable opposition, on the basis of the particular circumstances and background to the original development of the site.

The proposal for Henfield Business Park will not be pursued through the Local Development Framework process as a consequence of the consideration of the consultation responses and a re-examination of the planning considerations surrounding the development.

iii) Shoreham Cement Works

STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE
(REGULATION 28 STATEMENT)
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES

Representations on Shoreham Cement Works stated; the proposal should include tourism friendly developments; the site could make a contribution to tourism and leisure provision; clear the site and encourage natural growth; regard should be given to proximity to Beeding Hill and Newtimber SSSI; development of site will increase private car use; the site has inadequate access; the impact on A283/A27 junction needs to be considered; the site needs addressing its an eyesore; redevelopment is essential and desirable; and site management will be challenging once development has occurred.

Support was expressed for the policy approach if a need can be demonstrated; however, concern was expressed that additional employment development will increase demand for housing. Furthermore, concern was expressed that development would not support coastal regeneration and does not support the approach outlined in RPG9.

The Council has noted the representations received regarding the proposed policy approach for Shoreham Cement Works. The Council considers that the most appropriate approach for the Shoreham Cement Works site is to continue to pursue the policy provisions as outlined in the Issues and Options Document, through the Local Development Framework process.

iv) Warnham Brickworks Plant

Representations on Warnham Brickworks Plant suggested that; the site should be allocated as B2 and B8 major employment site; the site should be identified as a major employment allocation; and tourism and leisure provision should be considered at the site.

Noted; future redevelopment opportunities that may exist at this site will continue to be examined. It is accepted that an allocation of land for business and warehousing use would be appropriate.

v) Other Sites

Finally, representations were made that Colonnades, Pulborough and Kingsfold Nursery, Kingsfold are appropriate for commercial development.

These comments are noted but no change is proposed.

Improving the Quality of New development

Issue 21 - Improving the Quality of New Development
--

There was complete support for the principles set out in the Issues and Options consultation document; people wished to see developments of poor design being rejected and care taken over design particularly as densities increase. As may be expected there were differing views on what constitutes good design with support for both traditional and modern innovative approaches. It was suggested that design guides could be written and there was considerable support for Village and Town Design Statements, particularly if reliance is placed on them in the determination of planning applications. There was a wish to see less standard house types proposed by developers and more individuality. It was also felt that there needed to be more detail in the policy and greater definition of terms such as 'quality'. Finally, it was stressed by many that 'affordable housing' must not be bland and should be well integrated into any development.

All these points are accepted by the Council and it will endeavour to ensure good design with all new development. The Council is continuing to encourage the development of Village and Town Design Statements as they are considered to be the best way to set out the characteristics and the local design guidance needed across such a varied District. More detail on what is required in terms of good design will be included in the Development Control Policies document.

STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE
(REGULATION 28 STATEMENT)
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES

In addition to comments on design many respondents also commented on the need to ensure that developments are more environmentally friendly. There was a strong desire for development to respect the environment, particularly in terms of energy efficiency, promoting biodiversity, recycling and minimising waste. It was also felt that building designs should be adaptable to cater for peoples changing needs.

All these points are again accepted and the Council will work to ensure features to help protect the environment are incorporated into developments. Preferred Options Core Strategy Core Policy CP2 has been written to reflect this, and in addition more detail on what is required will be included in the Development Control Policies document.

STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE
(REGULATION 28 STATEMENT)
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES

SECTION D: FURTHER CONSULTEES (REGULATION 25)

The following organisations were invited to make policy specific comments (and wider comments) on the emerging Issues and Options Development Control policies.

Organisation	Name	Relevant Policies
English Nature	Louise Hutchby	LS1, LS3, LS4, EQ1, EQ2, EQ3
EDF Energy	John Park	EQ3
English Heritage	Steve Williams	LS1, LS2, QUAL1-7
Environment Agency	Erica Grey	EQ1, EQ2, EQ3, LS3, LS4
Landscape Officer	John Smith	LS1, LS2, LS3
Protecting Our World LSP	Gill Daniels	EQ1, EQ2, EQ3
Scotia Gas Networks	John Heyburn	EQ3
Sussex Wildlife Trust	Janyis Watson	LS3, LS4
Woodlands Trust	Tony Chadwick	LS4
British Horse Society	Patricia Butcher	RS5
Environmental Health	Rod Brown	EQ1, EQ2, EQ3
Southern Water	Chris Kneale	EQ1, EQ2
Thames Water	Georgie Cook	EQ1, EQ2
West Sussex Tourism		TOU1
West Sussex Archaeologist	c/o Emma Averis	QUAL2
Ancient Monuments Society		QUAL2
Countryside Agency	Mark Chessell	LS1, LS3, H1, RS1, RS2, RS3, RS8, R3
South Downs Joint Committee	Martin Small	LS3, TOU1, H1, RS1-RS7
Action in Rural Sussex	Teresa Gittins	H1, H2, H3, RS1, RS2, R3
High Weald AONB	Andrew Shaw	LS3, TOU1, H1, RS1
Leisure Services	Jim Gee	CF1, CF2
Older Persons LP	Veronica James	IC1
Sport England	Mick Anson	CF1, CF2
West Sussex Farm Advisor	Richard Wood	RS1, RS2, RS5, RS7, RS8
Mobile Operators Association	Mono Consultants	T1 (for circulation amongst its members)
Business Development Officer	Chris Baister	E1, E2
Police	Alan Chambers	GTSP1
Showmens Guild of Great Britain		GTSP1
Sussex Enterprise	Liz Cadman	E1, E2
Sussex Friends, Families and Travellers	Rob Whitehead	GTSP1
National Gypsy Council		GTSP1
Romany Institute		GTSP1
SEEDA		E1, E2, R1, R2, R4
BAA	Tim Lockwood	TRANS4
Design & Conservation Officer	Angela Haywood	QUAL1, QUAL4 to QUAL10
Highways Agency	Peter Minshull	TRANS1, TRANS2, TRANS3
Home Builders Federation	Pete Errington	H1, H2, H3
Horsham Society	Peter Tobutt	QUAL1
Local Homes LSP/Housing Services	Carolyn Antill	H1, H2, H3, IC1
Primary Care Trust	Sarah Creamer	IC1

STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE
(REGULATION 28 STATEMENT)
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES

Transport LSP	David Holmes	TRANS1
Tourism South East	Peter Colling	TOU1

STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE
(REGULATION 28 STATEMENT)
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES

SECTION E: SUMMARY OF MAIN ISSUES RAISED AND RESPONSES TO THE ADDITIONAL ISSUES AND OPTIONS CONSULTATION (REGULATION 25)

The responses were analysed in the order they appeared in the document. The text in **bold** is the Council's response to the issues raised in the Issues and Options consultation document.

GENERAL COMMENTS

There were only a few general comments made on the document as a whole, and by far the majority of consultees commented on individual policies. Comments made on the document as a whole were generally supportive, but included concern that it was difficult to understand and that it should be re-written in 'non-planning speak'. Another wanted a clearer definition of terms such as 'adversely', 'distinctive' and 'clearly outweighs' which it was felt were open to different interpretations. A further comment suggested that a clearer specification was needed on which policies applicants would have to comply with.

The Council has noted these comments and has attempted to write the policies as clearly as possible. The nature of the policies does however mean that some technical wording is necessary, but a glossary has been provided to help explain unfamiliar technical terms that may be encountered. Specifying which policies applicants will need to comply with is not set out in the document as all policies carry equal weight and all those which are relevant to a particular proposal will need to be considered.

COMMENTS ON INDIVIDUAL POLICIES

Landscape and Townscape Character

LS1 – Landscape Character

One comment questioned whether this policy was a replacement for Policy CS1 in the 1997 Local Plan. Another thought that the policy treated the District as one entity without enough recognition of the different character areas. It was thought that these different areas should be differentiated in this policy and referred to on a proposals map. The criteria of the policy could then be supplemented with criteria for the location, design, materials, landscape and design as appropriate. Another representation welcomed the policy but suggested adding a reference to landscape quality as well as pattern. It was also suggested that the reference to topography in part c) of the policy be removed or clarified.

LS2 – Townscape Character and Settlement Coalescence

Comments on this policy included a suggestion that the Core Strategy should not be making strategic gap designations, therefore reference to the Strategic Gap should be deleted from the policy. A further comment questioned whether the policy adequately dealt with small scale development and incremental change. Representations also suggested that the phrase "important recreational resources (including open space and rights of way)" should be substituted in place of the term 'green corridors'. Clarification of the term 'green corridors' was also requested. In relation to part b) of the policy, it was suggested to add a reference to the 'visual impact on townscape character' of new developments. It was also argued that the policy needed to offer more protection to townscapes including reference to the skyline.

LS3 - Protected Landscapes, Sites and Species

Responses relating to LS3 included detailed suggestions for additions or re-wording of the policy. Other comments suggested that the policy goes against government guidance / PPS1 for example by treating locally and nationally designated protected areas as the same in one policy. A further consultee sought clarification on the situation that would apply if the South Downs National Park comes into force which will change the status of the land designated as AONB. It was also suggested that references should be made to the list of protected habitats

STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE
(REGULATION 28 STATEMENT)
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES

cited in Circular 06/2005 (Annex c) which occur in Horsham District.

LS4 – Biodiversity, Woodland and Trees

A comment on this policy considered that no provision had been made to deal with trees existing on development sites. One representation questioned if it was possible to say that we will not permit development affecting Ancient Woodland, as there may be exceptions where the overall community benefit of development would be greater than preservation of the woodland. Comments on the policy included various suggestions for rewording and additions, including mention of felling and woodland clearance. It was also suggested that an addition be made to the supporting text stressing the need to plant native tree species and to stress the importance of Ghyll Woodlands. It was also suggested that the supporting text could set out the level of fine for those found to be clearing trees subject to TPOs.

Following consideration of the comments made on the policies above, the policies have been reworded where appropriate. This has included a new policy providing general countryside protection. The policies have also been reworded to provide a greater emphasis on the landscape character areas. It is not agreed that the Council should not be designating Strategic Gaps, and further detail on these designations is therefore retained in the Development Control policies.

The policies on protected sites, biodiversity woodland and trees have been reworded for greater clarity, and many suggested amendments have been added to the supporting text. Although the comments on having separate policies on different levels of protected sites are noted, the government aim of having a concise suite of development control policies could not be met if each level of designation were identified. It was therefore felt appropriate to group the policies together, given their aims are very similar.

Environmental Quality

There were a few comments relating to all three Environmental Quality policies. It was felt that there was a tension between the three policies and that they were possibly pulling in opposite directions. It was also felt that the wording in the three policies could be clarified in places.

EQ1 – Pollution

Comments on this policy were broadly supportive. It was queried whether the policy could discriminate between different types of pollution as all development is polluting. A minor wording change was suggested putting 'amenity' at the start of part a).

EQ2 – Flooding and water Resources

This policy that attracted to highest number of comments. These were generally supportive, but suggested that in various ways the policy does not go far enough and perhaps tries to cover too much. It was suggested that EQ2 needed to be split into several new policies, one for each of water resources/supply, flood risk, river corridors and foul/surface water drainage.

One representation suggested that the phrase 'reduce water consumption' in last line of the policy was open to interpretation and guidance should be given. Another comment suggested that reference should be made to 'waste water' and that the water supply issue should be clarified. Concerns were also raised in relation to the policy and its consideration of sewage infrastructure, which was felt to be insufficient. There was concern that development should not be permitted in areas where water supply may cause new infrastructure (especially reservoirs) to be constructed as water companies are obliged to supply water wherever it is needed even if this goes against a sustainable water supply policy. It was recommended that a new policy be written obliging developers to consider the capacity of sewerage infrastructure or fund appropriate improvements.

STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE
(REGULATION 28 STATEMENT)
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES

There were a number of suggested alterations to the supporting text for this policy. One suggested that in the final paragraph the term 'greywater recycling' should be replaced with a statement encouraging developers to apply BREEAM methodology to achieve better and more water efficient practices. A second suggestion was to add a statement in the supporting text to the effect that surface water should not be allowed to drain to foul sewer. A further representation suggested making reference to Environment Agency powers to control works associated with watercourses and to insert a reference to climate change as a causal factor in increasing the risk of flooding.

EQ3 - Climate Change and Renewable Energy

A few of the representations relating to EQ3 were supportive in nature. Others considered the policy too broad or sought clarification on the aim of the policy, questioning whether it related to wind farms or other forms of renewable energy intrinsically related to building design. Other representations received on this policy suggested amendments to the wording or supporting text. This included adding a reference to the effect that if it was not possible to install renewable energy heating, then cost-effective user controlled heating should be installed to ensure affordable warmth. There was a suggestion similar to that made in EQ2 above for a reference to climate change as a causal factor in increasing the risk of flooding.

In response to the representations submitted on the Environmental Quality policies, the policies have been amended to reflect many of the comments made. This has included separating out some of the issues previously covered by just one policy, with a new policy to cover flooding, and a separate one on water resources. The policy on water resources has also been amended to ensure that there is consideration of sewage infrastructure as part of planning proposals. It should however be noted that despite the concerns raised in response to the Issues and Options it is not possible to prevent development in areas of limited water supply and sewage infrastructure unless there is an embargo by the service providers. The Council has a duty to meet the housing requirements placed on it by the Government and new development should provide the necessary infrastructure. In addition to amending the policy on water quality, resources and flooding, amendments have also been made to the policy on renewable energy and climate change to cover both applications for renewable energy schemes, and to ensure that development more generally seeks to reduce on impact to climate change.

Improving the Quality of New Development

A range of comments were submitted on the policies regarding Improving the Quality of New Development. There was concern that some of the wording of policies in the current Local Plan should be retained. It was also suggested that the title of the section be amended, replacing 'Improving' with another term such as 'Ensuring' or 'Securing'. There was a suggestion that this section should appear first in the DC Policies document and another suggested new policies in this section specific to 'sustainable construction' and to 'Areas of Special Character' were required. It was also suggested that Issues and Options policies QUAL 5 and QUAL10 be deleted.

QUAL1 – Design

A few comments on this policy questioned the wording in the first line, concerning the position of the word 'only'. Most of the comments however, suggested additions to the policy. One suggested that there should be reference in the policy to the Landscape Character Assessment. Another representation put forward a number of new criteria against which permission to develop may be weighed. These included; control of phased development with each phase being a stand alone development, recognition of the need for development, a requirement that development results in local advantage, a criterion relating to appropriate density, one relating to 'overlooking', a requirement to provide unobtrusive and accessible rubbish/recycling collection facilities and finally a suggestion to put more emphasis on development being locally distinctive/appropriate to the local context.

STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE
(REGULATION 28 STATEMENT)
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES

Several representations suggested changes to individual parts of the policy. One questioned unqualified statements such as 'most efficient use' in part a) and suggested adding reference to 'neighbourhood or town statements' in part c) and again in the paragraph under m). The meaning and effectiveness of part d) was questioned and another representation suggested an addition to the wording in part e) making reference to British Standards as a benchmark of quality and size. One representation relating to QUAL1 suggested an addition to part f) referring to developments needing to provide safe access to the rights of way network where appropriate. It was further suggested to add the phrase "equestrians, where appropriate" after 'cyclists' in f). In part g) the use of the term 'those with mobility problems' was suggested as an alternative to 'disabled'. A few consultees asked to see specific reference made to energy conservation and also to sound proofing and insulation as design qualities. It was thought that some cross referencing would be necessary here. Another suggestion was to adopt a formal design code that could be rigidly followed such as that used by the Prince's Trust on their developments. A final comment sought a reference to the quality of workmanship.

QUAL2 – Archaeological Sites and Ancient Monuments

One of the representations suggested adding a reference to applicants needing to arrange funding of excavation and removal of remains in the first sentence of paragraph two. It was also suggested that the intention of the final sentence in paragraph two needed clarification. In other words, how was it intended that valuable remains should be displayed? It was thought that this would only be appropriate for prominent sites. A wording change was also suggested here. A small wording change was also suggested for paragraph three. It was recommended that paragraph 5 was replaced altogether with a new wording advising applicants how they could get advice on possible archaeological remains on their site.

It was also suggested that a policy similar to QUAL2 was needed for listed buildings and for those listed on the Historic Environment Record. This would reflect the fact that not all archaeological remains are buried under the ground.

QUAL4 - Conservation Areas

One of the representations here suggested that a new part to the policy be added stating that demolition and construction cannot be started until detailed permission has been given. Another comment here related to part b) where it was suggested there was a need to replace references to 'traditional' with "appropriate to the local context" which would reflect the fact that not all conservation areas are historical. A further comment welcomed the policy, but suggested that parts of it at least should be applied to wider areas of the town outside the Conservation Areas. This was suggested in relation to parts a), c), f) and g) in particular. Another representation asked for clarification of part b) of the second section of QUAL4.

QUAL6 – Listed Buildings

Several representations suggested minor wording alterations. In part c) it was suggested as above that there was a need to replace references to 'traditional' with "appropriate to the local context" which would reflect that not all listed buildings are historical. There were two recommendations for additions to the supporting text. The first to insert a link to the HDC listed buildings web page and the second to add the term 'flues' to the list in paragraph three.

QUAL7 – Listed Buildings – Enabling Development

A suggestion here was to add to the criteria the phrase "preserves the character and setting of the listed building." Another consultee suggested minor wording alterations.

QUAL8 – Shop Fronts

One consultee suggested minor wording alterations and also that reference should be made to the 'Design Guide' in the supporting text.

STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE
(REGULATION 28 STATEMENT)
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES

QUAL9 – Adverts

A comment on this policy suggested adding a new part covering harm to the visual amenity of nearby residents. Another representation suggested wording alterations and also asked for a reference to freestanding adverts which it was thought had not been covered in the policy.

In response to the representations submitted on Improving the Quality of New Development, the policies have been amended or deleted to reflect many of the comments made. The title of this section and its position within the document as a whole reflects the content of the LDF Core Strategy and as a result this has not been changed. Policies on sustainable construction / energy efficiency etc can be found elsewhere within the document and although Areas of Special Character are no longer retained we intend to ensure that all development is of a high quality and reflects the character of the area through the proposed new policies and the continuing support for Village, Parish and Town Appraisals and Design Statements.

Housing Provision

H2 – Loss of Dwellings

One representation found the thrust of this policy welcome as it helps the development of necessary services such as dentists in residential areas. Another representation however, thought that this might weaken the position of the Council to prevent the loss of single dwellings. This consultee questioned the scale of development to which the policy is intended to apply and it was questioned whether the loss of dwellings for other purposes was included by part b). Another consultee asked whether shared equity developments were included in this policy. It was suggested to add a part c) permitting the loss of a dwelling if it causes significant harm to the character of the area and stating that it would be replaced with a development of a lower density that enhances the area. It was suggested that 'residential accommodation' was a better term than 'homes' in the first sentence of H2.

H3 – Smaller Home/Housing Mix

One of the representations on this policy suggested clarification of the situation where an applicant does not provide for a mix of smaller homes in their development. It was also considered that there was nothing in the policy that would cover any of; infill development in the countryside; density requirements; new housing; sustainability issues; caravan sites; park home developments; or conversions of a dwelling to a greater number of dwellings. Another consultee questioned whether park homes were included, even if they were subject to a time-limited occupancy rule. It was felt by one consultee that a point should be made about the need to protect park homes where they were in a sustainable location. The desirability of a 'pepper pot' approach to distributing affordable housing was also questioned.

Another representation suggested that there may be a shortfall of three and four bedroom homes that would not be met by this policy. It was thought that reference to a requirement for the developer to provide a mix of houses reflecting the needs of the District would be more useful than referring simply to 'smaller houses'. Another consultee questioned the meaning of 'smaller homes'. One of the representations concerning H3 suggested that the policy would be more logically placed in the Core Strategy rather than in DC Policies as it is a fundamental plank towards achieving the overall objectives of the Core Strategy and it has significant impacts on the ability to attain overall housing targets. As such it was suggested that the policy should seek to allow choice and variety in the housing market to ensure housing needs of the whole community are met. Further, the policy should be informed by a local housing market assessment in consultation with landowners, developers and house builders and not just those in need of affordable housing. Finally, there was a suggestion to clarify the meaning of 'substantial proportion' as without further explanation it would be open to wide interpretation possibly causing the policy to be unsound.

STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE
(REGULATION 28 STATEMENT)
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES

The support for policy H2 is welcomed although it has now been amended and re-named to try and clarify some of the issues that had concerned respondents. The policy on small homes has also been amended to try and resolve some of the issues of concern and provide further clarity. We will re-examine both policies following the responses to this Preferred Options consultation exercise. It is the Councils intention to continue to seek smaller homes and to include a robust and clear policy within the Development Control policies. However we also recognise that the policy needs to be flexible and allow the nature of the local area, which varies across the District, to influence proposals.

Employment Provision

E1 – Employment Site/Land Protection

There were several supportive representations about this policy and a few suggesting alterations. These included rewording part b) of the policy to make it clear that only one period of marketing was needed for the premises for either an existing or a non-employment use. It as further suggested that the minimum period of this marketing should be less than 24 months which was considered excessive.

It was suggested that the first line of the policy needed clarification to explain how a proposal can 'equate to' a loss of employment use. There was also a comment that parts b) and d) acted on the premise that the premises were being sold and did not cover a rental marketing situation. It was therefore suggested that wording be changed to add the need to offer 'reasonable conditions' in the case that the premises were to be rented.

One representation suggested that a condition should be added covering under used sites so as to avoid protecting 'ramshackle' sites where there may well be a more beneficial use. Another consultee thought that E1 needed toughening up so that a poor quality site could not be redeveloped for housing just because it could not be marketed successfully within the given time period. A number of representations considered that a reference to the best use of an employment site was needed in the policy. A further comment sought clarification of where the EPZs covered and questioned the need to be explicit about policies that applied to EPZ and those that did not. One representation thought that there seems to be little difference between the ability to redevelop land within and outside an EPZ.

E2 – Other New Employment Development

One consultee asked for a change to 'Additional' rather than 'Other' in the title of this policy. Another asked for a reference to live-work units in this policy. More than one questioned the reasons why an employer would need to satisfy the conditions of this policy if they wanted to expand or relocate within the BUAB. Another consultee questioned the desirability of using BUABs as a basis for land use distinction. It was argued that sustainability of settlements should be the main reference point. There was also a suggestion here for a minor rewording of the policy to give more emphasis to protection of transport considerations. One more representation here thought that a new policy was needed to cover new employment outside the BUABs.

The comments in support of the policies are noted. The required period for marketing at each stage of the sequential approach has been reduced from 24 months to 18 months. It is the Council's view that within the designated Employment Protection Zones, a period of 18 months at each stage of the sequential approach is an appropriate marketing period prior to any non-employment proposal being put forward. The wording of the policy has also been amended so that all premises whether marketed for sale or rent; whether in good or poor condition, are covered by the policy.

The designation of particular areas as Employment Protection Zones is based on extensive background work undertaken by the Council, including the Employment Land Review study. Each site has been assessed against a number of criteria,

STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE
(REGULATION 28 STATEMENT)
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES

including sustainability criteria, ease of access and overall quality of the site and buildings. A limited number of EPZs have been proposed to ensure that only the highest quality and most sustainable sites are covered by the protection policy. The precise location and extent of each EPZ is shown on the Proposals Maps.

The title of the second policy has been amended to Additional New Employment Development. The policy has also been amended to allow for additional on-site extensions on existing sites. New employment provision outside of the built-up areas is covered by other policies under the Rural Strategy section.

Infrastructure Requirements

T1 - Telecommunications

The representation received on this policy suggested that it should be split into two, one policy for prior approved developments and one for new applications. It was also suggested that reference be made to mast or site share. There were also several minor wording alterations suggested.

Minor wording changes have been made to the policy. The policy now covers mast and site sharing. It was not considered appropriate to split the policy into two since the same assessment criteria are used and apply to both planning applications and prior approval for telecommunication development.

Protection and Enhancement of Community Facilities and Services

CF1- Protection of Existing Open Space, Sport and Recreation Facilities

There were a number of representations concerning CF1, most of which were relatively brief. One of these considered that the policy needed more emphasis on the development control recommendations in chapter 9 of the HDC PPG17 Assessment. The second recommended a reference in the supporting text to the need to protect the rights of way network as a recreational resource. A third asked for the inclusion of a reference to the protection of community facilities generally.

More detailed responses suggested that the policy needed to be firmer about how recreational areas should not be left to become poor quality as an excuse to redevelop them into a more valuable use, with policy wording suggested to reflect this. It was felt that the policy as a whole was not doing enough to protect open spaces and should be more restrictive in nature, and amendments to the policy were suggested in response to this.

CF2 - New Open Space, Sports and Recreation Facilities

Both responses to this policy were detailed in nature. It was suggested that by using the HDC PPG17 Assessment as the reference point, the policy may unwittingly resist the unforeseen development of new beneficial types of sport/recreation facilities as fashions and technology change in the future. An addition to the supporting text was suggested, encouraging the creation of new facilities that have a beneficial affect on health and wellbeing.

It was also considered that the policy is too restrictive as there were circumstances when the provision of additional or new facilities was justified even in areas of satisfactory or better provision. An example of this is a 'centre of excellence' which might meet more than local need. Equally additional facilities may be justified where existing ones were at capacity use. Finally it was felt that a more flexible approach was needed to enable development of sports and leisure facilities outside of the built-up areas due to a lack of space and prohibitive land values within the BUABs.

In response to the comments above, the policies and supporting text have been amended where appropriate. This has included an additional reference to Rights of

STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE
(REGULATION 28 STATEMENT)
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES

Way in the supporting text, ensuring their consideration as part of a planning proposal in addition to their protection under the Countryside and Rights of Way Act. Other suggested changes were not made, as it is considered that Core Strategy Policy CP14 Protection and Enhancement of Community Facilities and Services is strong enough to protect community facilities generally. Furthermore the development control policy can not in itself control the upkeep or otherwise of existing areas in order for them not to become run down. In addition it is not felt that the policy should be more prescriptive as to the suitable forms of open space as this will be area and site specific, and depend on the identified needs of that area.

Changes have also been made to the policies to take into account the concerns regarding future beneficial facilities. References to the PPG17 assessment are however retained as it will help to direct protection and development of facilities.

Rural Strategy

A number of comments were submitted on the policies relating to rural strategy. Most of these were relatively specific, for example seeking clarification or minor amendments to specific policies. It was also suggested that RS7 be deleted as barn conversions were not considered to be sustainable. More general comments on the rural strategy policies suggested that reference to the “provision, protection and improvement of the multi-use rights of way network” be made to policies RS1, 2, and 3. More detailed comments made on the different policies are summarised below.

RS1 - Sustainable Farm Diversification

One consultee questioned the purpose of this policy. Another felt that part c) was inappropriate as extension would be covered by a) and b). It was also felt that it would be too restrictive to insist that diversification proposals had to relate to the countryside.

RS2 – Agricultural and Rural Buildings for Industrial or Business Use

There were several brief representations specific to this policy including suggestions for minor wording changes. Other comments were supportive of the emphasis on using redundant agricultural buildings for small businesses. It was suggested that the reference to ‘vehicular access’ could there was a possible conflict with transport policies.

RS5 – Equestrian Development

A number of representations were received on this policy, including a query as to whether the policy needed to be explicit regarding the aim to resist stables becoming residential dwellings. In addition it was suggested that the Council should require any residential property needed for security or animal welfare to be limited in size and adjoin the stables. Another representation concerning this policy suggested that it was too negative. A new form of wording was put forward based on permitting new equestrian development where it is “in keeping with the countryside or the urban fringe location.” A further representation suggested substituting the term ‘preferred’ instead of ‘favourable’ in the last sentence of the paragraph b).

In response to these representations amendments to the policies and supporting text have been made where relevant. This has included reference to Rights of Way and the requested change from ‘vehicular access’ to ‘access’ in the policy on Agricultural and Rural Buildings for Industrial or Business Use. It was not however felt appropriate to alter the policy on barn conversions as the policy is considered restrictive enough to protect against unsuitably located conversions to residential.

Changes have been made to the policy on equestrian development, with the addition of wording controlling the siting of residential accommodation related to equestrian use as suggested. Minor wording changes have also been made, including the replacement

STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE
(REGULATION 28 STATEMENT)
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES

of the word 'favourable' with 'preferred'. It was not considered that the policy was too negative as suggested. No additions were made following and the concern that there should be specific reference to the restriction of conversion of stables to dwellings, as it is considered that this is covered by other policies regarding to residential development in the countryside and employment space loss.

Inclusive Communities

IC1 - Accommodation for the Elderly

Clarification was sought here in relation to a 'life-care' scheme which included aspects from both parts of the policy. Another representation suggested that nursing homes should be subjected to travel plans as although residents would not be likely to travel far from the facility by themselves, the travel of their visitors and the staff should be considered.

IC2 - Gypsy and Travelling Show People

The representation received about this policy felt that the policy should be split into two, one for gypsies and travellers and one for travelling showpeople. It was suggested that these two groups were seen as distinct by the government, had differing needs and were covered by different guidance and legislation. The representation challenged the idea that no new sites for travelling showpeople were needed within the District. Finally, it was felt that the term 'minimal' used in part d) of the policy was too vague and should be replaced with the phrase "a proposal should not have a significant detrimental impact."

Minor amendments have been made to policy IC1 in response to the comments and suggested inclusions in the policy. In response to the representations received, separate policies for 'Gypsy and Travellers' and 'Travelling Showpeople' have been developed. The wording has also been amended to reflect better the representation received. The Council will undertake further work on identifying any need for permanent sites for both Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople. In the interim period the Council has set out criteria based policies against which application for permanent sites will be considered.

Vitality and Viability of Existing Centres

R1 - New Retail Development within the Defined Retail Frontages

It was asked how the intent of part b) could be achieved if there was a change in use of the building.

R2 - New Retail Development outside the Defined Retail Frontages

It was thought that this needed to be two separate policies as it mixes up developments larger than 2500 sq. m and those developments outside the retail frontages. Another consultee thought that the policy ought to be more explicit that out-of-town retail developments will be resisted.

R3 - Proposals for Change of Use within the Primary and Secondary Defined Retail Frontages

One representation suggested that the periods of time in d) were too short and should be changed to the same as or indeed longer than those in part e). It was felt that change to residential should not be permitted in primary retail frontage areas.

R4 - Neighbourhood and Village Shops

STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE
(REGULATION 28 STATEMENT)
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES

There was a suggestion that the period of marketing time in part d) was too short. Further, it was put forward that there should be a new part f) stipulating that the loss of any retail outlet should not be permitted if it will reduce settlement sustainability.

The retail policies have been amended quite substantially since the Issues and Options consultation exercise and most of the concerns raised have been overcome by the restructuring of the policies. For example, the sequential approach is now set out in a clearer way and there is now a separate policy for new retail development within the defined retail frontages and an improved structure to the policy for retail development outside these frontages, and large scale development within the main shopping areas. It is considered that this approach will address the concern raised in relation to out-of-town development as the sequential approach must be applied for development outside the town and village centre boundaries. The marketing period has also been changed to ensure a stringent control of change of use within the defined shopping areas.

Tourism Development

TOU1 – Tourism

Comments received on this policy included a query as to what constitutes a 'major' tourism facility. Another representation considered that the first section of the policy was inappropriate, arguing that we cannot turn our back on tourism facilities that may improve settlement sustainability and economic vitality. There was also concern that the different sections of the policy conflicted with each other. It was also suggested that 'public transport network' should be replaced by 'existing highway network.'

A number of changes and additions have been made to the policy wording to improve the link with Core Strategy Policy CP19 Tourism and Cultural Facilities and to take into account the comments received related to the use of the phrase 'major tourism facility' and the perceived negative stance of the policy. There have been changes to the policy wording in order to remove the concern that part of the policy conflicted with the supporting text regarding the importance of the tourism industry to the District. The final change suggested regarding part c of the policy, to include reference to the public transport network has been incorporated.

Managing Travel Demand and Widening Choice of Transport

TRANS1 – Transport (General)

One of consultees suggested that the policy should seek to ensure that new development was required to mitigate its transport impact so there would be no adverse effects on the safe and free flow of traffic. This representation also considered that HDC should require developers to submit a transport assessment including a travel plan where the proposal had significant transport implications.

The second representation considered the wording of the policy in detail. For part a) it was suggested that the policy needed to expand on the term 'transport infrastructure' to make the phrase clear and less ambiguous. It was also suggested that as the public transport and cycle network was poor everywhere in the District, new development cannot be appropriate to the scale of what already exists and few developers can be expected to 'overcome deficiencies'. Therefore it was thought the policy would either have little effect or would serve to concentrate development into ever more localised areas of existing good transport infrastructure. A new form of wording was suggested aiming to address these concerns.

Considering part b) of the policy, there was a concern that the hierarchy and an overly rigid application of it could produce unforeseen and undesirable effects. It was felt that the wording be altered to the effect that consideration will be given to the hierarchy, rather than rigidly

STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE
(REGULATION 28 STATEMENT)
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES

following it. It was also suggested that 'car-owning residents' were missing from the hierarchy and that this group should be in the fifth position.

A number of suggestions were made about the supporting text of TRANS 1. In the first paragraph, it was suggested that "lower speed limits" be added as possible requirement. It was felt that the meaning of the third paragraph was not clear. It was suggested that the meaning should be clarified to the effect that if WSCC were forced to provide transportation facilities due to a new development, a contribution would be sought from the developers. Further, there was a suggestion that it should not always be WSCC which received the contribution payment. This should only be the case where existing or planned public transport facilities are affected by the development. If no existing or planned public transport facilities were involved it should be made clear that HDC will take the contribution towards community transport facilities and initiatives.

A suggestion was made for the fourth paragraph that a sum towards provision and maintenance of town centre public car parks should be sought where a new development will cause them to be used overnight. The final suggestion was that a general note should be added making clear an accepted definition of public transport by reference to the urban and rural intervals of buses. One hour and two hours were suggested as the appropriate intervals of urban and rural buses where this section was concerned.

TRANS2 - Protection of land for parking and highway purposes

One representation concerning this policy suggested that a District-wide parking strategy be referenced in the policy and developers be expected to comply with this where appropriate. Another representation questioned whether the A272 was a strategic route.

TRANS3 - Service Stations / Roadside Facilities

3.52 The one comment made on this policy was a simple expression of support.

In response to these representations a number of amendments to the policies and supporting text have been made where relevant. Many of the issues and comments will be more appropriately dealt with through a Supplementary Planning Document on Planning Obligations. The production of this document is programmed into the LDS and will cover a range of issues including contributions for public and community transport schemes. In addition many of the issues raised require the continuation of joint work with West Sussex County Council, the highways authority for this area, particularly through the implementation of the Horsham A.

STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE
(REGULATION 28 STATEMENT)
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES

**SECTION F: ADDITIONAL CONSULTATION UNDERTAKEN IN RELATION TO THE
SUBMISSION STATEMENT OF COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT**

Issues and Options

Early input from the Development Department.

Regular meetings and liaison with Development Department.

Input from the Planning Review Group

Comments were made at the Group's meeting on 15th September 2005

STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE
(REGULATION 28 STATEMENT)
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES

3. CONSULTATION UNDER REGULATION 26

- 3.1 A Preferred Options General Development Control Policies document was published with a six week period for public consultation and participation beginning on 4th November 2005 until 16th December 2005.
- 3.2 The document was available in the following locations; Horsham District Council Office, Libraries and Help Points across the District and was placed on the District Council's dedicated website.

Horsham District Council Office Park North North Street Horsham RH12 1RL		Opening hours Monday-Thursday – 8:45-5:20 Friday – 8:45-4:20 Saturday-Sunday - Closed
Billingshurst Library Mill Lane Billingshurst RH14 9JZ	Phone: 01403 783145 Fax: 01403 786817	Opening hours Monday – 9:30-1:00, 2:00-5:30 Tuesday– 9:30-1:00, 2:00-5:30 Wednesday – 9:30-10:00 Thursday – 9:30-1:00, 2:00-5:30 Friday– 9:30-1:00, 2:00-7:00 Saturday– 9:30-1:00, 2:00-5:00
Henfield Library Off High Street Henfield BN5 9HN	Phone: 01273 493587 Fax: 01273 494238	Opening hours Monday-Tuesday -10:00-1:00, 2:00-5:00 Wednesday – Closed Thursday – 10:00-1:00, 2:00-6:00 Friday - 10:00-1:00, 2:00-5:00 Saturday – 10:00-1:00, 2:00-5:00
Horsham Library & Help Point Lower Tanbridge Way Horsham RH12 1PJ	Phone General Enquiries 01403 224350 Information Enquiries 01403 224355 Help Point 01403 217957	Opening hours Monday-Friday – 9:30-7:30 Saturday – 9:30-5:00
Pulborough Library Brooks Way Off Lower Street Pulborough RH20 2BP	Phone: 01798 872891 Fax: 01798 875419	Opening hours Monday – 2:00-5:00 Tuesday – 10:00-1:00, 2:00-5:00 Wednesday – Closed Thursday-Saturday – 10:00-1:00, 2:00-5:00
Steyning Library Church Street Steyning RH20 2BP	Phone: 01903 812751 Fax: 01903 816827	Opening hours Monday-Wednesday – 9:30-1:00, 2:00-5:00 Thursday – Closed Friday – 9:30-1:00, 2:00-7:00 Saturday – 9:30-1:00, 2:00-5:00
Storrington Library & Help Point Ryecroft Lane Storrington Pulborough RH20 4PA	Phone: 01903 743075 Fax: 01903 740175	Opening hours Monday – 9:30-5:00 Tuesday – 9:30-7:00 Wednesday – 9:30-1:00 Thursday – 9:30-5:00 Friday – 9:30-7:00 Saturday – 9:30-5:00

STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE
(REGULATION 28 STATEMENT)
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES

- 3.3 The document and proposals matters were available on our website www.horsham.gov.uk/strategic_planning with a statement explaining where and when paper copies of the document were available for inspection.
- 3.4 An advertisement was placed in the West Sussex County Times newspaper on Friday 4th November, 2005, to advertise consultation on the Preferred Options General Development Control Policies (see Section G).
- 3.5 Copies of the document, together with details of where the documents were available for inspection were sent to the organisations listed in Section H and the Parish and Neighbourhood Councils (including affected adjoining Parish Councils) in Section I.
- 3.6 See also Section J which identifies the additional consultation/involvement undertaken in line with the submitted SCI.
- 3.7 315 comments were received from 50 individuals and organisations on the Preferred Options General Development Control Policies. The responses to the issues raised and the way they have been addressed in the Submission Document are set out in Section K.
- 3.8 Section L lists all respondents at the Preferred Options stage with ID numbers for reference.

STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE
(REGULATION 28 STATEMENT)
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES

SECTION G: LOCAL ADVERTISEMENT

This advertisement was placed in the West Sussex County Times newspaper on Friday 4th November, 2005, to advertise consultation on the Preferred Options General Development Control Policies.



Horsham District
Local Development Framework



Horsham
District
Council

PLANNING FOR OUR FUTURE

As the next stage in preparing the planning strategy for Horsham District to 2018, the District Council has published the **General Development Control Policies** for consultation. This document which is at the 'Preferred Options Stage' (the stage before submission) is open to comment on before being finalised; it sets out detailed policies against which individual planning applications will be assessed.

Consultation on this document will run from the 4th of November 2005 to **4.20pm on the 16th December 2005**. Comments can be submitted online at (www.horsham.gov.uk/strategic_planning) or alternatively on a separate comments form available from the Council. Any comments received will be analysed and considered when we prepare the General Development Control Policies submission document in the first part of 2006.

This document is available for inspection or purchase from the Horsham District Council offices, Park North, North Street, Horsham RH12 1RL. The offices are open 8.45am – 5.20 pm Monday to Thursday and 8.45am – 4.20pm on Fridays. The document is also available for inspection in public libraries and help points within the District.

STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE
(REGULATION 28 STATEMENT)
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES

SECTION H: CONSULTEES (REGULATION 26)

The groups that are highlighted were sent a copy of the General Development Control Preferred Options Document.

The groups not highlighted were sent notification of and information on where to view the General Development Control Preferred Options Document.

Organisation	Name
	JAMES PROVEN MEP
	MR W H SORRELL
	SIMON J ARCH
	MR J CLARK
	RICHARD DALES
	RICHARD MAILE
	MR & MRS MORSE
	DAVID ROBINSON
	JOHN GOSS
	FRANCES MAUDE MP
	ELIZABETH LAWRENCE
	MR AND MRS B. A. TAPPY
	MR ADDEY
	NICK DANN
	T.F.B COOPER
4 SIGHT: WEST SUSSEX ASSOCIATION FOR THE BLIND	COMMUNICATIONS OFFICER
A J SALTER & SON	ALAN SALTER
ACERT	MRS M WHIFFIN (GENERAL SECRETARY)
ACTION IN RURAL SUSSEX	TERESA GITTINS
ADAMS HENDRY	DEBRA IVORY
ADAMS HENDRY	ROBERT COLLETT
ADAMS HOLMES ASSOCIATES	MR H RYATT
ADAMS HOLMES ASSOCIATES	CAROLE HAWLARK
ADUR DISTRICT COUNCIL	PETER DAVIES
ADUR, ARUN & WORTHING PRIMARY CARE TRUST	J PARSONS (SNR CONTRACTS MANAGER)
ADVERSANE RESIDENTS ASSOCIATION	MRS J. KERN
AGE CONCERN (HORSHAM)	MRS V JAMES
ALLIANCE ENVIRONMENT & PLANNING	JOY MACCOUGHLAN
ALLIED DOMEQ (SPIRITS AND WINE) UK LTD	
AMBERLEY SOCIETY	MICHAEL TOYNBEE
ANCIENT MONUMENTS SOCIETY	
ANTHONY GREENWOOD	
ANTONY BOWHILL & ASSOCIATES	
APPLIED MATERIALS	CRAIG LOWRIE
ARRIVA SOUTHERN COUNTIES	KEVIN HAWKINS
ARUN DISTRICT COUNCIL	KAREN DOWER
ASB LAW	
ASHINGTON RESIDENTS ASSOCIATION	JOHN BERRY
BARTON WILLMORE	DAVID BRADLEY
BASF PRINTING SYSTMS LTD	MR R B J FOXLEY
BAULCH GROUP	

STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE
(REGULATION 28 STATEMENT)
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES

Organisation	Name
BAYLEY & WILLMER	PHILLIP WILLMER
BELLWAY ESTATES	REGIONAL PLANNING MANAGER
BERKELEY HOMES (SOUTHERN) LTD	SIMON COLLINS
BERKELEY STRATEGIC LAND	ADRIAN BROWN
BEWBUSH ACTION GROUP	MRS MARILYN SIMPSON
BEWBUSH COMMUNITY FORUM	MR BILL JARVIS
BEWBUSH SCOUT GROUP	MR P TAYLOR
BIBLE SOCIETY (HORSHAM) ACTION GROUP	MRS A BENNETT
BILLINGSHURST BUSINESS ASSOCIATION	MR T ANDERSON (CHAIRMAN)
BILLINGSHURST CHAMBER OF COMMERCE	COLIN LINNEY
BLAKES FARM HOUSE	DR F J COMERFORD
BLUE SKY PLANNING	JONATHON BEST
BOVIS HOMES LTD (SOUTH EAST REGION)	
BOYER PLANNING	DAVID LANDER
BRADBURY'S	PETER BRADBURY
BRETT INCORPORATED	MR S BRETT
BRIGHTON & HOVE CITY COUNCIL	ALAN MCCARTHY
BRIGHTON LESBIAN & GAY SWITCHBOARD	
BRITISH HORSE SOCIETY	MRS PATRICIA BUTCHER
BRITISH WATERWAYS	
BRITISH WIND ENERGY ASSOCIATION	KATIE ADDERLEY
BROADFIELD LIBRARY (MOBILE LIBRARY ONLY)	THE LIBRARIAN
BRUTON KNOWLES	
BRYANT HOMES (WESSEX)	
BSF PLANNING CONSULTANTS	MS J TAYLOR
BT	MS SAVILE (LOCAL LINES FORCASTER)
BUCK BARN RESIDENTS ASSOCIATION	MR V RAZZELL
BUTTERFLY CONSERVATION (SUSSEX BRANCH)	DAVID BRIDGES
C B RICHARD ELLIS	
C/O HORSHAM ROOM TRUST	ANDREW GILMORE
c/o THE ENVIRONMENT	CRAWLEY ENVIRONMENT FORUM
CADIA	PETER FELTHAM
CAMPAIGN TO PROTECT RURAL ENGLAND	MS K GORDON
CARADON TREND	
CENTEX STRATEGIC LAND	ERIC WILSON
CHARLES WADEY & SONS LTD	ALAN N C WADEY
CHASE & PARTNERS	STEPHEN ROSE
CHICHESTER DISTRICT COUNCIL	KEITH MORGAN
CHRIS BLANDFORD ASSOCIATES	GEOFF SMITH
CITIZENS ADVICE BUREAU	PAUL DOLLNER
CIVIL AVIATION AUTHORITY	MRS I BAROLO
CLUTTONS	FAO HAYDN PAYNE & MALCOM CHUMBLEY
COLIN HATCHER FRICS	
COMMUNITY SAFETY BRANCH	PETER HARDY
CONNELLS	ANDY JAMES
CONNELLS LAND & PLANNING	ANDY JAMES

STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE
(REGULATION 28 STATEMENT)
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES

Organisation	Name
COUNCIL FOR BRITISH ARCHAEOLOGY	BOWES MORRELL HOUSE
COUNTRYSIDE PROPERTIES (SOUTHERN) LTD	
COUNTY FIRE HEADQUARTERS	OPERATIONAL PLANNING OFFICER
COURTLEY CONSULTANTS LTD	HOWARD COURTLEY
CPRE - HORSHAM & CRAWLEY	MR N PACKWOOD
CPRE (SUSSEX BRANCH)	MRS E BEENEY
CRAWLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL	TED BERESFORD KNOX
CREIGHTONS PLC	STEPHEN SMALLS
CRICKMAY & PARTNERS	MR T HUCKER
CROUDACE STRATEGICLTD	PAUL LEMAR
CROWN ESTATE COMMISSIONERS	MR M J GRAVESTOCK
CSA ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING	CLIVE SELF
CUNNANE TOWN PLANNING	MR J BLACKWELL
CYCLIST TOURING CLUB	MR R NASH
D & M PLANNING PARTNERSHIP	JAYNE DEVERELL
DALIA LICHFIELD ASSOCIATES	
DALTON WARNER DAVIS	NIGEL ABBOTT
DAVID HICKEN ASSOCIATES	DAVID HICKEN
DAVID WILSON ESTATES (SOUTH EAST OFFICE)	DAVID BANFIELD
DEFENCE ESTATES	
DEFRA & RURAL TEAM (GOSE)	ANDY CHALMERS
DELUXE GLOBAL MEDIA SERVICES LTD	MIGUEL XAVIER
DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SECURITY	THE MANAGER
DIALOGUE	SEBASTIAN HANLEY
DISTRICT VALUER & VALUATION OFFICER	
DMH	TONY ALLEN
DOUGLAS BRIGGS PARTNERSHIP	LOUISE SHAW
DPDS	DIANNE BOWYER
DPDS CONSULTING GROUP	PETER THAIR / JESSE CHAPMAN
DPDS CONSULTING GROUP	DIANA BOWYER
DRIVERS JONAS	ALISON MCCUE
DTZ PIEDA CONSULTING	MARK JACKSON
DUKES OFFICES	DEREK SCOBLE RIBA CHARTERED ARCHITECT
DUNCAN O'KELLY PARTNERSHIP	DUNCAN O'KELLY
EAST SUSSEX COUNTY COUNCIL	MIKE LANGTHORNE
EDF ENERGY	JOHN PARK (NETWORKS BRANCH)
ENGLISH COURTYARDS	LYNNE BOWYER
ENGLISH HERITAGE (SOUTH EAST REGION)	STEVE WILLIAMS
ENGLISH NATURE	LOUISE HUTCHBY
ENGLISH PARTNERSHIPS	JUDITH SMALLMAN
EUROPEAN MOVEMENT (UK) THE SUSSEX BRANCH	MR S QUIGLEY
EVENING ARGUS	THE EDITOR
FAIRHOLME	JOHN CRABBE
FAIRVIEW NEW HOMES PLC	D CHURCHILL
FED OF SMALL BUSINESSES (SURREY/W SUSSEX)	MR DAVID CANNON, CHAIRMAN

STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE
(REGULATION 28 STATEMENT)
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES

Organisation	Name
FEDERATION OF SUSSEX AMENITY SOCIETIES	ANNABELLE HUGHES
FOREST ENTERPRISE	
FORESTRY COMMISSION	
FPD SAVILLS	D CRAMAND
FPD SAVILLS	JONATHON STEELE
FRIENDS, FAMILIES AND TRAVELLERS	ROB WHITEHEAD
FULLER PIEZER	
G L HEARN	ANTONIA LIU
GAAC C/O BLOOMFIELDS LTD	A P BLOOMFIELD
GATWICK AIRPORT CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE	MIKE KENDALL
GATWICK AIRPORT LTD	TIM LOCKWOOD
GEOFFREY G FRY & ASSOCIATES	G. FRY
GEORGE WIMPEY SOUTH LONDON LTD	DAVID HUGGETT
GMA PLANNING	EMMA RODLEY
GOADSBY & HARDING	PETER ATFIELD
GOVERNMENT OFFICE FOR THE SE (GOSE)	DAVID PAINE
GVA GRIMLEY	VNCENT GABBE
GYPSY COUNCIL FOR EDUCATION, CULTURE,...	MR P MERCER (PRESIDENT)
H J BURT & SON	
HAVEN PRESERVATION SOCIETY	MR N G MCLACHLAN
HBF SOUTHERN REGION	PETE ERRINGTON
HEALTH & SAFETY EXECUTIVE (HSE)	
HEATH COMMON RESIDENTS ASSOCIATION	M. J. GOULD (CHAIR)
HENRY ADAMS & PARTNERS	STEVE CULPITT
HENRY SMITH & SON	J A FARQUHAR
HEVECO MUSHROOMS LIMITED	MARK HOWARTH
HIGH WEALD AONB	ANDREW SHAW
HILL HUMBERTS LEISURE	MARTIN TAYLOR
HILLREED HOMES LTD	SIMON M POTTS
HOME COTTAGE	ROGER BLAKE
HORSHAM & CHANCTONBURY PCT (PRIMARY CARE TRUST)	ANGELA UGUR
HORSHAM & CHANCTONBURY PCT (PRIMARY CARE TRUST)	SARAH CREAMER
HORSHAM CHAMBER OF COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY	PETER BECKHAM
HORSHAM CHAMBER OF COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY (HCCI)	JACKIE WESTCOTT
HORSHAM COUNCIL FOR VOLUNTARY SERVICE	
HORSHAM FIRE STATION	DIVISIONAL COMMANDER
HORSHAM NATURAL HISTORY SOCIETY	MRS S NEELY
HORSHAM VISUALLY IMPAIRED GROUP	MRS M R DANIEL
HUMBERTS	ANDREW BURGESS
HUTCHINSON 3G UK LIMITED	ALASTAIR JEWELL
IFIELD VILLAGE CONS AREA ADVISORY CTTEE	JENNY FROST (SECRETARY)
ITPS	MR K POTTS

STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE
(REGULATION 28 STATEMENT)
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES

Organisation	Name
J & J DESIGN	JOHN SHEPHARD
JESTICO & WHILES	JOHN WHILES
JOHN LYTTON & CO	JOHN LYTTON
JONES DAY	ANGELA TURNER
JONES LANG LASALLE	
JOSEPH SULLIVAN & ASSOC.	JOSEPH SULLIVAN
KATE'S CAKES	TIM BREDEN
KEEP RUSPER GREEN ACTION GROUP	A S J RICE
KEMBER LOUDON WILLIAMS	MR R NIGHTINGALE
KING AND CHASEMORE	
KING STURGE	ANN BIRCHALL
KINGSFOLD RESIDENTS ASSOCIATION	JOHN CROCKFORD
LAING HOMES LTD	STRATEGIC LAND MANAGER
LANDMARK INFORMATION GROUP LTD	JAMES TIPPINS
LANGLEY LANE RESIDENTS ASSOCIATION	MARTIN MAY
LARA	MS C GARFIELD
LENNON PLANNING LTD	DES DUNLOP
LES HUMPHREY ASSOCIATES	
LIDL UK	MICHAEL NEWTON
LITTMAN & ROBESON	JOANNE PEARS
LUCAS LAND & PLANNING	STEPHEN LUCAS
MASONS	K. COOKSLEY
McCARTHY & STONE DEVELOPMENTS LTD	MICHAEL TUCKER
MENCAP SOCIETY (HORSHAM & CRAWLEY)	MR JOHN ROBINSON
MID SUSSEX BADGER PROTECTION GROUP	
MID SUSSEX DISTRICT COUNCIL	JUDITH HEWITT
MILL DENE ESTATE RESIDENTS ASSOC.	PAUL CASTLE
MILLER HUGHES ASSOCIATES	
MINISTRY OF DEFENCE	BRIAN SIMPSON
MOBILE OPERATORS ASSOCIATION C/O MONO CONSULTANTS LIMITED	NORMAN GILLIAN MRTPI
MOBILITY TRUST,SUSSEX	MR G BRIDGE
MOLE VALLEY DISTRICT COUNCIL	DISTRICT PLANNING OFFICER
MONKHOUSE & BANNISTERS	
MONTAGUE EVANS	MS K GULLETT
MORGAN COLE	DANIEL SCHARF
MUNTHAM HOME FARM	D BANKS
NATHANIEL LICHFIELD & PARTNERS	WILL EDMONDS
NATIONAL FARMERS UNION (HORSHAM & STEYNING)	JOHN GARRARD
NATIONAL FARMERS UNION (SE REGION)	MR SANDY ABBOT
NATIONAL GYPSY COUNCIL	MR H SMITH (PRESIDENT)
NATIONAL PLAYING FIELDS	RAYMOND COLE
NATIONAL TRUST	JANE ARNOTT
NETWORK RAIL	CHRIS PRICE, TOWN PLANNER
NEWFOUNDOUT PRESERVATION SOCIETY	C/O JAN O KEEFE
NHS EXECUTIVE SE	HEAD OF ESTATES
NORTH WEST SUSSEX BRIDLEWAYS	T PENDLE
NOVARTIS	
O2 UK	PETER FOSTER

STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE
(REGULATION 28 STATEMENT)
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES

Organisation	Name
ORANGE	NIALL TIPPING
ORDNANCE SURVEY SERVICES	PETER SWIFT
OSBORNE HOMES, GEOFFREY OSBORNE LTD	TONY COX
P J Smith Associates	Peter Smith
P R C	ANDY RIFLEY
PARKER DANN	MIKE PARKER
PAULA ROSA KITCHENS	PETER SPEERS
PEACOCK & SMITH	MALCOLM WALKER
PERSIMMON HOMES SOUTH EAST	PETER COURT (STRATEGIC LAND MANAGER)
PH2 PLANNING UNITED	P HODSKINSON
PLANWARE	MATTHEW CARPENTER
POST OFFICE COUNTERS LTD	DISTRICT MANAGER
POST OFFICE PROPERTY HOLDINGS	L. SIMMONS (TOWN PLANNING MANAGER)
PROPERTY ADVISORS TO THE CIVIL ESTATE	
PROPERTY CONSULTANT	PAUL NEWMAN
PULBOROUGH CHAMBER OF TRADE	TED HENNINGS
RAMBLERS ASSOCIATION	MR J SIMMONS
RAMBLERS ASSOCIATION (COUNTRYSIDE)	MR A QUINELL
RAMBLERS ASSOCIATION (SUSSEX AREA)	MR N SLOAN
RAPLEYS	AIDAN THATCHER
Rapleys LLP	Mr Aidan Thatcher
RAWLISON & BUTLER	
READY & ABLE SPORTS CLUB FOR PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES	MR T BEADLE
RH & RW CLUTTONS	TIM HUTCHINGS
RICHARD STUBBS	
RMC GROUP SERVICES LTD	DEREK WHITE
ROBERT TURLEY ASSOCIATES	FAO AMANDA BROWN
ROFFEY YOUTH CENTRE	MRS CHRISTINE FITZGERALD
ROMANY INSTITUTE	DR KENDRICK
ROUNDBOUT - TALKING NEWSPAPER FOR THE BLIND	MRS D HARTLEY
ROYAL & SUN ALLIANCE	KIERAN FLYNN
ROYAL AND SUN ALLIANCE INSURANCE	
ROYAL COMMISSION ON ENVIRONMENTAL POLLUTION	
ROYAL MAIL, BILLINGSHURST	PETER RUSSELL
RPS GROUP	DAVID CHURCHILL
RSPB	MR A COTTON
RSPCA	MR RICHARD GRAVESTOCK
RTPI	
RUDGWICK PRESERVATION SOCIETY	MR STAN SMITH
RURAL HOUSING TRUST	ANDREW SMITH
RUSPER RESIDENTS GROUP	J CHAPMAN
RUSSEL COOKE SOLICITORS	MR M MASKY
RYDON HOMES LTD	JOHN LONGHORN
SANDGATE CONSERVATION SOCIETY	D. J. FILLISTON MBE
SAVE HISTORIC PULBOROUGH	DR ANDREW TILBROOK

STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE
(REGULATION 28 STATEMENT)
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES

Organisation	Name
SCHENECTADY-BECK	BRIAN GOODCHILD
SCOTIA GAS NETWORKS (SOUTHERN GAS NETWORKS)	JOHN HEYBURN
SCOTTISH & SOUTHERN ENERGY	GEOFF FISHER
SEEDA	
SEERA	MIKE GWILLAM
SHOREHAM HERALD	MR A OLIEFF
SILVERTECH INTERNATIONAL	GORDON ELLIOTT
SMITH'S GORE	IAN SMITH
SOCIETY OF SUSSEX DOWNSMEN	THE SECRETARY
SOCIETY OF TRAVELLING PEOPLE	MR T B O'DOHERTY
SOUTH CENTRAL LTD	ROGER LANHAM
SOUTH EASTERN PLANNING SERVICES	MICHAEL GRAY
SOUTH HOLMES ESTATE RESIDENTS ASSOC.	
SOUTHERN WATER	CHRIS KNEALE
SOUTHWATER ACTION GROUP	MRS B MUNFORD
SOUTHWATER ASSOCIATION OF TRADERS	ANN SWAIN
SPORT ENGLAND (SOUTH EAST)	MICK ANSON
STAMMERHAM AMENITY ASSOCIATION	JOHN MACE
STEYNING CHAMBER OF TRADE	VAL WOOD
STEYNING SOCIETY	MR J HUNT
STORRINGTON CHAMBER OF COMMERCE	MR A BRIEN
STRATEGIC RAIL AUTHORITY	TOWN PLANNING TEAM
STRUTT & PARKER	JOHN WRIGHT
SUNLEY HOMES	
SURREY & NORTH SUSSEX BEAGLES	TOM RYAN
SURREY & SUSSEX NHS TRUST	
SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL	RICHARD EVANS
SUSSEX BAT GROUP	MS SHEILA WRIGHT
SUSSEX CLUBS FOR YOUNG PEOPLE	MR I SCOTT
SUSSEX DEAF ASSOCIATION	DOREEN MILLS
SOUTH DOWNS JOINT COMMITTEE	MARTIN SMALL
SUSSEX ENTERPRISE	LIZ CADMAN
SUSSEX GARDENS TRUST	SALLY WALKER
SUSSEX JAPAN SOCIETY	MR J SIMPSON
SUSSEX POLICE (HORSHAM)	CHIEF INSPECTOR CHAMBERS
SUSSEX POLICE HEADQUARTERS	ASSISTANT CHIEF CONSTABLE
SUSSEX WILDLIFE TRUST	JANYIS HYATT
T.P.C.	
TAYLOR WOODROW DEVELOPMENTS LTD	DAVID EDWARDS
TERENCE O'ROURKE PLC	
TESLA ENGINEERING LIMITED	DAVID CRACKNELL
TETLOW KING PLANNING	TRACY-ANN SCANLAN
THAKEHAM VILLAGE ACTION	JEAN LOCKER
THAMES WATER PROPERTY SERVICES	C/O GEORGIE COOK
THE BELL CORNWELL PARTNERSHIP	G BELL
THE BILLINGSHURST SOCIETY	MR R JORDAN
THE BLACKSMITHS ARMS	JASON HOOPER
THE CHARLES SMITH TRUST	MRS P G SIGGS

STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE
(REGULATION 28 STATEMENT)
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES

Organisation	Name
THE COLLEGE OF RICHARD COLLYER	DR J JOHNSTON
THE COUNTRYSIDE AGENCY	MARK CRESSWELL
THE EARL OF LYTTON	ESTATE OFFICE
THE ENVIRONMENT AGENCY	DEVELOPMENT PLANNING, THAMES OFFICE
THE ENVIRONMENT AGENCY	ERICA GRAY
THE ENVIRONMENT AGENCY	HAMISH WILSON
THE FEDERATION OF SUSSEX AMENITY SOCIETIES (NORTH WEST GROUP)	JANET AIDIN
THE HIGHWAYS AGENCY	HOWARD MOORE
THE HORSHAM SOCIETY	PETER TOBUTT
THE HOUSING CORPORATION	FIONA CRUICKSHANK
THE PLANNING BUREAU	Nigel Pugsley, Planning Assistant
THE PULBOROUGH SOCIETY	ROSEMARY WILSON (HON-SECRETARY)
THE RAMBLERS ASSOCIATION	
THE ROMANY GUILD	MR T LEE (GENERAL SECRETARY)
THE ROYAL AIR FORCES ASSOCIATION	AIR COMMODORE EDWARD JARRON
THE SHOWMEN'S GUILD OF GREAT BRITAIN	GEORGE IRVIN
THE SLINFOLD SOCIETY	ADRIAN SKEETS
THE WARNHAM SOCIETY	MRS M DALES
THE WIGGONHOLT ASSOCIATION	JANET AIDIN
THE WILDBROOKS SOCIETY	MR M O S HAWKINS
THE WOODLAND TRUST	TONY CHADWICK
THOMAS EGGAR	PETER BUSBY
TIDEY & WEBB LTD	
T-MOBILE	ANDREW MADDOCK
TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT	IAN JEFFREY
TRANSCO	PHIL CHALMERS
TRUFFLES	MR P R TOMPSETT
VLH ASSOCIATES	VIC HESTER
VODAFONE LIMITED	NICK GREER
W T LAMB HOLDINGS LTD	THE MANAGING DIRECTOR
WATES RESIDENTIAL	
WAVERLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL	PETER HARTLEY (PRINCIPAL PLANNER)
WEALD VALE ASSOCIATION	GWG MORFEY
WEALD VALE ASSOCIATION LTD	MR G W TRIBE
WEALDEN IRON RESEARCH GROUP	MR J S HODGKINSON, CHAIRMAN
WEATHERALL GREEN & SMITH	J MYCROFT
WEST CHILTINGTON RURAL PRES.SOC	MR G HOWELL
WEST SUSSEX ASSOCIATION FOR DISABLED PEOPLE	MRS L E WILLIAMS
WEST SUSSEX COUNTY COUNCIL	STEVE BROWN
WEST SUSSEX COUNTY TIMES	
WEST SUSSEX GAZETTE	
WEST SUSSEX INVESTMENT	MIKE COGSWELL
WESTBURY HOMES (HOLDINGS) LTD	MR PHIL HULL
WEY & ARUN CANAL TRUST LTD	
WOOLF BOND PLANNING	STEVE BROWN

STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE
(REGULATION 28 STATEMENT)
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES

Organisation	Name
WORTHING & SOUTHLANDS NHS TRUST	
WORTHING BOROUGH COUNCIL	CLARE MANGAN
WORTHING GUARDIAN	
WS PLANNING	MARGARITA BLOEM

STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE
(REGULATION 28 STATEMENT)
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES

SECTION I: PARISH & NEIGHBOURHOOD COUNCILS WITHIN HORSHAM

All Parish and Neighbourhood Councils were sent copies of the General Development Control Policies Preferred Options document.

Amberley Parish Council		Mrs C Whittington, The Clerk, 4 The Willows, Amberley Road, Storrington, Pulborough, West Sussex, RH20 4RJ Email: whittingtonbuild@aol.com Tel: 01903 741014
Ashington Council	Parish	Mrs K Dare, The Clerk, Honeysuckle House, London Road, Ashington, Pulborough, West Sussex, RH20 3JR Email: karendare@tiscali.co.uk Tel: 01903 893740
Ashurst Parish Council		Mrs H Roxby, The Clerk, 4 Shooting Field, Steyning, West Sussex BN44 3RQ Email: spc@steyningcentre.fsnet.co.uk Tel: 01903 814802
Billingshurst Council	Parish	Mrs E Berry, The Clerk, Council Office, The Billingshurst Village Hall, Roman Way, Billingshurst, West Sussex, RH14 9QW Email: clerk@billingshurst.gov.uk Tel: 01403 782555
Bramber Parish Council		Mrs A Hyde, The Clerk, Briarburn, Lower Station Road, Henfield, West Sussex, BN5 9UR Email: annehyde@tiscali.co.uk Tel: 01273 491902
Broadbridge Parish Council	Heath	Mrs T Hooker, The Clerk, 2 School Close, Horsham, West Sussex, RH12 4UA Email: bbhpc@tiscali.co.uk Tel: 01403 265748
Coldwaltham Council	Parish	Mrs S Norman, The Clerk, 7 New Place Road, Pulborough, West Sussex, RH20 2JD Email: clerk.coldwalthampc@tiscali.co.uk Tel: 01798 873509
Colgate Parish Council		Mrs E Dunsbee, The Clerk, 11 Chennells Way, Horsham, West Sussex, RH12 5TW Email: colgate.parishcouncil@virgin.net Tel: 01403 269305
Cowfold Parish Council		Mrs J Wright, The Clerk, 117 Acorn Avenue, Cowfold, Horsham, West Sussex, RH13 8RT Email:
Denne Council	Neighbourhood	Mrs W Glanfield, The Clerk, 4 Coltsfoot Drive, Horsham, West Sussex, RH12 5FH Email: wendy@wenmike.fsnet.co.uk Tel: 01403 264014
Forest Council	Neighbourhood	Mrs M Vinall, The Clerk, Church View, 40 Rookwood Park, Horsham, West Sussex, RH12 1 UB Email: fnc.horsham@tesco.net Tel: 01043 269265
Henfield Parish Council		Mr P Hill, The Clerk, Henfield Hall, High Street, Henfield, West Sussex, BN5 9DB Email: office@henfield.gov.uk Tel: 01273 492507
Itchingfield Council	Parish	Mrs J Critchley, The Clerk, 33 Smugglers Way, Barns Green, Horsham, West Sussex, RH13 0PP Email: jancritchley@itchpc.freemove.co.uk Tel: 01403 731596
Lower Beeding Council	Parish	Mrs P Brown, The Clerk, 1 Patchings, Horsham, West Sussex, RH13 5HJ Email: lbpcc@tesco.net Tel: 01403 262179
North Horsham Council	Parish	Mr T O'Hara, The Clerk, Roffey Millennium Hall, Crawley Road, Horsham, West Sussex, RH12 4DT Email: parish.clerk@northhorsham-pc.gov.uk Tel: 01403 750786
Nuthurst Parish Council		Mrs T Rowe, The Clerk, 24 Heron Way, Horsham, West Sussex RH13 6DQ Email: tracyrowe@nuthurstparishcouncil.freemove.co.uk Tel: 01403 249315
Parnham Parish Council		Mrs G Rowe, The Clerk, Pine Cottage, Rackham, Pulborough, West Sussex, RH20 2EU Email: glenysrowepc@aol.com Tel: 01903 744115
Pulborough	Parish	Mrs L Hoff, The Clerk, Parish Council Office, Pulborough Social

STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE
(REGULATION 28 STATEMENT)
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES

Council	Centre, Swan View, Pulborough, West Sussex, RH20 2BF Email: clerk@pulboroughparishcouncil.gov.uk Tel: 01798 87532
Rudgwick Parish Council	Mrs B Kenward, The Clerk, 6 Pathfield Road, Rudgwick, Horsham, West Sussex, RH12 3HS Email: ClerkRudgwick@aol.com Tel: 01403 822678
Rusper Parish Council	Mrs C Sowden, The Clerk, Medlands, Partridge Lane, Rusper, Horsham, West Sussex, RH12 4RW Email: Clairesowden@btopenworld.com Tel: 01293 871164
Shermanbury Parish Council	Ms C Page, The Clerk, 49 Little Oak, Partridge Green, Horsham, West Sussex, RH13 8JY Email: shermanbury@hotmail.co.uk Tel: 01403 711502
Shipley Parish Council	Mrs J Nunn, The Clerk, Rosemary Cottage, Dragons Lane, Shipley, Horsham, West Sussex, RH13 8GD Email: shipley.pc@virgin.net Tel: 01403 741329
Slinfold Parish Council	Ms B Turner, The Clerk, PO Box 360, Horsham, West Sussex, RH13 5GW Email: clerk@slinfoldpc.fsnet.co.uk Tel: 01403 266768
Southwater Parish Council	Mrs C Tobin, The Clerk, Beeson House, 26 Lintot Square, Faribank Road, Southwater, Horsham, West Sussex, RH13 9LA Email: catherine@southwater.net Tel: 01403 733202
Steyning Parish Council	Mrs L Spiers, The Clerk, The Steyning Centre, Fletchers Croft, Steyning, West Sussex, BN44 3XZ Email: clerk@steyningparishcouncil.fsnet.co.uk Tel: 01903 812042
Storrington & Sullington Parish Council	Mrs I Marshall, The Clerk, Sullington Parish Hall, Thakeham Road, Storrington, Pulborough, West Sussex, RH20 3PP Email: storringtonpc@btconnect.com Tel: 01903 746547
Thakeham Parish Council	Mr J Denman, The Clerk, Thakeham Parish Council Office, Storrington Road, Thakeham, Pulborough, West Sussex, RH13 0TR Email: clerk@thakehampc.plus.com Tel: 01798 815305
Trafalgar Neighbourhood Council	Mrs J McMillan, The Clerk, 20 Hillside, Horsham, West Sussex, RH12 1NG Email: julie.andymc@btinternet.com Tel: 01403 264302
Upper Beeding Parish Council	Mrs I Caygill, The Clerk, Ladymeade, Hyde Street, Upper Beeding, Steyning, West Sussex, BN44 3TG Email: upperbeeding.parishcouncil@virgin.net Tel: 01903 810316
Warnham Parish Council	Mr G Benham, The Clerk, Rose Cottage, 33 Ferring Street, Ferring, Worthing, West Sussex, BN12 5JN Email: gerry@benham21.freeserve.co.uk Tel: 01903 245217
Washington Parish Council	Mrs L Quirk, The Clerk, Oakhurst, Harbolets Road, West Chiltington, Pulborough, West Sussex, RH20 2LG Email: washingtonpc@talk21.com Tel: 01798 812332
West Chiltington Parish Council	Mr T Thomas, The Clerk, The Reading Room, Church Street, West Chiltington, Pulborough, West Sussex, RH20 Email: wccclerk@aol.com Tel: 01798 817301
West Grinstead Parish Council	Mrs H Dayneswood, The Clerk, The Parish Office, Village Hall, High Street, Partridge Green, Horsham, West Sussex, RH13 8HX Email: westgrinsteadpc@tiscali.co.uk Tel: 01403 710270
Wiston Parish Council	Mrs A Gordon-Johnson, The Clerk, Wiston Estate Office, Chanctonbury Ring Road, Wiston, Steyning, West Sussex, BN44 3EA Email: agj@ppublicns.wanadoo.co.uk Tel: 01903 812129
Woodmancote Parish Council	Mrs C Warren, The Clerk, Tithe Barn, Brighton Road, Woodmancote, Henfield, West Sussex, BN5 9ST Email: christine@warren5116.fslife.co.uk Tel: 01273 492986

**STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE
(REGULATION 28 STATEMENT)
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES**

Adjoining Parish Councils:

Parish Council	Name	Position	Address1	Address 2	Address 3	Postcode
LANCING PARISH COUNCIL	MRS R J WICKENS ESQ	THE CLERK	THE PARISH HALL	SOUTH STREET, LANCING	WEST SUSSEX	BN15 8AJ
IFIELD VILLAGE CONSERVATION AREA ADVISORY CTTEE	JENNY FROST (SECRETARY)	SECRETARY	CROSSHILL	IFIELD GREEN, IFIELD	CRAWLEY	RH11 0NH
WISBOROUGH PARISH COUNCIL	MRS LOUISE DAVIES	PARISH CLERK	NINE ACRES, NEWPOUND LANE	WISBOROUGH GREEN	WEST SUSSEX	RH14 0EF
ABINGER PARISH COUNCIL	MRS D BAKER	PARISH CLERK	17 EVELYN COTTAGES, ABINGER COMMON	DORKING	SURREY	RH5 6JE
OCKLEY PARISH COUNCIL	MRS L K FLETCHER	PARISH CLERK	61 HEATH WAY	HORSHAM	WEST SUSSEX	RH12 5XF
CAPEL PARISH COUNCIL	MRS J COKE	PARISH CLERK	FIELD HOUSE, VICARAGE LANE	CAPEL	SURREY	RH5 5LN
NEWDIGATE PARISH COUNCIL	MR A R WARNER	PARISH CLERK	CHEYNE WOOD, BROAD LANE	NEWDIGATE	SURREY	RH5 5AS
CHARLWOOD PARISH COUNCIL	MRS QUANTICK	PARISH CLERK	54 LESBOURNE ROAD	REIGATE	SURREY	RH2 7LD
ALBOURNE PARISH COUNCIL	MR K ADDISON	PARISH CLERK	OAKWOOD HOUSE, THORNDEAN DRIVE	WARNINGLID	WEST SUSSEX	RH17 5SX
BALCOMBE PARISH COUNCIL	MR R GRIEG	PARISH CLERK	11 FOXWELLS	BALCOMBE	WEST SUSSEX	RH17 6LZ
BOLNEY PARISH COUNCIL	JANET WRIGHT	PARISH CLERK	117 ACORN AVENUE	COWFOLD	WEST SUSSEX	RH13 8RT
CUCKFIELD RURAL PARISH COUNCIL	MRS E BENNETT	PARISH CLERK	18 LUXFORD ROAD	LINDFIELD	WEST SUSSEX	RH16 2LZ
FULKING PARISH COUNCIL	MRS S TRIST	PARISH CLERK	THE PERCH, EDBURTON ROAD	FULKING		BN5 9LP
BURY PARISH COUNCIL	MRS ALISON MILLER	PARISH CLERK	KESTERS HOUSE, THE STREET	BURY	WEST SUSSEX	RH20 1PA
FITTLEWORTH PARISH COUNCIL	MR PETER HENDERSON	PARISH CLERK	DYERS COTTAGE, LITTLE BOGNOR	FITTLEWORTH	WEST SUSSEX	RH20 1JT
LOXWOOD PARISH COUNCIL	MR PETER EVANS	PARISH CLERK	12 WEALD COURT, STATION ROAD	BILLINGSHURST	WEST SUSSEX	RH14 9RS
DUNSFOLD PARISH COUNCIL	MRS L R ENTICKNAP	PARISH CLERK	SETHERN, RAMS LANE	DUNSFOLD	SURREY	GU8 4NR
ANGMERING PARISH COUNCIL	MR R HUSKISSON	PARISH CLERK	5 ORCHARD WAY	FONTWELL	WEST SUSSEX	BN18 9AP
CLAPHAM PARISH COUNCIL	MRS CAROLINE TOMKINS	PARISH CLERK	7 WOODLAND CLOSE	CLAPHAM	WEST SUSSEX	BN13 3XR
FINDON PARISH COUNCIL	MRS S M BLAND	PARISH CLERK	VERONA, 4 STEEP LANE	FINDON	WEST SUSSEX	BN14 0UF

**STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE
(REGULATION 28 STATEMENT)
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES**

SLAUGHAM, HANDCROSS & PEASE POTTAGE PARISH COUNCIL	MR N RIGGLESWORTH	PARISH CLERK	PAGEBANK, 4 THE RISE	PARTRIDGE GREEN	WEST SUSSEX	RH13 8JD
ALFOLD PARISH COUNCIL	MRS L R ENTICKNAP	PARISH CLERK	SETHERN, RAMS LANE	DUNSFOLD	SURREY	GU8 4NR
CRANLEIGH PARISH COUNCIL	MRS P WHITEHEAD	PARISH CLERK	COUNCIL OFFICES, VILLAGE WAY	CRANLEIGH	SURREY	GU6 8AF
SOMPING PARISH COUNCIL	MRS KATE RHODES	CLERK	101 ALDSWORTH AVENUE	GORING BY SEA	WEST SUSSEX	BN12 4UT
STOPHAM PARISH MEETING	COL SIR BRIAN BARTTELOT	CHAIRMAN	STOPHAM PARK	STOPHAM	WEST SUSSEX	RH20 1EB
BURPHAM PARISH MEETING	MR W AUSTIN		THE GRANARY, WEPHAM	BURPHAM	WEST SUSSEX	BN18 9RQ
HOUGHTON PARISH MEETING	MR P LOOKER		MARSH ACRES, SOUTH LANE	HOUGHTON	ARUNDEL	BN18 9LN
PATCHING PARISH COUNCIL	CLLR R METCALFE		GREEN OAK HOUSE, COLDHARBOUR LANE	PATCHING	WEST SUSSEX	BN13 3XE
SOUTH STOKE PARISH MEETING	MR RYAN HAYDON		ORCHARD COTTAGE	OFFHAM FARM, ARUNDEL	WEST SUSSEX	BN18 9DP
COOMBES PARISH MEETING	MISS J PASSMORE		CHURCH FARM, COOMBES	LANCING	WEST SUSSEX	BN15 0RS

STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE
(REGULATION 28 STATEMENT)
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES

**SECTION J: ADDITIONAL CONSULTATION UNDERTAKEN IN RELATION TO THE
SUBMISSION STATEMENT OF COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT**

Preferred Options

Focus group to be used to work on specific policies.

Interested groups used to discuss the formulation of specific policy areas, examples include Design and Landscape policies.

Horsham District Community Partnership – investigate key themes relating to the Community Strategy to inform LDF.

Annual Conference of the Horsham Community Partnership (the District's Local Strategic Partnership) 6th of November to discuss (amongst other things), the potential spatial planning requirements of the Partnership. Information from this has been fed into the preferred options document.

Contact with Gypsies and Travellers.

See Section H

Consultation with business on employment policies.

See Section F

Local agents to be contacted.

Forum held at Park Barn on the 9th November 2005.

Website.

Document available on website.

Local newspaper advertising.

See Section G

Horsham District Council Planning Reception – all documents were available to view at the Council's planning reception.

STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE
(REGULATION 28 STATEMENT)
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES

**SECTION K: SUMMARY OF MAIN ISSUES RAISED AND RESPONSES TO THE
PREFERRED OPTIONS STAGE (REGULATION 26)**

Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
	157	618 Object	Document lacks a policy on recreation - specifically, the rights of way network.	Rights of Way is a statutory duty of West Sussex County Council, and as such this document cannot cover all areas of Rights of Way. There are, however, policies in both the Core Strategy (CP20 - which sets the scene to maintain and enhance the facilities for pedestrians) and the DC Policies document (DC45 - which covers access to and around new development) that deals with Rights of Way issues.
	157	619 Object	Document fails to include references to air or soil quality.	There is reference to both air and soil quality in paragraph 4.22 of the supporting text to policy DC7.
	94	3860 Object	Support presentation and clear way in which document is presented. It would be useful to give relevant ODPM web links and state where national documents can be viewed and collate references to the Core Strategy within Appendix 1.	References, where applicable, are already featured within the document.
Chapter 3	1574	401 Support	I write to confirm that I cannot add anything to these policies. All the landscape aspects are dealt with comprehensively.	Support is noted.
Landscape and Townscape Character	962	3964 Object	We recommend articulating Policy DC1 with the Core Policies and the Site Specific Allocations of Land Document. Would like to see explained the need to balance the protection of the countryside with appropriate development meeting the rural community needs. Concerning use, we support management of quiet recreational including within the capacity of the landscape and natural environment to accommodate visitor uses and their impact, especially for national designated areas to reduce pressure on them.	The Core Strategy sets the context with overarching policies (such as CP15), and the DC Policies document deals with the specifics. It is considered therefore that these documents set out the Council's approach, and address the concerns, on the matters identified in the representation.
Statement	1405	62 Object	Refer specifically to AONB in the vision	The Visions in the DC Policies document are those featured within the submitted Core Strategy, and as such cannot be altered. Policy DC4 deals specifically with development within the AONB.

STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE
(REGULATION 28 STATEMENT)
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES

Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC1	1405	63	Very prescriptive policy in Observations conflict with other rural policies	It is considered that this policy needs to be prescriptive in order to meet the sustainable development principles of the Core Strategy and to ensure compliance with CP1 in particular. The supporting text to the policy has been clarified however, to remove the perception that a conflict exists between this and other policies, such as those in the Rural Strategy section of the document.
DC1	1405	64	Clause B allows specific development if need shown without ref to other controls.	The DC Policies document is very clear about the need for those proposing development to read all of the relevant policies within the document. Therefore, it is not considered that a further reference to other landscape protection or conservation policies is needed in this policy. Any proposal for development under the criteria set out in this policy would be subject to all other relevant policies including, for example, the policy on proposals within an AONB where that was relevant.
DC1	157	565	Need to refer to conservation and enhancement of AONBs	The DC Policies document is very clear about the need for those proposing development to read all of the relevant policies within the document. Therefore, it is not considered that a further reference to other landscape protection or conservation policies is needed in this policy. Any proposal for development under the criteria set out in this policy would be subject to all other relevant policies including, for example, the policy on proposals within an AONB where that was relevant.
DC1	157	634	Policy is insufficient - needs to refer to mitigation and enhancement, and to recognise that the impact of a development might render it unacceptable, even if there is a "need" for that development.	The DC Policies document is very clear about the need for those proposing development to read all of the relevant policies within the document. Therefore, it is not considered that a further reference to the requirement to mitigate impacts or enhance the landscape is required as this is covered in other policies, for example, the Landscape Character Policy in the case of the need to enhance key characteristics of the landscape. The reference to this requirement within the supporting text is considered to be the best approach in this case.
DC1	1651	710	Under item c - include the provision of facilities for community use in addition to 'quiet informal recreational use'.	The request for the inclusion within this policy of a reference to the provision of church halls outside built-up area boundaries is thought to be too specific for inclusion in DC Policies document. It would however, not be an acceptable alternative to refer to 'community uses' as these are more appropriately and sustainably located within built-up areas where travel can be minimised for users. Therefore the inclusion of a reference to community uses in this policy is thought to be contrary to the sustainable principles of the Core Strategy and the sustainable settlement hierarch (CP5) in particular.
DC1	173	1032	No reason given	The support is noted.
DC1	1032	Support		
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome

STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE
(REGULATION 28 STATEMENT)
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES

Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC1	1784	1323 Object	The policy is too restrictive and does not take account of rural needs beyond agriculture and forestry in accordance with emerging government policy.	It is considered that this policy needs to be restrictive in order to meet the sustainable development principles of the Core Strategy and to ensure compliance with CP1 in particular. The supporting text to the policy has been clarified however, to remove the perception that a conflict exists between this and other policies, such as those in the Rural Strategy section of the document which sets out the circumstances under which development related to an established rural business need might be permitted.

Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC1	102	3631 Support	Supported	The support is noted.

Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC 1	2089	3680 Object	The wording should be more flexible in order to accommodate more easily some of the other policies in the document, e.g. Policy DC20 and Policy DC37 do allow for some development in the countryside that is unrelated to agriculture, forestry, minerals, waste or recreation. However, Policy DC1 would not permit any developments that are not related to these uses outside built-up areas. (WSCC Development Group, Planning Services)	It is considered that this policy needs to be restrictive in order to meet the sustainable development principles of the Core Strategy and to ensure compliance with CP1 in particular. However, the policies in the document need to be read together and to this end the supporting text to the policy has been clarified to remove the perception that a conflict exists between this and other policies, such as 'Exceptions Housing Schemes' and 'Retirement Housing and Care Homes' which set out circumstances under which exceptions to the criteria established in this policy might be permitted.

Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC 1	2089	3683 Support with conditions	Minor word change suggested (WSCC Ecological Officer)	The suggested minor wording change has been made.

Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC1	2089	3693 Object	No mention of landscape character in policy. Wording change suggested (WSCC Landscape Officer)	The DC Policies document is very clear in the need for those proposing development to read all of the relevant policies within the document. It is therefore considered that no further reference to landscape character is required in this policy as this is covered in the Landscape Character Policy.
DC1	1071	3703 Object	We object to the above policy as it is not flexible to enable it to deal with changing circumstances. For example, the monitoring of the housing trajectory may identify that the	The primary function of this policy is to provide a framework policy to encourage the protection and enhancement of the countryside. In doing this it must be in accordance with the sustainable development principles of the Core Strategy which in turn accord with PPS1. It is therefore felt that it is not appropriate to

STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE
(REGULATION 28 STATEMENT)
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES

Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
			Council is not meeting the annual rate of completions. There may be a need to release small greenfield sites, adjacent to built-up area boundaries in order to meet the forecast demand for housing. The policy is overly onerous and prescriptive and does not provide the council with the ability to respond to changing circumstances. The policy should be amended to include a further exception - d) It can be demonstrated that the development meets the aims and objectives of the Core Strategy.	include the suggested addition to the criteria of development that may be appropriate outside of the built-up areas. The allocation of greenfield sites is a matter for the Core Strategy and Site Specific Allocations of Land document. In addition, such an addition would fundamentally undermine the ability of the policy to achieve its primary objective of countryside protection. Other policies in the document detail specific circumstances when exceptions to this policy may be made and therefore the flexibility of the policy may be found in its role within the range of policies and not in the policy as viewed in isolation.
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC 1	1481	3849 Object	Please see other responses submitted by Mr Hood	The objection is noted. The objection relates to a specific site and it is not possible to make specific amendments to the policy on this basis.
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC1	94	3861 Object	Line 1ff - Change to "Development will ONLY be permitted WHERE IT PROTECTS..."	It is considered that it is not the place of the planning system to specifically seek to protect agriculture and other rural industries. This is subject to broader economic policies and to the rural economy itself. Therefore, the proposed amendment would change the thrust of the policy and could well cause the policy to be unsound as a spatial planning policy.
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC 1	2026	3895 Object	The policy is too narrow, needs to consider the needs of existing businesses and residential uses in rural areas.	The DC Policies document is very clear about the need for those proposing development to read all of the relevant policies within the document. Therefore, it is considered that no further reference to the needs of businesses outside of built-up areas is required in this policy as the Rural Strategy policies cover this aspect, for example, the expansion needs of current businesses.
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC 1	142	3949 Object	As currently worded, policy could preclude the implementation of water supply infrastructure necessary to meet the Core Strategy's wider development strategy. Suggest amendment of policy to rectify this.	It is considered that the majority of development in connection with the provision of water supply, for example pipelines, would be 'permitted development' unless it requires an Environmental Impact Assessment. Provision is made in CP13 for necessary infrastructure requirements to be met and this would include water supply. Nevertheless, for the sake of clarity of the policy, a reference has been made to water supply infrastructure within the supporting text of the policy.
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC 1	1572	3971 Support	Support	The support is noted.
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome

STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE
(REGULATION 28 STATEMENT)
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES

Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC1	1572	3996 Object	Suggested changes to para 3.16	It is felt that the suggested amendment to the wording of paragraph 3.16 helps to clarify the intention of the policy and helps to avoid the perception that there is a conflict between this and other policies within the document. The key elements of the amendment have therefore been implemented.
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC1	139	4017 Support	Support	The support is noted.
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC1	2281	4025 Object	Query effectiveness and robustness	The objection is noted, although it does not appear to relate to the content of the policy as drafted in the document.
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC2	1405	65 Object	Make reference to AONB management plan for areas within AONB's as well as character area statements	The DC Policies document is very clear about the need for those proposing development to read all of the relevant policies within the document. Therefore, it is not considered that a further reference to other landscape protection or conservation policies is needed in this policy. Any proposal for development under the criteria set out in this policy would be subject to all other relevant policies including, for example, the policy on proposals within an AONB where that was relevant.
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC2	157	566 Support with conditions	Refer to the South Downs Landscape Character Assessment.	The suggested amendment to the supporting text has been made in order to ensure consideration of the wider Landscape Character Assessments that have a bearing on the District.
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC2	157	567 Observations	This may be an appropriate location to refer to the Management Plans for the South Downs and High Weald.	The DC Policies document is very clear about the need for those proposing development to read all of the relevant policies within the document. Therefore, it is not considered that a further reference to other landscape protection or conservation policies is needed in this policy. Any proposal for development under the criteria set out in this policy would be subject to all other relevant policies including, for example, the policy on proposals within an AONB where that was relevant.
DC2	102	3632 Support	Supported	The support is noted.
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC2	1071	3705 Object	The policy should recognise that some elements of the landscape character area may not be desirable or appropriate to protect or enhance, for example poor quality hedgerows.	The suggestion to amend the policy to state that only positive characteristics of the landscape should be protected or enhanced is not felt to be an acceptable approach as 'positive' is a value laden term that can be used in different ways and in different circumstances. What is positive from one point of view is not from another. In addition, the inclusion of the term 'enhances' within the policy addresses the need to improve on those

STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE
(REGULATION 28 STATEMENT)
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES

Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
				aspects of the landscape which, for example, have fallen into neglect. The policy has been written to be inconformity with the core strategy and it is considered that this document is sound. It therefore follows that the policy can itself be considered to be sound.
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC2	1481	3850 Object	Please see other responses submitted by Mr Hood	The objection is noted.
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC2	94	3862 Object	Need to define term 'Waterbodies'	The term 'waterbodies' has already been defined in the Glossary to the document.
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC2	962	3965 Support with condition s	Support but consider that local landscape designations should not be necessary provided robust landscape character assessments are in place to underpin criteria-based policies for different character areas. There should be a shift in emphasis from protecting the best landscapes to a new approach that respects the character of all landscapes, whilst continuing to protect and enhance the best.	The support is noted. The points raised in this representation about the overall approach to local landscape designations relate to the Townscape Character and Settlements Coalescence Policy and have been dealt with there.
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC2	1572	3972 Object	Change to wording to strengthen policy	A part of the suggested minor amendment to the first line of the policy has been implemented in order to clarify the intentions of the policy. The addition of the word 'only' is not considered to be acceptable however, as it makes the policy more negative and restrictive and therefore goes against national policy as expressed in PPS12. The amendment suggested to part b. is not considered to be required as public rights of way are protected by highways legislation and by policies developed by WSCC as the highways authority.
DC2	2281	4026 Object	Query effectiveness and robustness	The objection is noted, although it does not appear to relate to the content of the policy as drafted in the document. There is a policy within this document that refers specifically to West Chilton and Heath Common Character Areas.
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC3	146	1331 Object	There is a direct conflict between the Core Strategy and the following Policies and HDC is contravening its own policies.	The objection is noted. It is not considered that there is a conflict between the core policies and those in the DC Policies document.
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC3	102	3633 Support	Supported	The support is noted.
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome

STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE
(REGULATION 28 STATEMENT)
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES

Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC3	1035	3700 Object	The plan supporting Policy DC3 shows land to the west of the A24 (between Two Mile Ash Road and the properties fronting the Horsham - Southwater road) within the Strategic Gap. Christ's Hospital sees no purpose in this land remaining within the designated strategic gap. Christ's Hospital requests that the strategic gap designation is removed from the land to the southwest of the A24.	The present boundaries of the Horsham – Southwater Strategic Gap have been based on a thorough review of the areas included within the designation. Although it is important for boundaries of strategic gaps to be clear and defensible, the key factors to consider are the present absence of development in the gap and the potential danger of settlement coalescence that could be materialise if the designation were to be withdrawn. On these criteria, the land to the west of the A24 meet to requirements of the Horsham - Southwater Strategic Gap and so the suggested amendment cannot be accepted.

Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC3	2133	3721 Object	(Originally entered under Respondent 1615 (orig. Jonathan Steele, now Crest Nicholson Developments Ltd) as rep number 641.) Objects to the Strategic Gap map. The Strategic Gap should cover land to the north-west of Crawley including Lamb's Green and Rusper.	The key purpose of the Strategic Gap is to prevent settlement coalescence by further protecting areas of the countryside where there is a current absence of development but where there is pressure for development and a real danger that development would lead to actual or perceived coalescence. The area around Rusper and Lambs Green to the north of the Strategic Gap as presently defined is not considered to meet the above criteria as there is only a limited pressure for development there. In addition, the emerging South East Plan clearly seeks to limit the extent of strategic gaps both in terms of the size of area covered and in terms of the size of the settlement protected by the designation. The area north of the presently defined gap would potentially cause the policy to conflict with the South East Plan were it to be included in the Strategic Gap, as it would lead to the total gap being larger than the five mile limit and would be seeking to include settlements with populations well under the threshold limit (10,000) imposed by the Plan. The suggested amendment cannot therefore be accepted.

DC3	1481	3851 Object	Please see other responses submitted by Mr Hood	The objection is noted.
-----	------	----------------	---	-------------------------

Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC3	94	3863 Support	Support	The support is noted.

Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC3	2026	3897 Object	No justification for Strategic Gaps exists, no evidence presented.	The justification for the retention of the Strategic Gaps policy can be found in the need to ensure that actual or perceived settlement coalescence is prevented between closely spaced settlements where there is a pressure for development but where there is at present an absence of significant development. One of the characteristics of the West Sussex settlement pattern is the closeness of settlement spacing which increases to potential for coalescence. This danger and the need to prevent it has been recognised by the WSCC Structure Plans since 1980 and is now recognised by the emerging South East

STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE
(REGULATION 28 STATEMENT)
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES

Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
				Plan where the need for well defined strategic gaps within the Gatwick sub-region is specifically referred to. The two Gaps in question have been thoroughly reviewed and the present boundaries are based on these reviews (which are ongoing in the case of the Horsham – Crawley Gap) as well as on the need to comply with the Structure Plan and now with the South East Plan.

Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC3	962	3966	Support but consider that local landscape designations should not be necessary provided robust landscape character assessments are in place to underpin criteria-based policies for different character areas. There should be a shift in emphasis from protecting the best landscapes to a new approach that respects the character of all landscapes, whilst continuing to protect and enhance the best.	The support for the policy is noted. It is acknowledged that a landscape character approach is desirable and this is reflected in Policy DC2. Nevertheless, it is considered that there is considerable justification for the continued existence of the strategic gaps within the District and that is justification is acknowledged by the WSCC Structure Plan and by the emerging South East Plan. The key purpose of the gaps is to prevent settlement coalescence by further protecting areas of the countryside where there is a current absence of development but where there is pressure for development and a real danger that development would lead to actual or perceived coalescence. In this respect landscape character is not the only or arguably the main consideration in the areas defined as strategic gaps and it is felt that reliance solely on the protection afforded by a criteria based policy underpinned by a landscape character assessment would be insufficient to prevent actual or perceived coalescence in all cases.

Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC3	1572	3973	Change wording to clarify and strengthen policy	The amendment suggested to part a. of the policy has been partially implemented in order to improve the clarity of the policy. It is felt that the term 'natural and man-made' is not required in the policy as it is well understood that the term townscape comprises of both sorts of features. Nevertheless, in order to reinforce the point a reference to 'natural and man-made features' has been added to the supporting text. It is considered that the amendments to part b. ii are not required as the term 'suburbanising' is generally accepted to be a part of what is understood by 'urbanising' and is therefore covered by that term. The suggestion to highlight the danger of an urbanising effect on the 'smaller settlements and villages' is felt to be unnecessary as they are already covered by the policy and by the sustainability hierarchy approach of the Core Strategy (CP5) determining which of the smaller settlements is considered suitable to warrant a built-up area boundary. Where no such built-up area boundary exists, the settlements are protected from urbanising influences by the full range of countryside protection policies.

Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC4	1405	60	Include reference to AONB Management Plans in clause 4B	A separate policy on AONBs has been provided, which makes clearer reference to the appropriate level of development for AONBs. This includes a reference to PPS7. In addition there is clearer reference to AONB management plans in the supporting text. It is not however considered that direct reference to management

STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE
(REGULATION 28 STATEMENT)
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES

Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
				plans need to be made in the policy wording itself.
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC4	1405	61 Object	Refer to High Weald AONB JAC not Unit	Correction has been made to the wording in updated AONB policy.
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC4	1405	66 Object	Strengthen statement to include test for 'need' in AONB and national significance	The AONB element of DC4 has been placed under a separate policy. This clarifies that there may be circumstances where development in these landscapes is necessary, and provides some explanation regarding national and local level developments. It is not however appropriate for the policy to repeat national policy, and reference to PPS7 is provided to those requiring further information.
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC4	1405	67 Object	Strengthen policy and define 'adequate'	It is acknowledged that full compensation etc may not always be possible, but some form of reparation for loss or harm caused by development is necessary. The word adequate has been removed from the policy wording, but the supporting text highlights the fact that the mitigation etc must be to a level that retains the national importance of the landscape.
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC4	157	576 Support with condition s	Support in principle, but policy should also require compensation for harm to nature conservation interests	The policy on biodiversity has been amended to refer to the need to protect and enhance the wider biodiversity of the District. Reference to compensation measures has also been made in the section of the policy on protected species.
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC4	157	621 Object	Policy should contain further guidance on acceptable development within AONBs.	DC4 has been amended with the element on AONBs placed under a new policy. The wording of this policy has been amended to set out that there may be exceptional cases where development in the AONB is necessary. Further explanation on this is provided in the supporting text with reference to major and minor developments in these areas. It is not however considered necessary for the policy to repeat national planning guidance, and reference to PPS7 is provided in the text for those requiring further information.
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC4	136	2330 Object	The policy should be more positively worded - in line with PPS1. In addition PPS9 requires that areas of biodiversity be enhanced and created, as well as compensated and mitigated	Whilst it is agreed that policies should usually be worded as positively as possible, the policy on biodiversity is generally restrictive in nature, and it is therefore considered that a negative wording helps provide a clearer policy. Reference to enhancement to biodiversity has however been added to the policy wording. It is not considered appropriate for the policy to specifically refer to corridors, as this is one element of biodiversity, and is not possible for the policy wording to identify every habitat and species in the District. The importance of wildlife corridors is however noted, and they are referred to in the supporting text.
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome

STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE
(REGULATION 28 STATEMENT)
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES

Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC4	1776	3627 Object	<p>Protected Sites - English Nature is concerned that DC4 is neither sufficiently clear nor robust to deliver an appropriate level of protections (and enhancement) of the full range of sites designated for nature conservation within Horsham District. Policy DC4 IS NOT CONSISTENT WITH NATIONAL POLICY. This is due to the fact that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - it fails to distinguish between locally, regionally and nationally important sites and, - as it refers only to areas shown on the Proposals Map, it does not offer protection to sites of regional and local biodiversity and geological interest. 	<p>The proposals map will distinguish between the different types of protected sites in the District. However it is not felt that it is necessary to have an individual policy for different protected sites as the considerations and processes that will be taken into account when considering proposals on this site are similar. The supporting text has been amended to refer to the different types of site to clarify the nature of the different sites but reference to PPS9 for those seeking further information on this matter.</p>
DC4	1776	3628 Support with conditions	<p>DC4c: Protected Rare and Vulnerable Species - English Nature welcomes the fact that a policy (DC4c) has been included which is aimed at preventing direct or indirect harm to important species as a result of development. This policy however only refers to species that are currently protected by law. There are other rare and threatened species which make an important contribution to the biodiversity of the district. English Nature strongly recommends that this policy should be aimed at a wider range of species that are of principal importance for the conservation of biodiversity in the district.</p>	<p>The policy has been amended to refer to the need to protect and enhance biodiversity more widely. The supporting text also refers to the Sussex and Horsham biodiversity action plan species, which include the more locally rare and threatened species.</p>
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC4	1776	3629 Support with conditions	<p>Para 3.21 - welcomed Para 3.22 - welcomed Para 3.23 - welcomed but English Nature strongly recommends that Policy DC4 makes it clear that all</p>	<p>Policy wording amended to clarify the requirement to receive all relevant information.</p>

STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE
(REGULATION 28 STATEMENT)
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES

Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
			necessary information is provided by the applicant prior to the determination of the application by the council.	
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC4	102	3634 Support	Supported	Support noted
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC4	2089	3684 Support with conditions	Consider that this is the ideal policy to secure the opportunities that development can provide for biodiversity. New section suggested - see full rep (WSCC Ecological Officer)	New section added to policy requiring developers to include measures that protect and enhance biodiversity more widely that protected sites and species.
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC4	1481	3852 Object	Please see other responses submitted by Mr Hood	Not applicable - comments submitted do not directly relate to changes needed to this policy and are instead promoting a site for development.
DC4	94	3864 Object	Policy and supporting text should refer to the Designated Boundary of the South Downs National Park and the designated areas. There are areas not currently in the AONB which are potentially designated, this should be a material consideration.	Reference to the National Park has been added to the supporting text of the new policy on AONBs, and provides a link where further information can be obtained from DEFRA. At this stage however, it is not considered appropriate to refer to the boundary of the National Park as the Government have not made a final decision as to its location.
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC4	105	3886 Support with conditions	The RSPB welcomes DC4 and reference to PPS9 guidance and draft circular. However strongly suggest landscape and biodiversity designations are separated within the DC policies allowing policy DC4 to focus on biodiversity and geology e.g. designated sites, and incorporate AONBs into DC2.	Landscape and biodiversity elements of DC4 were originally combined to fit in with guidance on the suggested length of the DC Policy document. It is however accepted that there the policy could be clarified by separating the two policy elements and this amendment has therefore been made.
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC4	142	3954 Object	Policy does not properly reflect PPS7 or CH2 of the WSCC structure plan. Policy fails to recognise that there may be exceptional circumstances where major development could be justified on an AONB. The policy wording could also be interpreted to extend the policy protection afforded to the AONB to land near it without	DC4 has been amended with the section on AONBs placed under a new policy. The wording of this policy has been amended setting out that there may be exceptional cases where development in an AONB is necessary. Further explanation is provided in the supporting text with reference to major and minor developments in these areas. It is not however considered necessary for the policy to repeat national planning guidance, and reference to PPS7 is provided in the text for those requiring further information.

STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE
(REGULATION 28 STATEMENT)
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES

Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
			proper justification. The policy wording should be amended accordingly.	
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC4	962	3967 Object	Support but consider that local landscape designations should not be necessary provided robust landscape character assessments are in place to underpin criteria-based policies for different character areas. There should be a shift in emphasis from protecting the best landscapes to a new approach that respects the character of all landscapes, whilst continuing to protect and enhance the best.	This Council has a character based approach to protecting landscapes as set out by CP1 of the Core Strategy and underpinned by Policy DC2. This approach is aimed at protecting and enhancing all landscapes, but it is still felt that further protection of the nationally important landscapes such as AONBs is necessary. Other than Strategic Gaps, the reasoning for which is set out elsewhere, there local landscape designations in the District. It is therefore considered that the objection to this policy is unfounded.
DC4	1572	3974 Object	Change wording to strengthen policy	It is considered that the wording of the policy referring to consideration of proposals that may affect protected sites is sufficiently robust, and the suggested change to the wording is not necessary.
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC5	1639	693 Object	Unduly restrictive on two counts: Imposition of TPOs on trees considered under threat. The felling of trees would only be allowed in exceptional circumstances.	It is not considered that the policy wording re threat should be amended. There may conceivably be instances where the threat to a trees / woodland is warranted even if they are not of the highest amenity value. It is not anticipated that this wording would however result in the halting of all development. The comments regarding of trees are noted and the policy has been amended to clarify that this applies to protected trees.
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC5	173	1027 Object	Lack of statement protecting the tree and woodland character of the District.	This policy will help ensure that the tree and woodland character of the District is protected. Furthermore the importance of trees and woodlands to the character of the District is set out in the supporting text. The policy on Landscape Character will also help ensure that the tree and woodland character of the District is retained, particularly as it is not intended for policies to be read in isolation.
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC5	146	1333 Object	There is a direct conflict between the Core Strategy and Policy DC5 and HDC is contravening its own policies.	It is considered that DC5 is in conformity with the Core Strategy, particularly CP1, and the Council does not therefore accept the view set out in this response.
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC5	1776	3630 Support	Welcomes DC5a	The support for this policy is noted
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC5	102	3635 Support	Supported	The support for this policy is noted

STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE
(REGULATION 28 STATEMENT)
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES

Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC5	2089	3685	Section (a) is supported but please avoid the term - Designated Ancient Woodland (WSCC Ecological Officer)	The support for this policy is noted. The Council is not minded to change the wording of the policy to include the word designated, and it is aware that undesignated ancient woodlands exist that are also in need of protection.
DC5	2089	3694	Consider the Policy is inadequately worded. Policy should not just repeat local authority duty to make Tree Preservation Orders (TPO's). Policy should be about the trees that are TPO'd. It does not refer to trees in Conservation Areas. Para c (ii) is outside the local authority duty remit. This policy does not take any opportunity to protect trees or woodland that is not statutorily protected. It does not cover Veteran Trees. It does not encourage replanting. Suggested re-wording of policy - see full rep. (WSCC Landscape Officer)	Whilst it is agreed that there is a legal duty to make TPOs, it is considered that this policy adds further detail to the legislative situation, particularly in relation to the consideration of threat to trees. The policy on conservation areas discussed trees and it does not need to be repeated in this policy. It is noted that the Council cannot refuse forestry authority applications and the policy wording has been amended accordingly. It is considered that the biodiversity policy will help protect trees and woodland not given statutory protection - this policy should not be read in isolation.
DC5	1071	3706	For clarity and in line with the remainder of the policy this sentence should be amended to state that 'the felling of PROTECTED trees...'	This comment is noted and the policy has been amended accordingly.
DC5	1481	3853	Please see other responses submitted by Mr Hood	The comments submitted related to the specifics of the Hornbrook Hilliers site, and are not directly relevant to this policy. It is not therefore considered that any changes are required on the basis of these comments.
DC5	94	3865	Support	The support for this policy is noted
DC5	962	3968	Support but consider that local landscape designations should not be necessary provided robust landscape character assessments are in place to underpin criteria-based policies for different character areas. There should be a shift in emphasis from protecting the best landscapes to a new approach that respects the character of all landscapes, whilst continuing to protect and enhance the best.	The support for this policy is noted: the Council agrees that the approach to protecting landscape should be character based, and the Core Strategy and the DC Policies document both have policies to ensure that this approach is taken. There will still however be occasions where some statutory protection is necessary and this policy provides detail on this.

STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE
(REGULATION 28 STATEMENT)
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES

Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC5	1572	3975 Object	Change wording to clarify and strengthen policy	This policy will help ensure that the tree and woodland character of the District is protected. Furthermore the importance of trees and woodlands to the character of the District is set out in the supporting text. The policy on Landscape Character will also help ensure that the tree and woodland character of the District is retained, particularly as it is not intended for policies to be read in isolation.

DC5	139	4006 Object	The policy does not adequately protect trees and woodland	This policy will help ensure that the tree and woodland character of the District is protected. Furthermore the importance of trees and woodlands to the character of the District is set out in the supporting text. The policy on Landscape Character will also help ensure that the tree and woodland character of the District is retained, particularly as it is not intended for policies to be read in isolation.
-----	-----	----------------	---	--

Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC5	2281	4022 Support	Support	The support for this policy is noted

Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC6	157	580 Support	Comprehensive policy	The support has been noted.

Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC6	146	1334 Object	There is a direct conflict between the Core Strategy and Policy DC6 and HDC is contravening its own policies.	It is not considered that a direct conflict between the Core Strategy and Development Control Policies exists. Development Control policies are grouped under Core Strategy spatial objectives making the link between the two documents transparent.

Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC6	102	3636 Support	Supported	The support has been noted.

Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC6	1071	3707 Object	The policy as drafted fails as there is no clear mechanism for implementation. It is not clear what is defined as a 'risk'. All development results in impacts on noise and vibration, therefore it could be argued that all development poses a 'risk'. The policy test should be whether the development will result in 'unacceptable harm'. As drafted it fails to recognise that appropriate mitigation measures could be adopted to address pollution to a degree that would make it acceptable. It should be made clear that planning conditions should only be imposed where they satisfy	It is considered that Chapter 4 provides an adequate monitoring and implementation procedure and no changes are considered necessary; a more detailed response is provided under Chapter 4 – Monitoring and implementation framework. The request for the policy test to move away from ideas of 'no risk' to one of 'no unacceptable harm' is considered to be a valuable addition. Therefore, the policy test will shift to one that considers 'unacceptable risk and/or harm'. The use of mitigation measures to make a damaging or potential damaging proposal acceptable whilst already dealt with in paragraph 3.36, has been amended slightly as a result of the term 'unacceptable', to acknowledge that some harm/risk could be acceptable. However, it is not considered necessary to add to paragraph 3.36 the stipulation that planning conditions should not duplicate other controls. Paragraph 3.37 refers to applicants being required to

STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE
(REGULATION 28 STATEMENT)
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES

Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
			the provisions of Circular 11/95. Specifically, conditions should not be used to duplicate other controls. We object to paragraph 3.37 on the basis that the approach is inconsistent with the provisions of PPS12 Local Development Frameworks paragraph 2.31. The above provision in the reasoned justification reads as a new policy and expressly contains material which would be used to make decisions on planning applications.	carry out a full contamination assessments and proposed remediation works. This paragraph was not intended to be read as a determining factor when considering an application, but was included to help highlight relevant legislation that is required to be undertaken by the applicant in accordance with section 57 of the Environment Act 1995. The supporting text has therefore been amended accordingly.

Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC6	2053	3882 Object	Issue of smells from Mushroom production is not acknowledged by the District - should be reflected in policies.	The policy specifically highlights odours as being a consideration in the determination of planning applications, this issue is dealt with sufficient by the policy and it is not considered necessary to have text relating to a specific form of land use such as mushroom production. Furthermore, reference to specific land uses would not create a flexible policy capable of deal with the wide range of applications received by this Council.

Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC6	142	3958 Support	Consider that DC6 assists Southern water by helping to identify areas immediately adjacent to our sewage treatment works in which residential or sensitive developments are excluded.	The support has been noted.

Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC6	1572	3976 Object	Change wording to clarify	Issues of landscape character are already addressed through policy DC 2, therefore, it is not necessary to included 'landscape character' within this policy. No single policy should be read in isolation when determining an application.

Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC7	1639	694 Object	Policy is considered unduly restrictive but also lacks clarity; Proper assessment needs to be undertaken in each case and this then balanced against other material considerations. Requirement for individual developments to make an assessment of undefined cumulative impacts is unreasonable.	Policy DC7 was written to be in accordance with PPS25 as well as Core Strategy Policy CP2, and it is not therefore felt that the policy was unduly restrictive. Notwithstanding this however, the policy wording has been amended to clarify the position that the policy must be applied in accordance with the requirements of PPG/ draft PPS25.

STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE
(REGULATION 28 STATEMENT)
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES

Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
			Flood risk assessments are a requirement of developments in relevant areas, this will then be the subject of statutory consultation under the GDPO.	
DC7	146	1336 Object	There is a direct conflict between the Core Strategy and Policy DC7 and HDC is contravening its own policies.	Policy CP2 of the Core Strategy states that development should minimise flooding. DC7 adds further detail and information to the Core Strategy policy, and it is not considered that there is any conflict between the two documents.
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC7	102	3637 Support	Supported	Support noted
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC7	1071	3708 Object	We object to the policy on the basis that it is not in conformity with planning policy, the approach is not consistent with PPG25 development and Flood Risk, paragraph 54. The policy as drafted is overly restrictive. The policy test is not whether a site is at risk of flooding but whether after appropriate mitigation measures, the residual risks are unacceptable.	Policy DC7 was written to be in accordance with PPS25 as well as Core Strategy Policy CP2, and it is not therefore felt that the policy was unduly restrictive. Notwithstanding this however, the policy wording has been amended to clarify the position that the policy must be applied in accordance with the requirements of PPG/ draft PPS25.
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC7	2026	3899 Object	This policy may prevent even a change of use. Consider policy should only restrict development which would increase risk of flooding.	Policy DC7 was written to be in accordance with PPG25 as well as CP7. The policy wording has been amended to clarify this. This could however mean that there are some instances where a change of use is not considered acceptable, in accordance with the sequential test and exception test set out in the now revised draft PPS25.
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC7	136	3938 Object	Feel SA has not informed policy development process - DC7 does not set out measures required to reduce risk of flooding. Greywater recycling relates to sustainable use of water resources. Feel supporting text is should be clarified (wording suggested).	The comment on greywater refers to SA/SEA not Policy DC7. The SA/SEA will however be corrected to reflect this remark. Whilst Policy DC7 does not include measures to reduce the risk of flooding, its wording aims to stop development that would increase flood risk and measures to achieve this (such as SuDS) are set out in the supporting text. The need to clarify the supporting text is however noted and has been incorporated as far as possible. However, some of the suggested wording was very technical and where applicable it has been altered to make it more accessible to a wider audience.
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC7	142	3960 Support	Support policy DC7 that seeks to prevent development where it would be at risk of flooding or where it increases the risk of flooding.	Support noted
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome

STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE
(REGULATION 28 STATEMENT)
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES

Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC7	142	3962	Support with conditions	Reference to the interim code of practice has been added to the supporting text of the policy. Issues such as the site geology and long term maintenance of SuDS are set out in this document, and it is not considered that it needs to be repeated in the DC Policies document.

Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC7	113	4028	Object Policy does not reflect PPG25. It is not the risk of flooding per se that is the problem but the scale or degree of that risk. Government policy allows some development in areas of low risk but, rightly, not in the areas of high risk and in the functional floodplain. This policy should adopt this approach rather than applying a blanket ban.	Policy DC7 was written to be in accordance with PPS25 as well as Core Strategy Policy CP2, and it is not therefore felt that the policy was unduly restrictive. Notwithstanding this however, the policy wording has been amended to clarify the position that the policy must be applied in accordance with the requirements of PPG/ draft PPS25.

Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC8	157	581	Support Watercourses and aquifers are important and should be protected.	The support has been noted.

Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC8	136	2331	Object The supporting text needs to be revised to improve clarity.	The requested amendments to the first sentence of paragraph 3.41 are considered to be useful additions that add clarity; the suggested amendments have been included in full. However, removal of 'where possible' from the third sentence is not considered necessary as 'where possible' helps maintain the flexibility of the supporting text. Similarly, the suggested addition to paragraph 3.42 is considered useful in adding clarity to the policy and again the changes have been implemented. The changes suggested to the third sentence of paragraph 3.42 are not considered flexible enough in the sense that not all development necessarily increases the pressure on water resources, for example, it is conceivable that the re-development of a site may in fact reduce water consumption; the latter part of the alteration has however been incorporated in a revised form. Finally, the changes to paragraph 3.43 are in part considered useful, the reworded first sentence has been included in full. The suggested changes to the second sentence are felt to transcend from supporting text to a policy requirements, therefore, the text from the second sentence onwards will remain as drafted.

Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC8	102	3638	Support Supported	The support has been noted.

Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC8	2089	3695	Object Policy does not refer to wetlands. Policy does not refer to sustainable drainage	It is acknowledged that the policy does not refer to wetlands and it is considered this addition will enhance the policy by acknowledging the different types of water

STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE
(REGULATION 28 STATEMENT)
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES

Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
			systems (SUDS). Suggest Policy wording to be amended - see full rep (WSCC Landscape Officer)	environments. The insertion of text requiring sustainable drainage systems (SUDS) is not necessary as it is dealt with in the supporting text of Policy DC 7 – Flooding.
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC8	1071	3709 Object	Point (a) fails to recognise that appropriate mitigation measures could be adopted to address potential adverse effects to water quality resources. There is no statutory or legislative requirement for new development to make use of water conservation measures. The policy is onerous, unjustified, not a planning matter.	It is considered that Chapter 4 provides an adequate monitoring and implementation procedure and no changes are considered necessary; a more detailed response is provided under Chapter 4 – Monitoring and implementation framework. In response to the suggested inclusion of mitigation measures, reference to mitigation has now been included within the supporting text of paragraph 3.41. Mitigation is also dealt with in paragraph 3.42. The wording in part (b) of the policy and paragraph 3.42 are considered to be necessary to ensure not only the clarity of the policy but also high design standards. The request for part (c) of the policy text and also paragraph 3.43 is considered adequate, planning obligations will be sought that conform to the criteria set within the Planning Obligation SPD and which is scheduled for adoption prior to the adoption of this Council's development control policies. It is not felt that this policy is onerous nor beyond the realm of Planning, the inclusion of this policy is important to help ensure that additional strain/damage is not placed upon a resource currently in short supply.
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC8	142	3963 Support	Supports all aspects of policies - accords with needs and aims of Southern Water.	The support has been noted.
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC8	142	3970 Object	Supports reference to BREEAM requirements in paragraph 3.42, but feel "consideration" in inadequate. In addition very good breem rating can be achieved without considering water resources. It is suggested that the policy and para 3.42 are amended accordingly	The inclusion of a stricter requirement within the policy seeking water efficiency measures that exceed the current standards required by the building regulations goes beyond the realm of planning and therefore cannot be included, however, paragraph 3.42 has been amended as a result of another representation to address the mitigation of impacts from developments. The addition of a reference to BREEAM Ecohome standards is not necessary as it is considered that this is too specific.
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC8	1572	3977 Object	Word change to strengthen	The objection has been noted and the text changed accordingly.
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC8	157	582 Support	The policy achieves the right balance between encouragement and protection.	Support noted
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC9	102	3639 Support	Supported	Support noted
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC9	2089	3696	Policy does not list wind	It is agreed that the policy should refer to wind power and

STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE
(REGULATION 28 STATEMENT)
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES

Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
		Object	turbines as a form of renewable energy / design, layout and orientation as contributory factors to achieving sustainable development / sustainable drainage systems (SUDS). Suggest wording changes. (WSCC Landscape Officer)	the text has been amended accordingly. Reference to layout and design has also been enhanced, although this is also covered by the Policy DC11, design. It is not considered appropriate to refer to SUDs in this policy as it is referred to under the flooding policy where it is more directly relevant. Furthermore, development proposals will be considered taking all policies in the document into account.

Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC9	1071	3710 Object	The policy as drafted fails to meet soundness test (viii) in that there is no clear mechanism for implementation. As drafted it reads as though development will only be permitted where the above provisions are met. This requirement is overly restrictive and onerous. There is no statutory or legislative requirement for developments to comply with the above. The policy should be deleted.	It is not considered that the policy should be deleted. PPS22 states that LDDs should promote and encourage renewable energy, and the policy provides a basis for this. In addition the south-east plan also requires this and suggests a proactive approach in achieving this. This has resulted in the amended policy seeking a percentage of on-site renewable energy generation in larger developments.

Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC9	94	3866 Object	Need more detail of sustainable construction techniques	It is not considered that the DC Policies document is the place for a detailed description of sustainable construction techniques; it would lead to the document becoming overly long. However it is agreed that some further information on sustainable construction would be beneficial to those proposing development, and the supporting text has therefore been amended indicating that a supplementary planning document will be produced on this subject.

Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC9	1572	3978 Object	Change wording to clarify and strengthen	Whilst landfill gas is listed as a renewable energy supply in PPS22, the policy has been amended to refer to wind energy in its place. It was agreed that point b needed clarification, but the wording of the policy has now been amended to require a % of renewables, and it is not felt that the suggested amendment is now required.

Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC10	157	583 Support with conditions	Welcome and support, but reference to townscapes and landscapes in clause (j) needs qualification.	The support is welcomed and the reference to good quality townscape / landscape has been added.

DC10	1639	696 Object	Policy appears overly detailed and unduly prescriptive against innovative and higher density forms of development.	The policy has been amended following the feedback from organisations and individual and is now more concise and clear. Good quality design is particularly important to this area due the high quality of the existing environment; there is no reason to accept poor quality design. It is not considered that the policy is unduly prescriptive against innovative and high density of development, indeed criteria 'a' refers to the need to
------	------	---------------	--	--

STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE
(REGULATION 28 STATEMENT)
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES

Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
				make efficient use of land and there is no reason why innovative design should not be able to accord with the criteria set out in this policy.
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC10	1517	1345 Object	Changes suggested in relation to parking provision.	It is acknowledge that there are 'qualifications' to some of the criteria but it is considered that this reflects the reality of designing schemes which must in all case be aware of their surroundings and the different constraints that exist. The suggested redraft would be too open to interpretation and not conform with the requirement to provide clear policies. The second point on parking is not considered to be solely a design issue although the concerns are recognised. Parking provision is an issue covered by PPG13 and PPG3 and it is felt that this policy reflects current Government guidelines.
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC10	102	3640 Support	Supported	The support is welcomed
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC10	2089	3697 Object	Suggest para c includes reference to Horsham District Character Assessment.	Criteria 'd' of the policy now refers to Character Assessments, which will include the Landscape Character Assessment; in addition Policy DC2 relates solely to Landscape Character and there is no need for this to be repeated within the Design policy.
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC10	1071	3711 Object	Policy proposes too many criteria and is overly complex. The policy should be deleted and replaced with a more concise policy. The reasoned justification should set out how the policy contributes to the soundness of the document, this is a requirement set out at paragraph 2.31 of PPS12. (See full text for minor changes suggested.)	The policy has been amended following the feedback from organisations and individual and is now more concise and clear. The reference to Planning Obligations has been removed as it is felt to be adequately covered elsewhere; 'i' and 'k' have been combined; the landscaping criteria clearly makes reference to 'important' features; and reference to car parking is related to the need to make efficient use of land and will be supplemented by the SPD on Planning Obligations. An explanation of 'physical and social barriers' has been added to the supporting text to aid applicants.
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC10	2133	3720 Object	(Originally entered under Respondent 1615 (orig. Jonathan Steele, now Crest Nicholson Developments Ltd) as rep number 624.) Objects to criterion C of Policy 10. It should be consistent with Core Policy CP6 and should include reference to west of Crawley.	This aspect of the policy relates to issues of character. Although an AAP may include reference to character it is not in itself a Design Statement or Character Assessment. The AAP will of course have the status of a DPD and can include policies on character.
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC10	1481	3854 Object	Please see other responses submitted by Mr Hood	The response relates to site specific issues rather than the policy itself.
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC10	94	3867 Object	d - Object to wording suggest alternative.	Regarding criteria 'd' this part of the statement is to reflect the different sensitivities of development e.g. business

STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE
(REGULATION 28 STATEMENT)
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES

Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
			e - promotion of public art must be of secondary importance until there is greater investment in good design.	uses, recreation, residential. Not all neighbouring uses will be as sensitive as others. The comment regarding criteria 'e' is accepted although the policy was never intended to imply that public art should come above good design, all reference has however been removed.
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC10	94	3869	Re para 3.55 - Support but some public examination would help strengthen documents already adopted. A list of Village and Parish Design Statements within the document would help clarify the Councils commitment to them and their importance in planning decisions.	We accept that a list may be helpful but it will need to be updated regularly and this is not possible within a DPD. Instead the respondent could refer to the Local Development Scheme which includes all the documents we are publishing and is updated annually.
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC10	136	3898	Amend policy as follows: Object Add: n) incorporate SuDS within the landscape design of development amend L) to include watercourse corridors	The addition of a reference to watercourses has been made but it is felt that a reference to SUDs is covered by the policies on Water Quality and Resources, and Renewable Energy and Climate Change.
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC10	89	3928	Object Suggest adding the words "sympathetic to local character" in the second line after the word "landscaping"	Unsure what part of the text this response relates to and therefore have been unable to consider the implications of the comment.
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC10	962	3969	Support We support the requirement to incorporate the recommendations set out in Village or Parish Design Statements or the Horsham Town Neighbourhood Character Assessments.	The support is welcomed
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC10	1572	3979	Object Change wording to strengthen policy	This element of the policy has been significantly re-worded but reference to banks has been added and a reference to gullies is incorporated within the description of watercourses.
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC10	2281	4027	Object Query effectiveness and robustness	It is intend that due to the more succinct nature of the development control policies and document that the policies will be clearer and more robust. In addition in areas of low density character an additional policy exists to assist in the retention of their character.
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC11	102	3641	Support Support	The support is welcomed
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC11	2089	3676	Archaeological field evaluation,	The suggested alterations have been incorporated into

STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE
(REGULATION 28 STATEMENT)
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES

Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
		Object	prior to determination of a planning application, and recommended in PPG 16, is referred to only in the descriptive text (paragraph 3.58), but not in the wording of the policy. Reference should be made to the need for “preservation by record” (ref. PPG 16) rather than simply “excavation”; the emphasis should be on the preservation of sites either in situ or through appropriate recording before their destruction by development. The promotion of measures to raise public awareness of archaeological investigation and recording is welcomed. Suggest amended policy - see full text. (WSCC Archaeological Officer)	the revised policy.

Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC11	2089	3686 Object	Inspection trenches must wait until a reptile population has been translocated (Spring and Autumn) and any scrub cleared (Autumn/Winter). Therefore, amend the text of as shown in full rep (WSCC Ecological Officer)	The supporting text has been amended to refer to the potential need for an ecological assessment before works start.

Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC11	157	584 Support with conditions	Support, but there should be a reference to conserving historic landscapes generally.	This comment has been incorporated into the amendments made to Policy DC2 - Landscape Character.
DC12	102	3642 Support	Supported	The support is welcomed

Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC12	2089	3677 Object	Suggest reference be made in the descriptive text to buried archaeological features relating to historic parks and gardens. (WSCC Archaeological Officer)	The supporting text has been amended as requested and in addition an historic landscape assessment has been requested as part of any application.

Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC12	2089	3698 Support	Strongly support this Policy. Additional guidance notes are available from the Garden History Society. Suggest that the supporting text makes reference to The Planning Conservation Advice Notes. (WSCC Landscape Officer)	The support is welcomed and the additional sources of further guidance have been added to the policy.

STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE
(REGULATION 28 STATEMENT)
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES

Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC13	1517	1351	Questions certain aspects of the policy and whether some of the criteria are enforceable.	The Council does not currently make provision for the local listing of buildings, however many are identified within Conservation Area Appraisals or Village and Parish Design Statements. The wording of criteria (d) has been amended in line with the comments. We accept point regarding criteria 'g' to 'h' but consider that this is implicit within the policy and does not need to be stated.
DC13	102	3643	Supported Support	The support is welcomed.
DC13	94	3868	DC13i - The contribution of old farm buildings can often add to the rural character. Many of the buildings have not changed their use; their normal fate is to be demolished. Suggest wording amendment.	It is accepted that old farm buildings can add to the rural character of the area. It is not consider that old farm buildings will necessarily be considered as unsympathetic or in need of 'tidying up' and therefore there may be many occasions when there should be no need to demolish them.
DC13	94	3870	Para 3.62 - Minor wording changes	The wording has been changed to reflect comments
DC13	1572	3980	Change wording to clarify and strengthen	It is considered that the respondent's first point may result in considerable effort in identifying the valued parts of a Conservation Area and devaluation of the remainder where in reality all parts of a Conservation Area have a significant role to play. It is not the practice of the Council to permit development in keeping with the poorer parts of such an area. The amendment to criteria 'c' is accepted. 'Redevelopment' of an area could include open space where appropriate and it is therefore not considered necessary to state this within the policy. In addition the policy states that an exception may be made where demolition itself would enhance the Conservation Area, this may result again open space. The comment regarding Listed Buildings is covered by the Listed Building policy and does not need to be repeated.
DC13	139	4007	Man-made, historic and natural features of conservation area need protecting. New development should be in keeping with valuable parts of the conservation area. Demolition which creates valuable open space should not be discouraged. The setting of listed buildings, the views of them and from the conservation area should be protected.	It is consider that the respondent's first point may result in considerable effort in identifying the valued parts of a Conservation Area and devaluation of the remainder where in reality all parts of a Conservation Area have a significant role to play. It is not the practice of the Council to permit development in keeping with the poorer parts of such an area. 'Redevelopment' of an area could include open space where appropriate and it is therefore not considered necessary to state this within the policy. In addition the policy states that an exception may be made where demolition itself would enhance the Conservation Area, this may result again open space. The comment regarding Listed Buildings is covered by the Listed

STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE
(REGULATION 28 STATEMENT)
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES

Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
				Building policy and does not need to be repeated.

Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC14	1215	1406 Object	<p>Development will not be permitted unless it will satisfy the conditions set out in (a) to (f).</p> <p>(b) it would be more consistent with other relevant legislation if the wording of s7 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 were repeated viz. the proposal will not "affect its character as a building of special architectural or historic interest" or its setting.</p> <p>(d) as drafted this reads as though development will not be permitted unless it incorporates landscaping. This cannot be the intention.</p> <p>(e) That unsympathetic features should be removed and missing features restored is welcomed but, as drafted, it reads as though these features will have to be removed or restored even if they are not part of the application. Is this enforceable.</p> <p>(f) For 'preservation' substitute 'conservation'</p> <p>Para 3.72 should include a reference to BS7913:1998 Guide to principles of the conservation of historic buildings.</p>	The Council does not intend to make provision for areas of special character; instead it intends to use the work undertaken in Village / Parish / Town Design Statements to identify the character of all areas, not just those that are special. The wording of criteria (d) has been amended in line with the comments. We accept the point regarding criteria 'e' but consider that this is implicit within the policy and does not need to be stated. The use of the term 'preservation' is common throughout many policies relating to Listed Buildings. Regarding reference to individual documents, in general we aim to point applicants towards the source of such information rather than the document itself as this is subject to change.

Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC14	102	3644 Support	Supported	The support is welcomed

Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC14	2089	3678 Object	DC14 (b), applicants should provide sufficient information on the historical and architectural development of Listed Buildings to demonstrate that there will be no adverse effect on the most ancient or distinctive parts of the building. Suggest amending the policy - full text in main rep (WSCC	The policy has been amended to include the need for an architectural / historical assessment to accompany an application.

STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE
(REGULATION 28 STATEMENT)
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES

Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
			Archaeological Officer)	
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC14	2089	3687 Object	There is a much greater chance of bat roosts being present in listed buildings by virtue of age, design and construction materials used. The District Council may wish to consider raising this issue within the supporting text and referring the applicant to Policy DC4. (WSCC Ecological Officer)	Reference to the need for an ecological assessment has been made within the supporting text.
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC14	94	3871 Object	Re para 3.69 - Explain "non-visible parts of buildings".	Non-visible does not relate solely to the public, but it will depend on the scale and nature of the proposal. Development cannot necessarily be completely invisible.
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC14	94	3872 Support	Support para 3.70 and 3.71	The support is welcomed
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC15	102	3645 Support	Supported	The support is welcomed
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC15	1572	3981 Object	Delete policy	Following consideration it is felt that although the policy is to an extent covered by Policy DC14(f) it is still important that there is a more detailed policy on enabling development that can provide further guidance on this important issue. Although such applications are rare they can be controversial and impact on the historic environment it is therefore important that we have stringent guidance in place.
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC15	139	4008 Object	Delete this policy.	Following consideration it is felt that although the policy is to an extent covered by Policy DC14(f) it is still important that there is a more detailed policy on enabling development that can provide further guidance on this important issue. Although such applications are rare they can be controversial and impact on the historic environment it is therefore important that we have stringent guidance in place.
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC16	1215	1382 Object	That new shop fronts will only be permitted where they respect the building and the street is welcomed but the reference to enhancing the street scene appears to admit the possibility of a replacement being of a different design and therefore in conflict with DC13 (d)	The policy has been amended to clarify policy and not conflict as identified.
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome

STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE
(REGULATION 28 STATEMENT)
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES

Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC16	102	3646	Supported Support	The support is welcomed
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC16	94	3873	Object Old shop fronts are a valuable part of the street scene. Object to second part of policy, too widely drafted to allow consideration first of a replacement.	The policy has been amended to reflect the comment.
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC17	157	637	Support Support with conditions	Reference to the cumulative impact of signs has been added to the policy however no specific reference to the impact on AONBs is included as this is already covered by the reference to the impact on landscape and the Landscapes policy.
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC17	102	3647	Supported Support	The support is welcomed
DC17	94	3874	Object Does not deal with 'temporary' advertisements which can be permanent features.	All temporary development is covered by the Temporary buildings / Development policy and is therefore not repeated in this policy.
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC17	2026	3901	Object There are methods which satisfactorily illuminate signs internally which neither harm or detract from the character and appearance of a building	This is accepted; however, it is still the Councils intention that due to the need to protect the existing high quality character of the District that internally illuminated signs should still be the exception rather than the norm.
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC18	102	3648	Supported Support	The support is welcomed
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC19	173	1033	Support No reason given	The support is welcomed
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC19	1572	3982	Support Support	The Support is welcomed
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC19	139	4018	Support Support	The support is welcomed
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC19	2281	4020	Support Support with conditions Support policy, it is essential that this policy is retained as a replacement for the Local Plan policies. It would be appropriate to include a map of	The support is welcomed

STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE
(REGULATION 28 STATEMENT)
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES

Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
			the area covered by the policy. The area covered by T1 updated to allow for any minor built-up boundary changes would be suitable, should exclude allocation AL6 as the density requirements may conflict.	
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
Section Housing Provision	1403	87 Observations	It is vital to maximise the area's economic potential and adequate housing provision to meet the needs of the economy. It is crucial that housing is made affordable.	The comment has been noted
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC20	1481	143 Object		The response relates to a site specific issue rather than a policy.
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC20	1469	148 Support	Inclusion of rural exception policy is essential to address the increasing lack of affordable homes within smaller rural settlements and to ensure the long term future of such settlements as vibrant and mixed communities.	The support is welcomed
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC20	157	585 Support	Supports the policy as it seeks to facilitate the provision of affordable homes whilst protecting character.	The support is welcomed
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC20	1436	666 Support with conditions	Policy DC20 is supported in general terms. However: 1. Paragraph "c" is too prescriptive and goes beyond what is required by Planning Policy Statement 3 (Rural housing section). It does not enable imaginative schemes to be put forward by parishes and landowners that allow affordable housing to be managed in perpetuity by a body other than a Registered Social Landlord. An example would be a trust that includes representatives from a landowning estate and a parish council. Many rural estates have an established track record of providing affordable housing from their existing housing stock on an informal	The support is welcomed and the wording has been amended to allow for other management bodies if they fulfil the criteria set out.

STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE
(REGULATION 28 STATEMENT)
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES

Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
			<p>basis to those who fit the four categories under paragraph "b". For instance, over a third of houses on the Wiston Estate are let at a concessionary rent due to the particular needs of tenants or their association with the local community. This existing track record of estates should be acknowledged by allowing affordable housing to be provided and managed in a less prescriptive way.</p> <p>2. Paragraph "d" is impractical. The nature of the need for affordable housing means that it will often be focussed in rural communities that are away from built-up areas. An identified need for affordable housing may indeed be part of a local strategy for improving the well-being of a small rural community by improving the sustainability of local facilities such as village shops and bus services; this approach is generally supported in the Core Strategy (e.g. para 4.44). This Paragraph should be removed or modified to reflect the above.</p>	

Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC20	1654	717 Support	Saxon Weald supports retention of rural housing exception policy as the impact of increasing property values and the Right to Buy have been most acute in rural areas.	The support is welcomed.

Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC20	102	3649 Support	Supported	The support is welcomed.

Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC20	1481	3855 Object	Please see other responses submitted by Mr Hood	The comments relate to a site specific issue rather than the policy.

Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC20	2026	3904 Object	There is a need for the policy to be responsive to changing market conditions. Restricting exceptions housing schemes to those only associated with RSLs could reduce opportunities for such schemes coming forwards. Criteria 'd' should be omitted.	The wording has been amended to allow for other management bodies if they fulfil the criteria set out.

Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
--------	--------	--------	---------	---------

STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE
(REGULATION 28 STATEMENT)
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES

Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC20	89	3929 Object	Policy too restrictive as RSLs only - suggest including other schemes that are similar but orchestrated by registered charities. Also, option under sub-paragraph d should be widened to include occupiers being able to participate in part rent/part owned schemes	The wording has been amended to allow for other management bodies if they fulfil the criteria set out. There are limited opportunities for occupiers to consider shared ownership schemes, but this is set out on a site by site basis and the acute need is for affordable rented accommodation.
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC21	1420	85 Support	Park Homes play an important role in the provision of low cost accommodation. Finance is now readily available.	The support is welcomed
DC21	1436	683 Support with conditions	Paragraphs c and d of the policy are too prescriptive given the nature of the developments	The support is welcomed. We do not consider that part 'c' of the policy is too restrictive. These types of homes are intended to meet a local need identified by a number of parties during consultation; they are not intended to be considered as general market housing. However criteria 'd' has been amended to refer to schemes being prepared in 'partnership' rather than 'supported' by the local community as it is accepted that all schemes are likely to be the subject of some opposition.
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC21	102	3650 Support	Supported	The support is welcomed
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC21	2270	3931 Object	It is essential to assist established park home development as they provide opportunity for affordable housing. Policy should be amended to include opportunities for further development that can come forward at existing park home sites even if not at edge of existing built-up area. Should not require support of local community or to be prepared in partnership with them. Should be down to pure planning considerations.	We acknowledge that Park Homes may provide a level of more affordable housing provision, but this should not override the sustainable development objectives that are fundamental to this Plan. Developments should have access to a range of services and facilities and should not be entirely dependent on the private car. As a result the requirement to be well related to an existing built-up area remains. However part 'd' of the policy has been amended to require schemes to be prepared in partnership with the local community, rather than necessarily 'supported' by them. We have not removed this criterion entirely as it is important that the schemes are based on local needs and requirements and a result they must include the involvement of those communities local to them.
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC22	1641	658 Object	The policy should allow for the replacement of dwellings lost to other uses or redevelopment, including those within rural areas or outside the development framework of towns.	This comment is not accepted, the loss of residential units will only be permitted in the exceptional circumstances stated. The building of new dwellings should be judged on their own merits and not in conjunction with an application for loss, it may not always be appropriate to replace dwellings and this approach could result in a significant increase in development in the countryside.
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC22	102	3651 Support	Supported	Support is welcomed

STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE
(REGULATION 28 STATEMENT)
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES

Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC22	2026	3934 Object	No reason for criteria 'a'. Criteria 'b' - Development should not be judged on whether substantial community benefits can be provided. An identified need for the accommodation is sufficient.	We do not wish to encourage the redevelopment / change of use of dwellings as it would undermine our Core Strategy; however, we do accept that there may be exceptional circumstances. However these exceptional circumstances must offer up some significant community benefit to offset this loss of housing. It is felt that stating that there are no reasonable alternatives available may go some way in addressing the objection.
DC23	1481	144 Object		The comment relates to a site specific issue rather than the development control policy.
DC23	1573	656 Object	Objection to excessive proportion of all developments being smaller homes, argues that small households do not necessarily require small dwellings	The criteria set out within the policy and supporting text has been based upon the Housing Needs Survey 2003 and the Supply / Demand Analysis 2003 studies; these studies provide a credible evidence base for the nature of housing demand within the District. It is accepted that small households do not necessarily require smaller homes, however, in order to provide for the population's basic needs now, and in the medium term future, a larger proportion of smaller dwellings are required to ensure access to the housing market through improved affordability and also ensure the identified demand for 1 and 2 bed homes is met. The 80% threshold is not considered excessive, and is necessary in order to meet people's basic needs as identified by the studies carried out to date; interestingly, the study also found that of the households surveyed only 27% were 4 or more bedrooms. The 80% requirement for smaller dwellings is therefore, not that dissimilar from the current bedroom split in the existing housing stock and should help to ensure a positive supply of smaller dwellings.
DC23	1639	698 Object	Policy statement should make clear that the efficient use of land is a priority that will be achieved taking account of the existing character into which new development is located.	It is noted that there is a need to make the efficient use of land a priority and one that should be achieved whilst taking into account the existing character of the area. It is felt that paragraph 3.94 has dealt with this issue adequately by stressing the desire for high density developments, whilst also taking into account the local character of an area. Some additional wording has been added to improve the clarity of the supporting text.
DC23	1639	699 Object	Policy statement should make clear that the efficient use of land is a priority that will be achieved taking account of the existing character into which new development is located.	In addition to the response made to representation 699, the Council does actively encourage high design standards and is in agreement that innovative design has the potential to create highly desirable living environments. It is also noted that high density development should be balanced with the living environments provided, for both new and existing

STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE
(REGULATION 28 STATEMENT)
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES

Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
			PPG3 is therefore intended to be design-led with density being a product of design rather than the other way round. Policies 10 and 23 do not adequately reflect this.	residents, no changes to the policy in this respect are required.
DC23	102	3652 Support	Supported	Support for this policy is acknowledged.

Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC23	1071	3714 Object	Policy is not founded on a robust and credible evidence base, see test (vii). Moreover that there is no clear mechanisms for the implementation and monitoring of the policy. Council should work in partnership to prepare a Housing Market Assessment. Only once this has been carried out can an affordable housing policy be put forward for consultation.	The evidence base underpinning this policy is considered credible and the monitoring systems in place for the Core Strategy, SSAL and General Development Control Policies are considered sufficient; for further details refer to Chapter 4 – Monitoring and Implementation. The evidence base for Policy DC 23 came from the Housing Needs Survey 2003 conducted by David Couttie Associates Limited; this study comprises of two documents, the Housing Needs Survey 2003 and the Supply / Demand Analysis 2003. The complexities surrounding the Sub-regional Housing Market analysis, as required in the recently published draft PPS3, mean that it is not feasible in the short to medium term for this type of study to be available to the Council for use in its evidence base, and it must be remembered that at this point in time it is purely a draft requirement; the housing study carried out represents the most credible evidence base available at this point in time. Similarly, clarification regarding how relevant groups and organisations have been involve in the development of the information is explicitly highlighted within the 2003 Housing Needs Survey; the study surveyed 12,999 households within the district and is therefore a householder survey only (a response rate of 38.3% was achieved). In defence of the evidence base, it is felt that there is no reasonable justification has been provided to simply disregard the 2003 Housing Needs Survey because emerging guidance specifies a new type of analysis and which cannot be provided in the short term due to its complex nature. To not use this data would result in an identified basic need for smaller dwellings remaining unaddressed and for the current surplus of 4 bed dwellings to be compounded.

Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC23	2133	3719 Object	(Originally entered under Respondent 1615 (orig. Jonathan Steele, now Crest Nicholson Developments Ltd) as rep number 536.) Reference should be made to the fact that the percentage of smaller homes may be different for the west of Crawley development as it is aimed at meeting Crawley's needs.	This objection is acknowledged and it is considered reference should be made in the supporting text to the West of Crawley allocation as the development to the West of Crawley is intended to meet the needs of Crawley. Therefore, the policy text in paragraph 3.93 has been amended to outline that the masterplanning process currently being undertaken jointly, between Horsham District Council and Crawley Borough Council will identify Crawley's housing mix / size requirements.

STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE
(REGULATION 28 STATEMENT)
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES

Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC23	2026	3936 Object	Should not specifically identify 1, 2, and 3 bed homes. It is not the case that only small dwellings will be needed in the future, there needs to be an adequate range of family homes.	The Housing Needs Survey 2003 clearly identifies a need for 1 and 2 bed dwellings; it is therefore felt that reference to 1, 2 and 3 bed dwellings is justified and necessary. Although smaller dwellings are sought by this Council, the policy is not considered onerous in its requirements as 20% of dwellings could be 4 bedroom dwellings and the mix of the remaining 80% of 1, 2 and 3 bed properties has not been specified; although a varied mix of dwelling types / sizes will be favoured. Whilst it is acknowledged that small dwellings may not always be required, the future need for larger dwellings is equally not certain. The demographic structure of the District is changing; the number of 0-19, 20-29 and 30-44 year olds in the District is predicted to decrease, whilst those over 45 years old are predicted to rise sharply. Also, couples tend to start families later in life whilst having fewer children; this would suggest the need for different types of accommodation. To simply ignore the evidence base, even though a new form of housing needs assessment is required as a result of the emerging PPS3 guidance would be inappropriate, the need for smaller dwellings must therefore be addressed based upon the information available. This situation will be reviewed annually in the AMR and should the circumstances change, the need for the retention of a small dwellings policy will be considered.

Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC23	113	4029 Object	This policy must be included in the core strategy alongside the affordable housing and housing provision policies. The policy should seek to allow choice and variety in the housing market and to ensure that the housing needs of the whole community are met. The policy should be informed by a local housing market assessment.	The inclusion of a separate small dwellings policy in the Core Strategy rather than the DC Policies document is not felt to be necessary as Policy CP12 makes reference to the general need for smaller dwellings in order to meet identified needs. It is felt that the suite of Core Strategy Policies will be effective in creating sustainable and balanced communities. The evidence base used to underpin Policy DC23 represents the needs of the whole community rather than those in need of affordable housing and whilst an 80% threshold for 1, 2 and 3 bed homes is specified, there remains adequate flexibility to meeting changing market requirements. As mentioned previously, the evidence base utilised for this policy is a statistically sound householder analysis of the District's needs and has taken into account the accommodation needs of all resident in light of a changing demographic structure; there is no reasonable justification for not using this evidence base. In terms of a local housing market assessment, its inclusion at this point in time is considered unworkable; it is therefore proposed that this requirement is removed from the policy until a time when it becomes feasible. Reference to the need for a local housing market assessment is something to be considered as part of a possible SPD on dwelling mix and housing need.

Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC24	1639	701 Object	Sites in and around Pulborough, Storrington ,	The comments are noted. Although not all employment sites and premises have been identified as EPZs, the

STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE
(REGULATION 28 STATEMENT)
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES

Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
			Steyning and Henfield should be identified as a means of supporting the self-containment of these settlements.	second part of the policy seeks to protect the most sustainable and viable industrial sites within the built-up areas. The Local Planning Authority must ensure that they comply with national planning guidance in making the best use of the land, including striking a balance between protecting valuable employment sites and premises and releasing land for alternative uses. The Council has undertaken an Employment Land Review study which forms part of the background documentation to the Core Strategy and may be used for individual proposals submitted through planning applications.

Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC24	2062	3319 Object	<p>4.29 Policy 24 relating to employment site and land protection states the following:</p> <p>'Proposals equating to the loss of commercial (office, industrial and warehousing) use to non employment uses within the Defined Employment Protection Zones will not be permitted unless:</p> <p>'The Council is satisfied through evidence (marketing information and feasibility and viability studies) submitted with the planning application that the sequential approach has been applied towards the redevelopment of the site. The sequential approach being; employment based redevelopment; mixed-use or other employment creating use redevelopment, and finally, alternative non-employment use based redevelopment; 'The Council is satisfied the commercial unit(s) are no longer viable as a consequence of the unit(s) having been marketed at a reasonable price or at a reasonable rent with appropriate conditions attached for at least 18 months prior to the application submission at each stage of the sequential approach;'</p> <p>4.30 The site is again not</p>	Some of the more sustainable sites not identified as EPZs will be closely monitored and will be reconsidered for inclusion once the policy needs updating.

STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE
(REGULATION 28 STATEMENT)
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES

Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
			<p>identified on the maps. There seems to be confusion as to whether the Council is considering including the Eagle Industrial Estate as part of the EPZ (as stated in the response to consultation).</p> <p>4.31 The outcome of the appeal alone safeguards the site from development for residential in the near future. This is a view that was also expressed by the Council planning officer.</p> <p>4.32 The appeal decision concludes that the site is suitable for housing given the right circumstances relating to employment needs. In line with these conclusions, the policies relating to this site should remain flexible. We understand these circumstances are not likely to change in the near future, however should allow the ability for the site to be reappraised.</p> <p>4.33 Further, the evidence supporting the inclusion of the site within the EPZ is weak at best. The Inspector raised a number of concerns relating to the information supplied at the Public Inquiry and therefore neither this evidence nor the Employment Land Review should form part of the basis for its inclusion.</p>	

Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC24	1639	3414 Object	In order to fulfil the aims and objectives of the Core Strategy the existing employment protection zones should be extended to significant employment sites within and adjoining the Category 1 settlements. It is considered that this is essential to further the self containment of the more sustainable Service Centres.	Sites and premises within built-up areas not identified as EPZs will be assessed against the second part of the policy. Other sites and premises may be considered for inclusion at a later stage when the document is being reviewed.
DC24	102	3653 Support	Supported	The support is welcomed.

STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE
(REGULATION 28 STATEMENT)
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES

Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC24	1980	3859 Object	Parsonage Farm, Horsham should be defined an EPZ	It is not considered appropriate to define this site as an EPZ at this stage. A large proportion of the site has been identified for a mixed-use development including new commercial development in the submitted Site Specific Allocations of Land document. The site in its present form is under-used and the benefits of redeveloping the site outweigh the benefits of protecting it. However, once the site has been comprehensively redeveloped it may be appropriate to review the position.

Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC24	2026	3937 Object	Loss of employment land within built-up areas ensures the best use of land that is available is undertaken. See no reason that to show that commercial operation is no longer viable. Fail to see need for assisting on sequential approach. Residential developments can attract less traffic.	It is considered vital to sustain and enhance the District's economic performance. This is, in part, is dependent on protecting and enhancing the existing employment land and sites. In order to meet the need of existing companies and future demand for employment floorspace it is important to protect the most sustainable and valuable industrial estates. The identification of EPZs will ensure that these objectives are met whilst allowing for the redevelopment of employment sites and premises that are no longer needed or viable. The Employment Land review, undertaken on behalf of the Council, provides further information on individual sites and premises and outlines the likely future demand for employment floorspace.

Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC24	2273	3946 Object	Exceptions should be made for alternative uses, particularly on fringes of badly performing industrial estates. eg buildings fronting Redkilm Way where despite marketing , occupation of these premises has not been possible. Flexibility is therefore required with appropriate wording to allow consideration of alternative uses.	The policy allows for some flexibility within the defined EPZs although proposals for redevelopment of EPZs must meet the criteria as set out in the policy including appropriate marketing and application of the sequential approach. However, should employment use be shown to be an unviable option, the Council will consider a mixed-use or alternative uses redevelopment proposals.

Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC24	1071	3953 Object	Employment use which is no longer needed should be released for other uses, specifically residential. This policy should be replaced with one accepting change of use where is it demonstrated there is no need for the use, without a period of marketing or sequential test.	The policy aims to protect the most sustainable employment sites so that other less viable sites can be considered for redevelopment. However, it is important that future requirements for commercial floorspace are met and that there is a range of different types of units available to ensure the economic well-being of the District.

DC25	102	3654 Support	Supported	The comment is noted.
------	-----	-----------------	-----------	-----------------------

Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC25	1071	3955 Object	Policy relates solely to new employment development in	The policy will apply to the employment element of mixed-use schemes. New commercial development outside the

STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE
(REGULATION 28 STATEMENT)
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES

Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
			built-up areas. It is overly restrictive, should identify the scope of employment use that could come forward as part of a mixed-use development on the edge of existing settlements, e.g. east of Billingshurst. Wording change suggested.	built-up areas will be assessed against the relevant policies set out in the Rural Strategy section of this document.
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
Section Infrastructure Requirements	2089	3682 Object	There should either to be a policy on infrastructure requirements in general or a reference to the policy that covers this in the Core Strategy (e.g. CP13 in the Submission Document). (WSCC Development Group, Planning Services)	Reference to the Core Strategy Policy CP13 can be found in para 3.106. The overarching general infrastructure requirements policy can be found in the Core Strategy (CP13). Policy DC26 and Policy DC47 (that focuses on transport infrastructure requirements) amplify the Core Strategy policy further.
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC26	157	586 Support with conditions	Support, but comment that mast-sharing is not always the optimum landscape solution.	Comments are noted. Applications will be assessed on their merits and there may be exceptional cases where other solutions would be preferable and will be dealt with on a case by case basis.
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC26	102	3675 Observations	It is felt appropriate for the Parish Council to advise the Secretary of State its' own policies in relation to telecommunication masts in respect of Schools and other educational establishments.	The observations are noted. Application will be assessed against any national and regional guidance available as well as against the District Council's own policies.
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC26	2089	3679 Object	Reference should be made to the potential impact of telecommunications development on the historical landscape, suggested amending policy - see full rep (WSCC Archaeological Officer)	The suggested amendments are noted. However, other policies contained within this document cover these points.
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC26	2259	3858 Object	Suggest the inclusion of a telecommunications policy as outlined in their full representation and minor wording changes to Councils policy. The policy should be introduced by a paragraph outlining the development pressures and the policy aims. Wording is suggested in their full representation. Suggest background information could be contained in a separate non	The introductory and supporting text sets out the aims and objectives and provides additional background information to the policy. The policy has been amended to reflect, as appropriate, the suggested changes.

STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE
(REGULATION 28 STATEMENT)
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES

Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
			statutory document.	
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
Section Protection and Enhancement of Community Facilities	2089	3681 Object	The policies refer only to open space, sport and recreation. These should be broadened out to cover other services including education and libraries. There should be a policy to permit new school facilities to meet local needs. (WSCC Development Group, Planning Services)	Comment is noted. This policy does not preclude other facilities coming forward. Core Policy CP 14 should be read in conjunction with this policy, this policy states that new or improved community facilities will be encouraged in order to enrich the overall quality of life within the District. It is not considered suitable or practicable to list facilities in this policy.
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC27	79	1328 Object	However, Sport England OBJECTS to this policy still does not refer to the quantity of open space in the policy text but relies on a reference to the criteria in the Council's PPG17 assessment	Welcome support for the policy. Needs cannot be identified in the policy, reference to the PPG17 Assessment that sets out the needs and details of these for settlements in the District is considered the best approach, following guidelines for policy formulation in Development Plan Documents. The PPG17 Assessment sets out the way forward for the Council.
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC27	1517	1371 Object	The criteria of low quality and low value are inappropriate given the potential for improving open spaces and the landscaping skill which HDC itself has shown.	The supporting text does state that the Council will encourage the improvement of those sites that have been identified as being of low quality but of high value to community. The second paragraph of the supporting text also states that there may be instances to enhance facilities of a recreational or amenity space. This paragraph also states that the PPG17 Assessment states that the Council should resist the loss of community grass sports pitches, and this will be taken into account when assessing any development proposals.
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC27	102	3655 Support	Supported	Support for the Policy is welcomed.
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC27	1324	3908 Object	Wording referring to need for applicants to contact WSCC about rights of way gives the impression that the District Council may not be protecting and enhancing rights of way sufficiently. Requests policy wording is changed to show Council's commitment to this	Changes have been made to Policy DC45: Transport and Access, that applies to all proposals, the changes strengthen requirements regarding rights of way. Rights of way in the District are however a function of West Sussex County Council, not the District Council.
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC27	1572	3983 Object	Change wording	The Core Policy CP14 that would have to be considered in conjunction with this policy sets out in a. & b., when in exceptional circumstances such as a loss may be considered acceptable.
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC28	1651	708 Object	Include community facilities (such as places of public worship) along with sports and recreation facilities.	Comment is noted. This policy does not preclude such a facility coming forward. Core Policy CP 14 should be read in conjunction with this policy, this policy states that new or improved community facilities will be encouraged in

STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE
(REGULATION 28 STATEMENT)
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES

Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
				order to enrich the overall quality of life within the District. It is not considered suitable or practicable to list facilities in this policy.
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC28	79	1330 Support	Sport England supports this policy which would encourage new provision of sporting and recreational facilities particularly in connection with other new development.	The support is welcomed.
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC28	2012	3618 Object	Broadbridge Heath village has already been identified by Horsham District Councils PPG17 Assessment as falling well below the existing standards of quality and quantity of our open spaces, sport and recreational facilities. There is no dedicated football pitch within Broadbridge Heath. We would therefore suggest that in accordance with HDC Core Strategy Policy CP13 that any deficiency identified in the existing sports / recreational facilities within the village would be rectified prior to any development. New sports and recreational facilities will be essential to meet not only the needs of the existing community but those of a greatly enlarged one. New facilities should be developed and made ready prior to the sale of newly constructed residential property.	The issue of sports/ recreation facilities will be dealt with in the West of Horsham Masterplan. This policy, including the PPG17 Assessment and Core Policy CP14 will help with this issue, identifying the need and setting the requirements for the area that will be set out in the West of Horsham Masterplan and agreed at the planning application stage.
DC28	2012	3626 Object	Re para 3.124 - This is not acceptable if combining local needs with those of the District. Local needs must be kept separate from those of the District. We would argue that local sports and recreational facilities that may be developed for our enhanced community be entrusted and controlled by Broadbridge Heath Parish Council and the local community.	The issue of entrusting the control of a local sports & recreational facility to Broadbridge Heath Parish Council and the local community would be dealt with at the detailed planning application stage.
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC28	102	3656	Supported	Support welcomed.

STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE
(REGULATION 28 STATEMENT)
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES

Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
			Support	
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
Statement Rural Strategy	1572	3997 Object	Delete statement	This box states the Spatial Objective's from the Core Strategy that are relevant to this section of policy and should not be deleted.
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC29	157	589 Object	Policy should include a reference to traffic generation associated with a farm diversification scheme.	Changes have been made to Policy DC45: Transport and Access, which applies to all proposals, the changes strengthening transport and access requirements. Supporting text states that, development should be of a scale that is appropriate to its location and has access to a range of modes of transport. The transport Policies are also referred to specifically in the supporting text of now Policy DC28.
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC29	102	3657 Support	Supported	Support for the Policy is welcomed.
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC29	94	3877 Object	Word changes suggested	The suggested word 'establishes' has been inserted into the policy wording where suggested, however it is considered that 'convincingly' was unnecessary. Whilst the actual wording 'agricultural operation' has not been used, the used phraseology 'agricultural enterprise' is in the same spirit and accords with the wording of PPS 7.
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC29	94	3878 Support	Para 3.134 - Strong support	Support for the policy is welcomed.
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC29	1324	3907 Object	Wording referring to need for applicants to contact WSCC about rights of way gives the impression that the District Council may not be protecting and enhancing rights of way sufficiently. Requests policy wording is changed to show Council's commitment to this	Changes have been made to Policy DC45: Transport and Access, that applies to all proposals, the changes strengthen requirements regarding rights of way. Rights of way in the District are however a function of West Sussex County Council, not the District Council.
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC29	2026	3939 Object	Reword criteria 'b', it is repetition of criteria 'a'	The policy has been reworded to take into account the concern & provide clarity.
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC29	1572	3984 Object	Change wording to strengthen policy	The changes have been incorporated in the reworded Policy; however the wording is not identical to that suggested.
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC29	1572	3998 Object	PARA 3.134 - Change for Clarification and to align with ODPM definition of rural areas.	The change suggested has been incorporated into the reworded policy supporting text.
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome

STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE
(REGULATION 28 STATEMENT)
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES

Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC29	139	4009 Object	Farm diversification must be compatible with a countryside location and not harm the character, amenity, quiet enjoyment or environment.	The reworded policy, part c. deals with this concern, there is also specific reference to the Landscape and Townscapes & Environmental Quality policies in the supporting text.
DC30	157	590 Object	Policy needs additional criteria relating to the acceptability of the building, provision for bats or owls and placing services underground.	The reworded supporting text of the policy, final paragraph addresses these concerns. Concerns addressed directly in the text or by specific reference to other policies.
DC30	173	1028 Object	This policy is too weak. The building or buildings should only be located in sustainable locations, the use be of a sufficiently small scale that it will not impact the location, the character of the landscape, the local natural or historic landscape features or the local road network.	Changes have been made to Policy DC45: Transport and Access, which applies to all proposals, the changes strengthening transport and access requirements. The transport policies are also referred to specifically in the supporting text of now Policy DC29. The reworded policy and supporting text addresses the other concerns raised.
DC30	173	1370 Object	Considers that this policy for use of agricultural and rural buildings for industrial or business use is too weak.	Changes have been made to Policy DC45: Transport and Access, which applies to all proposals, the changes strengthening transport and access requirements. The transport Policies are also referred to specifically in the supporting text of now DC29. The reworded policy and supporting text addresses the other concerns raised.
DC30	102	3658 Support	Supported	Support for the policy welcomed.
DC30	2089	3689 Object	There is a much greater chance of bat roosts and nesting birds being present in agricultural and rural buildings, the District Council may wish to consider raising this issue within the supporting text and referring the applicant to Policy DC4 (WSCC Ecological Officer)	Changes have been made to the supporting text so that there is now specific reference to this concern in the final paragraph of the supporting text.
DC30	94	3879 Object	(i) The policy should be sub-divided / 2 policies. One policy relating to buildings that have not changed their greenfield status, the other policy should relate to other buildings and structures. The former are greenfield land. The later are brownfield and available for	It is not considered suitable to divide the policy, following guidelines on policy formulation. It is considered that the reworded policy and supporting text sets the framework for the conversion of agricultural and rural buildings for industrial, business or residential uses.

STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE
(REGULATION 28 STATEMENT)
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES

Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
			development if sustainable. The 10 yr provision for agricultural buildings in 'c' relates to diversification and should be in DC29. A new policy is proposed in full representation.	
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC30	2053	3880 Object	Sympathetic to diversification, but considers that industrial and business use in the countryside is not appropriate as a suburbanising effect.	Changes have been made to Policy DC45: Transport and Access, which applies to all proposals, the changes strengthening transport and access requirements. The transport Policies are also referred to specifically in the supporting text of now DC29. Policy DC3 seeks to prevent settlement coalescence.
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC30	1324	3902 Support	Supports reference to rights of way para d) wording of which is excellent	Support for the policy welcomed.
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC30	2026	3940 Object	Need to acknowledge the former agricultural use of a building could have generated far greater activity and noise / pollution that proposed business / employment use would. Reference should be made in criteria 'c' to the existence of a building rather than the use of a building.	Section c. of the policy has been reworded, this change and the reworded policy should clarify the requirements/ when a proposal would be permitted.
DC30	1572	3985 Object	Change wording to strengthen policy	The policy has been reworded, the changes made to the Policy and specific reference in the supporting text to other policies meet the concerns. Following guidelines for the formulation of development control policies, they should be positive where ever possible, therefore the first suggested change has not been incorporated.
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC30	139	4010 Object	Policy is too weak. The building or buildings should only be located in sustainable locations and the use be of a small scale so that it will not impact the location, character of the landscape, the local natural or historic landscape features or the local road network.	The policy has been reworded, the changes made to the policy and specific reference in the supporting text to other policies meet the concerns.
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC31	102	3659 Support	Supported	Support for the policy welcomed.
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC31	94	3887 Object	Expansion of buildings within established industrial estates or employment sites in the countryside should not be permitted unless there are	It is considered that development in the countryside must be carefully controlled. It is considered more suitable to extend facilities rather than new development in the countryside and this is clear in this reworded policy and supporting text.

STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE
(REGULATION 28 STATEMENT)
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES

Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
			exceptional circumstances.	
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC31	1324	3903 Object	Wording referring to need for applicants to contact WSCC about rights of way gives the impression that the District Council may not be protecting and enhancing rights of way sufficiently. Requests policy wording is changed to show Council's commitment to this.	Changes have been made to Policy DC45: Transport and Access, that applies to all proposals, the changes strengthen requirements regarding rights of way. Rights of way in the District are however a function of West Sussex County Council, not the District Council.
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC31	127	3923 Object	Policy SF2 of current local plan should be saved and included in the document. Feel its non inclusion will lead to character of village being at risk from its expansion.	Any future proposals for expansion would be required to meet all relevant development control policies. There is therefore no longer a need for this policy.
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC31	89	3930 Object	Suggest adding the following words in Para 2 - "Proposals for the expansion and/or adaptation of existing buildings within established industrial estates.	In the reworded policy, section b ii. addresses the issue raised.
DC31	2026	3942 Object	In addition to established industrial estates / single employment uses in rural areas there are a number of businesses such as public houses to golf courses that may wish to expand. DC31 appears to be the best policy in which to address their expansion in addition to established industrial estates etc.	No changes have been suggested to the policy directly, the policy and supporting text have been reworded following other representations received. The location and type of facility would determine which Policies to be used in the determination of the application.
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC31	1572	3986 Object	Change policy, wording suggested	Policy DC24: New Employment Development is the policy for such development within built up area boundaries, Policy DC30: New Rural Commercial Development and the Expansion of Existing Rural Commercial Sites/ Intensification of Uses, is for such development outside the built up area boundary. The reworded policy and supporting text meet the issues raised.
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC31	139	4011 Object	Employment sites in countryside locations should not be expanded or the use intensified for any use than those that require a countryside location. Quite the opposite, policies should encourage commercial and industrial uses	It is considered that development in the countryside must be carefully controlled. There is a separate policy for such development within the built up area boundary, Policy DC 24: New Employment Development. The policy and supporting text have been reworded, providing more clarity and direction regarding such development.

STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE
(REGULATION 28 STATEMENT)
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES

Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
			to move into the settlements of towns and villages.	
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC32	102	3660	Supported Support	Support for the Policy is welcomed.
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC32	94	3888	Object Add point (e) 'The requirement for the building is compatible with a countryside location.'	Suggested change added to section c. of the reworded policy.
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC32	89	3932	Object Suggest following additional paragraph "proposals for the replacement of buildings for business and employment purposed will be permitted if: a) the intended use of the site meets with the sustainability criteria for the location involved."	The policy has been reworded, section a. of the policy goes some way towards meeting the issue raised.
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC32	2026	3943	Object See comments on policy DC31. DC32 should read ... proposals for the replacement or of new buildings to support businesses and employment purposes...	The policy and supporting text have been reworded, however the first paragraph has remained the same, apart from employment being replaced by commercial.
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC32	1572	3987	Object Change wording of policy as suggested	The policy has been reworded, the changes made to c. and d. meet the issues raised. Following guidelines for the formulation of policies, they should be positive where ever possible, therefore the first suggested change has not been incorporated.
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC32	139	4012	Object Commercial or industrial buildings in countryside locations should not be replaced except for those uses that require a countryside location. Quite the opposite, policies should encourage commercial and industrial uses to move into the settlements of towns and villages.	It is considered that development in the countryside must be carefully controlled. There are policies for such development within and outside the built up area boundary. The policy and supporting text have been reworded, providing more clarity and direction regarding such development.
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC33	157	591	Object Policy should have additional criteria relating to bridleway network and erosion, and additional specific criteria for sand schools.	Changes have been made to Policy DC45: Transport and Access, that applies to all proposals, the changes strengthen requirements regarding rights of way. Rights of way in the District are however a function of West Sussex County Council, not the District Council. Reference has specifically been made to Landscape and Townscape and other policies in the supporting text.
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome

STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE
(REGULATION 28 STATEMENT)
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES

Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC33	102	3661	Supported Support	Support for the policy is welcomed.
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC33	2089	3699	Object Policy should be more strongly worded in view of potential for detrimental and incremental impact of horsy-culture on landscape character. Suggested wording and sources of advice in full rep (WSCC Landscape Officer)	The policy and supporting text has been reworded. Changed have been made to b. meeting the issue raised, reference to manure and screening has been added to the supporting text. Reference has specifically been made to Landscape and Townscape and other policies in the supporting text which meets the other issues raised.
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC33	1572	3988	Object Change policy to clarify	Following guidelines for the formulation of policies, they should be positive where ever possible, therefore the first suggested change has not been incorporated. The supporting text encourages the submission of a comprehensive plan and business plan for proposals. The rewording of the policy and specific reference made to Landscape and Townscape and other policies in the supporting text meet the third issue raised.
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC34	157	594	Object Policy should require it to be demonstrated that an employment-generating use is not feasible or acceptable, have additional criteria, and clarify the term "residential use".	Previous Policies DC30 and DC34 have been combined into the new Policy DC29. The reworded policy and supporting text meet the issues raised.
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC34	173	1030	Object This policy is too weak and should be strengthened to be in line with revised DC 30 as suggested by respondent.	Previous policies DC30 and DC34 have been combined into the new Policy DC29. The reworded policy and supporting text meet the issue raised.
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC34	102	3662	Supported Support	Support for the policy is welcomed.
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC34	2089	3690	Object There is a much greater chance of bat roosts and nesting birds being present in agricultural and rural buildings, HDC may wish to consider raising this issue within the supporting text and referring the applicant to Policy DC4. Possible addition to paragraph 3.144 suggested - see full rep (WSCC Ecological Officer)	Previous Policies DC30 and DC34 have been combined into the new Policy DC29. Changes have been made to the supporting text, to address the specific concern raised.
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC34	94	3889	Object Wording changes and typo	Previous Policies DC30 and DC34 have been combined into the new Policy DC29. Policy DC11: Design, which is made specific reference to in the supporting text of Policy

STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE
(REGULATION 28 STATEMENT)
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES

Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
				DC14: Conservation Areas & DC15: Listed Buildings would be read in conjunction with this policy. 'Proved' has been added to the text of c. in the reworded policy, which is now the relevant section. Landscape and Townscape Character policies are specifically mentioned in the supporting text, which deal with the impact on the proposal on the location.
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC34	89	3933 Object	Suggest adding the following paragraph" Outside the defined built-up areas, the conversion of rural buildings will be permitted where: a) the intended use of the site meets with sustainability criteria for the location involved. "	Previous Policies DC30 and DC34 have been combined into the new Policy DC29. The policy has been reworded in section a of the policy tom seek to address the issues.
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC34	2026	3945 Object	Support principal of converting rural buildings for residential use. Criteria 'b' - The policy should be concerned with the fact that a building has been in existence for 10 years rather than in use. Inappropriate reference in paragraph 3.1444 to need to consider small dwellings, it may be the case that a large property is more appropriate.	Previous Policies DC30 and DC34 have been combined into the new Policy DC29. It is considered that the policy should remain with the wording 'in use' following further consultation with the Development Team. It is also considered that Policy DC22: Smaller Homes should be read in conjunction with this policy.
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC34	1572	3989 Object	Change wording to clarify	Previous Policies DC30 and DC34 have been combined into the new Policy DC29. Landscape and Townscape Character policies are specifically mentioned in the supporting text, which deal with the impact on the proposal on the location. Following guidelines for the formulation of policies they should be positive where ever possible, therefore the first suggested change has not been incorporated.
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC34	139	4013 Object	This policy is too weak and should be strengthened to be in line with revised DC 30.	Previous Policies DC30 and DC34 have been combined into the new Policy DC29. The reworded policy and supporting text meets this issue.
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC35	157	636 Object	Need for such dwellings should not be allowed to override other considerations such as siting and design.	The reworded policy and supporting text meets the issue raised, specifically the new section d. of the policy.
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC35	102	3663 Support	Supported	Support for the policy is welcomed.
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC35	94	3892 Object	Object to final para - It is important to support the stock of tied agricultural dwellings.	There is no change made to the 18 months requirement for appropriate marketing of a property, and also needs to be proven that the dwelling is no longer required for the

STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE
(REGULATION 28 STATEMENT)
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES

Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
			Concerned there is constant move to convert to general residential use. A period of 5 years marketing would be appropriate. Should be a requirement to search for suitable properties in the vicinity of an agricultural holding before permission is given for a new tied dwelling.	essential rural workers. Section b iv. addresses the issue of suitable property in the immediate area or existing accommodation on site.
DC35	2026	3947 Object	A number of rural businesses can require accommodation in order to support the businesses future e.g. dog kennels, catteries, vet clinics etc can require accommodation. A properties size should not be restricted to the needs of the holding as opposed to the requirements of the applicant. There needs to be greater flexibility in criteria b (iii).	It is considered that development in the countryside must be carefully controlled; the wording of this policy is such to implement strict controls over development in the countryside. Loosening restrictions on rural workers, to allow businesses that do not need to be located in the countryside, would create more development pressure on the countryside. It is not considered that the suggested changes should be made to the policy.
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC36	157	600 Object	Policy fails to ensure the conservation of a stock of smaller dwellings within the district.	The reworded policy, section b ii addresses this issue.
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC36	102	3664 Support	Supported	Support for the policy is welcomed.
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC36	94	3881 Object	Section 'i' - wording change suggested	The reworded policy, section b ii addresses this issue.
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC36	2026	3948 Object	Welcome removal of small dwellings category, the social arguments have lapsed. Suggest Authority also removes reference to tests in terms of scale, design and wider landscape setting when giving consideration to such a policy.	It is not considered that reference to scale, design and wider landscape setting should be removed from the policy.
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC36	1572	3990 Object	Change wording to strengthen policy	Following guidelines for the formulation of policies they should be positive where ever possible therefore the first suggested change has not been incorporated. Rewording of the policy, sections b i & b ii meet the other issues raised.
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome

STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE
(REGULATION 28 STATEMENT)
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES

Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC37	1520	215	Sussex Health Care supports the aims of para 3.150 and Policy 37 but suggests minor amendments to the wording of Policy 37(b) or 37(c) to clarify the Council's position.	The support is welcomed however we do not intend to make specific reference to the acceptability of such developments outside built-up areas within the policy and would not wish to encourage such developments solely within the countryside as there may be occasions when a built-up area is more appropriate. Each case will be accepted on its individual merits, however part cii does allow for such rural developments if they are fully justified.

Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC37	1592	421 Other	Support the policy but suggest that land could be allocated for a CCRC at Faygate	The support is welcomed but the DC Policies document is not the mechanism in which to get a site allocated for such as use.

Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC37	102	3665 Support	Supported	The support is welcomed

Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC37	94	3883 Object	b. wording change and explanation given	There is a growing role for the larger scale continuing care retirement communities to meet the needs of an ageing population. Research has shown that they have considerable benefits and do not produce problems of isolation or elderly persons 'ghettos'. On the contrary, the social contact as a result of the facilities and services provided and the integration by virtue of these facilities being used by a wider population in local communities is seen by residents of such schemes as a positive benefit. It is recognised that ideally such schemes should be within the defined built-up areas but in practice this may be difficult in terms of the nature and scale of the community intended. The opportunity for appropriate schemes in location outside the built-up areas where they can be justified in terms of exceptional circumstances and contributions towards meeting the identified needs coupled with substantial environmental improvement should not be ruled out. The policy needs to be sufficiently flexible to respond to changing circumstances whilst being consistent with the overall policy approach.

Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC37	1572	3991 Object	Change wording to clarify and strengthen	There is a growing role for the larger scale continuing care retirement communities to meet the needs of an ageing population. Research has shown that they have considerable benefits and do not produce problems of isolation or elderly persons 'ghettos'. On the contrary, the social contact as a result of the facilities and services provided and the integration by virtue of these facilities being used by a wider population in local communities is seen by residents of such schemes as a positive benefit. It is recognised that ideally such schemes should be within the defined built-up areas but in practice this may be difficult in terms of the nature and scale of the community intended. The opportunity for appropriate schemes in location outside the built-up areas where they can be justified in terms of exceptional circumstances and

STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE
(REGULATION 28 STATEMENT)
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES

Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
				contributions towards meeting the identified needs coupled with substantial environmental improvement should not be ruled out. The policy needs to be sufficiently flexible to respond to changing circumstances whilst being consistent with the overall policy approach.

Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC37	1572	3999 Object	PARA 3.158 AND 3.159 Delete paragraphs.	Regarding para 3.159, for reasons set out within this policy there are occasions where such accommodation is better placed in the Countryside. This is not intended to lead to the mental trauma of isolation. There is a growing role for the larger scale continuing care retirement communities to meet the needs of an ageing population. Research has shown that they have considerable benefits and do not produce problems of isolation or elderly persons 'ghettos'. On the contrary, the social contact as a result of the facilities and services provided and the integration by virtue of these facilities being used by a wider population in local communities is seen by residents of such schemes as a positive benefit. It is recognised that ideally such schemes should be within the defined built-up areas but in practice this may be difficult in terms of the nature and scale of the community intended. The opportunity for appropriate schemes in location outside the built-up areas where they can be justified in terms of exceptional circumstances and contributions towards meeting the identified needs coupled with substantial environmental improvement should not be ruled out. The policy needs to be sufficiently flexible to respond to changing circumstances whilst being consistent with the overall policy approach.

Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC37	139	4014 Object	Such development must be within built-up areas to promote inclusive communities.	As was set out in para 3.158 there are a limited set of reasons where care homes etc may be better placed in the Countryside. This is not intended to lead to the isolation of residents. There is a growing role for the larger scale continuing care retirement communities to meet the needs of an ageing population. Research has shown that they have considerable benefits and do not produce problems of isolation or elderly persons 'ghettos'. On the contrary, the social contact as a result of the facilities and services provided and the integration by virtue of these facilities being used by a wider population in local communities is seen by residents of such schemes as a positive benefit. It is recognised that ideally such schemes should be within the defined built-up areas but in practice this may be difficult in terms of the nature and scale of the community intended. The opportunity for appropriate schemes in location outside the built-up areas where they can be justified in terms of exceptional circumstances and contributions towards meeting the identified needs coupled with substantial environmental improvement should not be ruled out. The policy needs to be sufficiently flexible to respond to changing circumstances whilst being consistent with the overall policy approach.

STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE
(REGULATION 28 STATEMENT)
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES

Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC38	157	605 Object	Policy should reflect the guidance in Circular 1/94 about gypsy sites in AONBs.	Comment is noted. However, any development within the AONBs will also be assessed against Policy DC4 Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty. This is a new policy and has been added since the Preferred Options stage. Policy DC4 states that "planning permission will not be granted for proposals in or near the South Downs or the High Weald AONBs that would adversely affect the character, quality, views, distinctiveness or threaten public enjoyment of these landscapes". Proposals for sites for caravans for Gypsies and Travellers in or near the two AONBs will be subject to this policy as well as Policy DC37 (was DC38).
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC38	102	3666 Support	Supported	The supporting comment is noted.
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC38	2089	3691 Support with conditions	Support for final sentence of the policy however inappropriately sited caravan (etc) sites have historically damaged sites of wildlife importance therefore they may be a case for strengthening the policy. Wording suggested in full rep (WSCC Ecological Officer)	The comments are noted. However, the suggested changes are covered in other policies of the document.
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC39	102	3667 Support	Supported	The comment is noted.
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC39	2089	3692 Support with conditions	Support for final sentence of the policy however inappropriately sited caravan (etc) sites have historically damaged sites of wildlife importance therefore they may be a case for strengthening the policy. Wording suggested - see full rep (Comments are noted. However the changes suggested are covered in other policies of the document.
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC40	1572	4003 Object	POLICY DC40-44 STORRINGTON VILLAGE CENTRE Change: Rename to Storrington Village	Policy amended to reflect the comments made.
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC41	1342	3 Object	Roger Tym & Partners act on behalf of Somerfield Stores Ltd. We object to Policy 41 of the General Development Control Policies Preferred Options. Wish to highlight the 'real-terms' scale of their 2,500sqm	The comments are noted. The policy has been amended to reflect the changes suggested. The new policy requires all new retail development in an edge-of-centre or out-of-centre location to demonstrate that a quantitative and qualitative need exists; that the sequential approach has been applied and that the proposed development will be accessible by a variety of modes of transport, including

STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE
(REGULATION 28 STATEMENT)
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES

Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
			<p>threshold. PPS6 (Annex A – Table 3) identifies ‘supermarkets’ as being stores with a trading floorspace of less than 2,500sqm. Hence under Policy 41 a proposal for a new supermarket (perhaps with 1,500 to 2,000sqm of trading floorspace) would not necessarily be required to demonstrate need, the full sequential approach and accessibility.</p> <p>Should amend paragraphs 4 and 5 of Policy 41 to the following, and then delete paragraph 6:</p> <p>“For new retail development proposals (regardless of size), in addition to satisfying the criteria outlined above, will be required to be accompanied by evidence that:</p> <p>i. A clear need and primarily quantitative need exists and can be demonstrated.</p> <p>ii. The sequential approach to site selection has been applied, including application of flexible formats to enable the possibility of locating closer to the established retail centre.</p> <p>iii. The proposed development will be accessible by a variety of modes of transport, particularly public transport, walking and cycling.”</p>	<p>walking and cycling. In addition, the new policy also requires any proposal for retail development of more than 1000 sqm gross to be accompanied by a Green Travel Plan.</p>

Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC41	141	3613	<p>The HA supports the application of the sequential test for the development of new retail land use. The HA would prefer that development is located in areas where there are alternative transport modes available. Out-of-town developments can bring about a decline in trade within the town centres locations - which are located close to good transport hubs. New developments could have a</p>	<p>The comments are noted. The policy on retail development in an edge-of-centre and out-of-centre location has been amended to reflect the comments made. Criterion C of the amended policy requires any application for new retail development outside the defined town and village centres to be accessible by a variety of modes of transport including walking and cycling. Proposals amounting to more than 1000 sqm gross of new retail floorspace, whether within or outside the existing centres are required to be accompanied by a Green Travel Plan.</p>

STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE
(REGULATION 28 STATEMENT)
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES

Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
			significant negative impact on the trunk road network. The overall transport impact should be analysed using an appropriate modelling tool in line with PPS12 requirements. Any Transport Assessment should include a Travel Plan.	

Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC41	102	3668	Supported	The supporting comments are noted.

Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC42	1215	1375	Object By restricting changes of use from non-residential to residential to avoid a detrimental effect on the vitality and viability of Horsham Town Centre, the policy appears to conflict with Policy DC22 which restricts changes of use from residential to non-residential (para 3.91). Loss of residential accommodation contributes to vandalism and anti-social behaviour.	The policy does not apply to existing residential development within the defined town and village centres. Policies DC22 and DC42 aims to strike a balance between town centre uses and residential development within the centres to ensure a good mix of the two without compromising the vitality and viability of existing centres. This approach is supported by national planning policy, particularly PPS6 published in 2005.

Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC42	94	3884	Object Line 23 - sense not clear	The policy only restricts the use at ground floor level.

Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC42	94	3885	Object Para 3.175 - Line 16 typo	Comment noted.

Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC44	102	3669	Support Supported	Support noted

Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC44	1982	3702	Support Re para 3.177 - Support the sentence in the paragraph where it is stated the Council can not prevent the closure of neighbourhood and village shops which are no longer economically viable.	Supporting comment noted.

DC44	1071	3957	Object Policy relates solely to neighbourhood and village shops within built-up boundary. It is overly restrictive and should identify that retail use could come forwards as part of a mixed-use development on the edge of an existing settlement. The threshold of 400sq. m criteria (b) is overly	The policy approach set out is consistent with national planning policy, particularly PPS6 which supports new retail development in appropriate locations, well-connected to existing shopping areas and accessible by a variety of modes of transport. The threshold of 400 sqm has been lowered to 200 sqm to be consistent with Core Strategy Policy CP18. However, any new retail development above this threshold outside the defined centres will be assessed against the policy on new retail development outside the defined centres which allows for
------	------	------	--	---

STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE
(REGULATION 28 STATEMENT)
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES

Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
			restrictive, should be deleted.	new retail development outside the defined centres provided that a quantitative and qualitative need exists and can be demonstrated and meets all other criteria set out in that policy.
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC44	1572	3992 Object	Add criteria	The comments are noted. However, public houses (which fall within class A4 of the use classes order) are covered by the policy.
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC44	139	4015 Object	Public houses in villages need special protection.	The comments are noted. However, public houses (which fall within class A4 of the use classes order) are covered by the policy.
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
Section Tourism Developm ent	1826	3896 Object	Consider hotels are not just tourist facility - business / overnight accommodation should be considered. Policy wording should be reworded to reflect this.	In considering the representations made on Policy CP19 and in the light of subsequent discussions about 'common ground' it has been concluded that it would not be inappropriate to include a reference to business visitors in the second sentence of the first paragraph to the policy, as set out in Horsham District Council's Position Statement Core Strategy, Matter 13.
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC45	157	608 Object	Policy should make special mention of the South Downs	This issue is covered by the Policy DC4: Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, and there is specific reference to Townscape and Landscape Policies in the supporting text.
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC45	102	3670 Support	Supported	Support for the policy is welcomed.
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC45	1572	3993 Object	Change wording to clarify	The policy rewording incorporates the changes suggested in the first and second paragraph.
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
Statement	141	3614 Support	Re Paragraph 3.191 The HA are pleased previous comments regarding transport policy have been noted. We agree that when new development occurs the transport situation should not be worsened.	The support is welcomed
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC46	1403	88 Support	In addition an adequate transport policy must look to ease congestion on the region's roads.	Our policies aim to contribute to the Regional objectives and support alternative methods of transport; however it is not realistic to seek to ease congestion on a region wide basis through the DC Policies.
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC46	146	1338 Object	There is a direct conflict between the Core Strategy and Policy DC45 and HDC is contravening its own policies.	This comment is noted and will be subject to testing at the Core Strategy Examination.

STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE
(REGULATION 28 STATEMENT)
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES

Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
			Change to the document not required - HDC just needs to follow its own policies.	
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC46	141	3615	Notes the aim to ensure sustainable transport development, and the proposed transport improvements. The HA would like to see emerging policies that minimise demand at source and require the mitigation of trunk road impacts throughout all stages of development planning, implementation and operation.	It is considered that Core Policy CP5 (Built-up Areas and Previously Developed Land) seek in some way to minimise demand by ensuring that much of the new development is accommodated in areas that have access to public transport. This LDF is just one of a number of plans that incorporate transport policies and it should not seek to replicate the policies in for example the West Sussex Local Transport Plan. We have however noted the comment and have made minor alterations to the accompanying text.
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC46	102	3671	Supported Support	The support is welcomed
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC46	1481	3856	Object Please see other responses submitted by Mr Hood	This response relates to a site specific issue and is not specifically relevant to this policy
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC46	1071	3959	Object Object to point (c) as it fails to meet tests set out in Circular 5/05 as to when contributions are appropriate, public transport will only be sought when they meet these tests. Para 3.197 - traffic management measures should only be determined by the results of a Transport Assessment.	Do not consider that an amendment to criteria 'c' is necessary as the policy does state 'appropriate provision' which will of course have to be in accordance with circular 5/05 and the SPD on Planning Obligations. However minor word change has been made which may alleviate concern. It is felt that no alteration to the text is required as a result of comments on para 3.197 as it does refer to 'appropriate' cases and we are aiming to keep the policies and text short and succinct which in turns does mean not referring to every eventuality.
DC46	1572	3994	Object Change wording to clarify	Minor changes to wording have been made which may resolve objection; however we are trying to keep our policies in a 'positive' tone.
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC46	1572	4000	Object PARA 3.196 - Change wording	The change has been incorporated
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC46	2281	4024	Object Query effectiveness of DC46 (Private Lanes), policy too generally worded	The issue of private lanes is specific to that area and is better covered by the Village Design Statement. We can not require West Sussex County Council to consult on certain issues; it is a matter between the community and that Council. It is envisaged that 'materially worsened' states similar objectives to that of part 'b' which requires development to be appropriate to the scale of the transport infrastructure.
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome

STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE
(REGULATION 28 STATEMENT)
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES

Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC47	141	3616	We note and support Policy DC 47. The HA would suggest that car parking requirements be proactively managed. Restricted parking facilities can diminish the attractiveness of private car trips and boost the viability of sustainable transport modes.	The support for the policy is welcomed.

Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC47	102	3672	Supported	The support is welcomed.

Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC47	1572	3995	Change wording to clarify Object	Have noted first comment and made minor alterations to policy. Have removed reference specifically to highways from the policy to keep it succinct. Do not intend to remove last clause as there may be need to remove a car park, this loss may be mitigated against by improvements in public transport / cycling and walking. Further wording has been added to clarify the situation.

Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC47	1572	4001	PARA 3.203 Delete the Object	This paragraph has been moved to follow the policy on Service Stations / Roadside Facilities. Although it is a County matter it is relevant to this policy.

Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC47	139	4016	Paragraph 3.203 Delete the paragraph as this is a matter for the County Council, not District Council.	Although it is a County matter it is considered that this information is relevant to this policy.

Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC48	102	3673	Supported	The support is welcomed.

Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC49	141	3617	A transport impact assessment would be required for any sites applying to become off-airport parking facilities. The LDF must incorporate policy mechanisms to minimise demand at source and require the mitigation of trunk road impacts throughout all stages of development planning, implementation and operation. If an off-airport parking development site is proposed close to the trunk road, the HA would require a joint working approach to provide a package of measures to manage demand and also provide, as a last resort, funding towards motorway and	It is felt that restricting car parking as set out in this policy is in line with the need not to undermine the sustainability policies. It is not appropriate for the District to include policies to mitigate against demand at the source as the source is outside of this District. We have included reference to transport impact assessments are requested.

STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE
(REGULATION 28 STATEMENT)
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES

Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
			trunk road infrastructure.	

Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
DC49	102	3674	Supported	The support is welcomed.
		Support		

Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
Chapter 4	1071	3961	Chapter fails to identify clear mechanisms for the monitoring of policies. It refers to indicators of the Core Strategy, this is insufficient. There should be milestones and indicators for each policy.	<p>It is felt that milestones and indicators for each of the 49 polices is an over complication for an area of the LDF that generally requires a more flexible monitoring approach. As each planning application is judged on its own merits, introducing broad-brush generalized targets/indicators is unlikely to highlight where individual policies are failing, for example a permitted application is unlikely to be in conformity with all policies. A balance between the benefits and negatives is sought though the planning process and individual circumstances will dictate the weight of individual policy in the determination of an application.</p>

The spatial monitoring systems developed to monitor the progress and effectiveness of Core Strategy and SSAL indicators against the spatial objectives of the Core Strategy relies upon the analysis of planning appeals, permissions and completions data. This system will highlight any permitted development contrary to the spatial objectives of the Core Strategy and the objectives of the SSAL, as the DC Policies are grouped under Core Strategy spatial objectives a sufficient link is provided. Should it be deemed necessary, the individual circumstance of any permission can then be analysed further to assess how policy was used and whether any policies need strengthening. It is felt this approach is better suited to the monitoring of DC policies as the breath of variety in applications cannot be adequately assessed through generalized indicators, this system will instead focus on individual applications rather than individual policies, and assess the role of policy in the determination of that application. Therefore, the monitoring procedure outlined within Chapter 4 is deemed to be sufficient.

Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
Appendix 1	1576	411	In Appendix 1 is a very useful guide for Parish Council comments on planning applications - we would like to see listed ECD1 and ECD2 indicating the new policy within the Local Development Framework - General Development Control Policies.	Appendix 2 of the Local Development Scheme sets out all the policies of the Local Plan and how they relate to Local Development Framework. Not all of the policies are to be found in the DC Policies document, as they relate to policies now found either in the Core Strategy or Site Specific Allocations of Land Development Plan Documents.

Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
Appendix 1	1572	4002	Change: The transition for all the policies of the previous plan should be included, eg CS1 to CS4, etc.	Appendix 2 of the Local Development Scheme sets out all the policies of the Local Plan and how they relate to Local Development Framework. Not all of the policies are to be found in the DCI Policies document, as they relate to

STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE
(REGULATION 28 STATEMENT)
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES

Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
			Reason: Clarification.	policies now found either in the Core Strategy or Site Specific Allocations of Land Development Plan Documents.
Policy	ID No.	Rep ID	Summary	Outcome
Appendix 1	2281	4021	A number of detailed observation submitted - see full rep	Appendix 2 of the Local Development Scheme sets out all the policies of the Local Plan and how they relate to Local Development Framework. Not all of the policies are to be found in the DC Policies document, as they relate to policies now found either in the Core Strategy or Site Specific Allocations of Land Development Plan Documents.

STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE
(REGULATION 28 STATEMENT)
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES

SECTION L: RESPONDENTS TO PREFERRED OPTIONS WITH REFERENCE NUMBER.

The following table identifies respondents to the Preferred Options

Contributor ID	Surname	Company Name
79	Anson	Sport England
89	Denman	Thakeham Parish Council
94	Aidin	Federation of Sussex Amenity Societies
102	O'Hara	North Horsham Parish Council
105	Dennison	RSPB
113	Errington	Home Builders Federation
127	Turner	Slinfold Parish Council
136	Winchester	Environment Agency
139	Locker	
141	Pratt	Highways Agency
142	Kneale	Southern Water
146	Edworthy	Denne Neighbourhood Council
157	Small	Sussex Downs Joint Committee
173	Newman	
962	Delcroix	The Countryside Agency
1035		Christs Hospital School
1071		Bellway Homes Ltd
1324	Butcher	British Horse Society
1342	Spencer	Roger Tym & Partners
1403	Carpenter	Sussex Enterprise
1405	Shaw	High Weald AONB Unit
1420	Doe	Brooks Green Park
1436	Trinick	Wiston Estate
1469	Donnelly	Saxon Weald
1481	Hood	Humberts Leisure Consulting
1517	Palmer	Horsham Society
1520	Davis	Gerry Lytle Associates Ltd
1572	Locker	Thakeham Village Action
1573	Nightingale	KLW
1574	Smith	Horsham District Council
1576	Norman	Coldwaltham Parish Council
1592	Appleshaw	
1639		Croudace Homes
1641	Griffiths	Weinerberger
1651	Bricknell	Horsham Room Trust
1654	Standfast	Saxon Weald
1776	Knight	English Nature
1784	Crawford-Clark	Henry Smith
1826	Atkinson	
1980	Mr & Mrs Searle	
1982		Hall and Woodhouse
2012	Soanne	Broadbridge Heath Football Club
2026	Potts	ITPS
2053	Dawes & Hay	
2062	Lamb	WT Lamb Holdings
2089	Brown	West Sussex County Council
2133		Crest Nicholson Developments Ltd
2259		Mobile Operators Association
2270	Doe	C/O ITPS
2281	Tanous	Heath Common Residents Association

STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE
(REGULATION 28 STATEMENT)
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES

4. CONSULTATION UNDER REGULATION 27

- 4.1 The General Development Control Policies document was submitted to the Secretary of State on the 1st September 2006, with a 6 week period for representations ending on 13th October 2006.
- 4.2 The document was available in the following locations; Horsham District Council Office, Libraries and Help Points across the District and was placed on the District Council's dedicated website.

Horsham District Council Office Park North North Street Horsham RH12 1RL		Opening hours Monday-Thursday – 8:45-5:20 Friday – 8:45-4:20 Saturday-Sunday - Closed
Billingshurst Library Mill Lane Billingshurst RH14 9JZ	Phone: 01403 783145 Fax: 01403 786817	Opening hours Monday – 9:30-1:00, 2:00-5:30 Tuesday– 9:30-1:00, 2:00-5:30 Wednesday – 9:30-1:00 Thursday – 9:30-1:00, 2:00-5:30 Friday– 9:30-1:00, 2:00-7:00 Saturday– 9:30-1:00, 2:00-5:00
Henfield Library Off High Street Henfield BN5 9HN	Phone: 01273 493587 Fax: 01273 494238	Opening hours Monday-Tuesday -10:00-1:00, 2:00-5:00 Wednesday – Closed Thursday – 10:00-1:00, 2:00-6:00 Friday - 10:00-1:00, 2:00-5:00 Saturday – 9:30-5:00
Horsham Library & Help Point Lower Tanbridge Way Horsham RH12 1PJ	Phone General Enquiries 01403 224350 Information Enquiries 01403 224355 Help Point 01403 217957	Opening hours Monday-Friday – 9:30-7:30 Saturday – 9:30-5:00
Pulborough Library Brooks Way Off Lower Street Pulborough RH20 2BP	Phone: 01798 872891 Fax: 01798 875419	Opening hours Monday – 2:00-5:00 Tuesday – 10:00-1:00, 2:00-5:00 Wednesday – Closed Thursday-Saturday – 10:00-1:00, 2:00-5:00
Steyning Library Church Street Steyning RH20 2BP	Phone: 01903 812751 Fax: 01903 816827	Opening hours Monday-Wednesday – 9:30-1:00, 2:00-5:00 Thursday – Closed Friday – 9:30-1:00, 2:00-7:00 Saturday – 9:30-1:00, 2:00-5:00
Storrington Library & Help Point Ryecroft Lane Storrington Pulborough RH20 4PA	Phone: 01903 743075 Fax: 01903 740175	Opening hours Monday – 9:30-5:00 Tuesday – 9:30-7:00 Wednesday – 9:30-1:00 Thursday – 9:30-5:00 Friday – 9:30-7:00 Saturday – 9:30-5:00


STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE
(REGULATION 28 STATEMENT)
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES

- 4.3 The document and proposals matters were available on our website www.horsham.gov.uk/strategic_planning with a statement explaining where and when paper copies of the document were available for inspection.
- 4.4 An advertisement was placed in the West Sussex County Times Newspaper on Friday 25th August 2006 to advertise the representation period on the submission General Development Control Policies document (see section M).
- 4.5 Copies of the document, along with details of where the documents were available for inspection, were sent to the organisations listed in Section N and the Parish and Neighbourhood Councils (including affected adjoining Parish Councils) in Section O

STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE
(REGULATION 28 STATEMENT)
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES

SECTION M: LOCAL ADVERTISEMENT

This advertisement was placed in the West Sussex County Times newspaper on Friday 25th August, 2006, to advertise consultation on the Preferred Options General Development Control Policies.



**HORSHAM DISTRICT
LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK**

Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004
The Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004

**Notice of Submission of the
Horsham District Local Development Framework
General Development Control Policies document and Proposals Map**

The Horsham District Local Development Framework (LDF) - The **General Development Control Policies** document sets out policies that reflect the vision and objectives of the Core Strategy and will be used to assist in the determination of planning applications. The **Proposals Map** of the District includes inset maps at a larger scale which identify the location of all the site and location specific policies in the Core Strategy, Site Specific Allocations of Land and General Development Control Policies Submission documents. Two background documents providing further technical information and the **Sustainability Appraisal and Strategic Environmental Assessment (SA/SEA)** of the General Development Control Policies document will also be published.

The General Development Control Policies, Proposals Map and SA/SEA documents will be submitted to the Secretary of State on Friday 1 September 2006 and from that date these documents will be subject to a six week representation period to **4.20pm on 13 October 2006**. An independent Inspector, appointed by the Secretary of State, will then consider all representations made during that period alongside the submitted documents. The Inspector will then prepare a report, which will identify any changes to be made. The report is binding on the Council. All respondents will be notified when the Inspector's Report is available. Respondents may also request to be sent notification of when the Council adopts the General Development Control Policies document and Proposals Map.

There are two ways in which representations can be submitted:

- * Electronically on the dedicated website www.horsham.gov.uk/strategic_planning; or
- * On the representation form available from the Council and sent to Strategic and Community Planning, Horsham District Council, Park North, North Street, Horsham, West Sussex RH12 1RL or fax to (01403) 215597.

Representations made on the Submission documents must relate to the 'Tests of Soundness' set out by the Government. A guide has been published entitled 'How to make effective representations' which is available from the above address, the website or at the locations below. If you find it difficult to complete the form, a member of the Strategic and Community Planning Department will be able to help on (01403) 215398.


Inspecting the documents

The Submission General Development Control Policies, Proposals Map and SA/SEA documents will be available to view on the website www.horsham.gov.uk/strategic_planning from 1 September 2006.

Hard copies of the documents; representation forms and information booklet will also be available in the following locations:

Horsham Library:	Lower Tanbridge Way, Horsham	(01403) 224350
	Opening hours: Mon-Fri 9.30am-7.30pm, Sat 9.30am-5pm.	
Billingshurst Library:	Mill Lane, Billingshurst	(01403) 783145
	Opening hours: Mon/Tues/Thurs 9.30am-5.30pm, Weds 9.30am-1pm, Fri 9.30am-7pm, Sat 9.30am-5pm. Closed every day between 1pm-2pm.	
Henfield Library:	off High Street, Henfield	(01273) 493587
	Opening hours: Mon/Tues/Fri/Sat - 10am-5pm, Weds closed, Thurs 10am-6pm. Closed every day between 1pm-2pm.	
Pulborough Library:	Brooks Way, off Lower Street, Pulborough	(01798) 872891
	Opening hours: Tues/Thurs/Fri/Sat - 10am-5pm, Weds closed, Mon 2pm-5pm. Closed every day between 1pm-2pm.	
Steyning Library:	Church Street, Steyning	(01903) 812751
	Opening hours: Mon/Tues/Weds/Sat 9.30am-5pm, Thurs closed, Fri 9.30am-7pm. Closed every day between 1pm-2pm.	
Storrington Library:	Ryecroft Lane, Storrington	(01903) 743075
	Opening hours: Mon/Thurs/Sat 9.30am-5pm, Tues/Fri 9.30am-7pm, Weds 9.30am-1pm.	

Horsham District
Local Development Framework



STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE
(REGULATION 28 STATEMENT)
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES

SECTION N: CONSULTEES (REGULATION 27)

The groups that are highlighted were sent a copy of the General Development Control Preferred Options Document.

The groups not highlighted were sent notification of and information on where to view the General Development Control Preferred Options Document.

Organisation	Name
	JAMES PROVEN MEP
	MR W H SORRELL
	SIMON J ARCH
	MR J CLARK
	RICHARD DALES
	RICHARD MAILE
	MR & MRS MORSE
	DAVID ROBINSON
	JOHN GOSS
	FRANCES MAUDE MP
	ELIZABETH LAWRENCE
	MR AND MRS B. A. TAPPY
	MR ADDEY
	NICK DANN
	T.F.B COOPER
4 SIGHT: WEST SUSSEX ASSOCIATION FOR THE BLIND	COMMUNICATIONS OFFICER
A J SALTER & SON	ALAN SALTER
ACERT	MRS M WHIFFIN (GENERAL SECRETARY)
ACTION IN RURAL SUSSEX	TERESA GITTINS
ADAMS HENDRY	DEBRA IVORY
ADAMS HENDRY	ROBERT COLLETT
ADAMS HOLMES ASSOCIATES	MR H RYATT
ADAMS HOLMES ASSOCIATES	CAROLE HAWLARK
ADUR DISTRICT COUNCIL	PETER DAVIES
ADUR, ARUN & WORTHING PRIMARY CARE TRUST	J PARSONS (SNR CONTRACTS MANAGER)
ADVERSANE RESIDENTS ASSOCIATION	MRS J. KERN
AGE CONCERN (HORSHAM)	MRS V JAMES
ALLIANCE ENVIRONMENT & PLANNING	JOY MACCOUGHLAN
ALLIED DOMEQ (SPIRITS AND WINE) UK LTD	
AMBERLEY SOCIETY	MICHAEL TOYNBEE
ANCIENT MONUMENTS SOCIETY	
ANTHONY GREENWOOD	
ANTONY BOWHILL & ASSOCIATES	
APPLIED MATERIALS	CRAIG LOWRIE
ARRIVA SOUTHERN COUNTIES	KEVIN HAWKINS
ARUN DISTRICT COUNCIL	KAREN DOWER
ASB LAW	
ASHINGTON RESIDENTS ASSOCIATION	JOHN BERRY
BARTON WILLMORE	DAVID BRADLEY
BASF PRINTING SYSTEEMS LTD	MR R B J FOXLEY
BAULCH GROUP	

STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE
(REGULATION 28 STATEMENT)
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES

Organisation	Name
BAYLEY & WILLMER	PHILLIP WILLMER
BELLWAY ESTATES	REGIONAL PLANNING MANAGER
BERKELEY HOMES (SOUTHERN) LTD	SIMON COLLINS
BERKELEY STRATEGIC LAND	ADRIAN BROWN
BEWBUSH ACTION GROUP	MRS MARILYN SIMPSON
BEWBUSH COMMUNITY FORUM	MR BILL JARVIS
BEWBUSH SCOUT GROUP	MR P TAYLOR
BIBLE SOCIETY (HORSHAM) ACTION GROUP	MRS A BENNETT
BILLINGSHURST BUSINESS ASSOCIATION	MR T ANDERSON (CHAIRMAN)
BILLINGSHURST CHAMBER OF COMMERCE	COLIN LINNEY
BLAKES FARM HOUSE	DR F J COMERFORD
BLUE SKY PLANNING	JONATHON BEST
BOVIS HOMES LTD (SOUTH EAST REGION)	
BOYER PLANNING	DAVID LANDER
BRADBURY	PETER BRADBURY
BRETT INCORPORATED	MR S BRETT
BRIGHTON & HOVE CITY COUNCIL	ALAN MCCARTHY
BRIGHTON LESBIAN & GAY SWITCHBOARD	
BRITISH HORSE SOCIETY	MRS PATRICIA BUTCHER
BRITISH WATERWAYS	
BRITISH WIND ENERGY ASSOCIATION	KATIE ADDERLEY
BROADFIELD LIBRARY (MOBILE LIBRARY ONLY)	THE LIBRARIAN
BRUTON KNOWLES	
BRYANT HOMES (WESSEX)	
BSF PLANNING CONSULTANTS	MS J TAYLOR
BT	MS SAVILE (LOCAL LINES FORCASTER)
BUCK BARN RESIDENTS ASSOCIATION	MR V RAZZELL
BUTTERFLY CONSERVATION (SUSSEX BRANCH)	DAVID BRIDGES
C B RICHARD ELLIS	
C/O HORSHAM ROOM TRUST	ANDREW GILMORE
c/o THE ENVIRONMENT	CRAWLEY ENVIRONMENT FORUM
CADIA	PETER FELTHAM
CAMPAIGN TO PROTECT RURAL ENGLAND	MS K GORDON
CARADON TREND	
CENTEX STRATEGIC LAND	ERIC WILSON
CHARLES WADEY & SONS LTD	ALAN N C WADEY
CHASE & PARTNERS	STEPHEN ROSE
CHICHESTER DISTRICT COUNCIL	KEITH MORGAN
CHRIS BLANDFORD ASSOCIATES	GEOFF SMITH
CITIZENS ADVICE BUREAU	PAUL DOLLNER
CIVIL AVIATION AUTHORITY	MRS I BAROLO
CLUTTONS	FAO HAYDN PAYNE & MALCOM CHUMBLEY
COLIN HATCHER FRICS	
COMMUNITY SAFETY BRANCH	PETER HARDY
CONNELLS	ANDY JAMES
CONNELLS LAND & PLANNING	ANDY JAMES

STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE
(REGULATION 28 STATEMENT)
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES

Organisation	Name
COUNCIL FOR BRITISH ARCHAEOLOGY	BOWES MORRELL HOUSE
COUNTRYSIDE PROPERTIES (SOUTHERN) LTD	
COUNTY FIRE HEADQUARTERS	OPERATIONAL PLANNING OFFICER
COURTLEY CONSULTANTS LTD	HOWARD COURTLEY
CPRE - HORSHAM & CRAWLEY	MR N PACKWOOD
CPRE (SUSSEX BRANCH)	MRS E BEENEY
CRAWLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL	TED BERESFORD KNOX
CREIGHTONS PLC	STEPHEN SMALLS
CRICKMAY & PARTNERS	MR T HUCKER
CROUDACE STRATEGIC LTD	PAUL LEMAR
CROWN ESTATE COMMISSIONERS	MR M J GRAVESTOCK
CSA ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING	CLIVE SELF
CUNNANE TOWN PLANNING	MR J BLACKWELL
CYCLIST TOURING CLUB	MR R NASH
D & M PLANNING PARTNERSHIP	JAYNE DEVERELL
DALIA LICHFIELD ASSOCIATES	
DALTON WARNER DAVIS	NIGEL ABBOTT
DAVID HICKEN ASSOCIATES	DAVID HICKEN
DAVID WILSON ESTATES (SOUTH EAST OFFICE)	DAVID BANFIELD
DEFENCE ESTATES	
DEFRA & RURAL TEAM (GOSE)	ANDY CHALMERS
DELUXE GLOBAL MEDIA SERVICES LTD	MIGUEL XAVIER
DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SECURITY	THE MANAGER
DIALOGUE	SEBASTIAN HANLEY
DISTRICT VALUER & VALUATION OFFICER	
DMH	TONY ALLEN
DOUGLAS BRIGGS PARTNERSHIP	LOUISE SHAW
DPDS	DIANNE BOWYER
DPDS CONSULTING GROUP	PETER THAIR / JESSE CHAPMAN
DPDS CONSULTING GROUP	DIANA BOWYER
DRIVERS JONAS	ALISON MCCUE
DTZ PIEDA CONSULTING	MARK JACKSON
DUKES OFFICES	DEREK SCOBLE RIBA CHARTERED ARCHITECT
DUNCAN O'KELLY PARTNERSHIP	DUNCAN O'KELLY
EAST SUSSEX COUNTY COUNCIL	MIKE LANGTHORNE
EDF ENERGY	JOHN PARK (NETWORKS BRANCH)
ENGLISH COURTYARDS	LYNNE BOWYER
ENGLISH HERITAGE (SOUTH EAST REGION)	STEVE WILLIAMS
ENGLISH NATURE	LOUISE HUTCHBY
ENGLISH PARTNERSHIPS	JUDITH SMALLMAN
EUROPEAN MOVEMENT (UK) THE SUSSEX BRANCH	MR S QUIGLEY
EVENING ARGUS	THE EDITOR
FAIRHOLME	JOHN CRABBE
FAIRVIEW NEW HOMES PLC	D CHURCHILL
FED OF SMALL BUSINESSES (SURREY/W SUSSEX)	MR DAVID CANNON, CHAIRMAN

STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE
(REGULATION 28 STATEMENT)
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES

Organisation	Name
FEDERATION OF SUSSEX AMENITY SOCIETIES	ANNABELLE HUGHES
FOREST ENTERPRISE	
FORESTRY COMMISSION	
FPD SAVILLS	D CRAMAND
FPD SAVILLS	JONATHON STEELE
FRIENDS, FAMILIES AND TRAVELLERS	ROB WHITEHEAD
FULLER PIEZER	
G L HEARN	ANTONIA LIU
GAAC C/O BLOOMFIELDS LTD	A P BLOOMFIELD
GATWICK AIRPORT CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE	MIKE KENDALL
GATWICK AIRPORT LTD	TIM LOCKWOOD
GEOFFREY G FRY & ASSOCIATES	G. FRY
GEORGE WIMPEY SOUTH LONDON LTD	DAVID HUGGETT
GMA PLANNING	EMMA RODLEY
GOADSBY & HARDING	PETER ATFIELD
GOVERNMENT OFFICE FOR THE SE (GOSE)	DAVID PAINE
GVA GRIMLEY	VNCENT GABBE
GYPSY COUNCIL FOR EDUCATION, CULTURE,...	MR P MERCER (PRESIDENT)
H J BURT & SON	
HAVEN PRESERVATION SOCIETY	MR N G MCLACHLAN
HBF SOUTHERN REGION	PETE ERRINGTON
HEALTH & SAFETY EXECUTIVE (HSE)	
HEATH COMMON RESIDENTS ASSOCIATION	M. J. GOULD (CHAIR)
HENRY ADAMS & PARTNERS	STEVE CULPITT
HENRY SMITH & SON	J A FARQUHAR
HEVECO MUSHROOMS LIMITED	MARK HOWARTH
HIGH WEALD AONB	ANDREW SHAW
HILL HUMBERTS LEISURE	MARTIN TAYLOR
HILLREED HOMES LTD	SIMON M POTTS
HOME COTTAGE	ROGER BLAKE
HORSHAM & CHANCTONBURY PCT (PRIMARY CARE TRUST)	ANGELA UGUR
HORSHAM & CHANCTONBURY PCT (PRIMARY CARE TRUST)	SARAH CREAMER
HORSHAM CHAMBER OF COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY	PETER BECKHAM
HORSHAM CHAMBER OF COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY (HCCI)	JACKIE WESTCOTT
HORSHAM COUNCIL FOR VOLUNTARY SERVICE	
HORSHAM FIRE STATION	DIVISIONAL COMMANDER
HORSHAM NATURAL HISTORY SOCIETY	MRS S NEELY
HORSHAM VISUALLY IMPAIRED GROUP	MRS M R DANIEL
HUMBERTS	DARREN HOOD
HUTCHINSON 3G UK LIMITED	ALASTAIR JEWELL
IFIELD VILLAGE CONS AREA ADVISORY CTTEE	JENNY FROST (SECRETARY)
ITPS	MR K POTTS

STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE
(REGULATION 28 STATEMENT)
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES

Organisation	Name
J & J DESIGN	JOHN SHEPHARD
JESTICO & WHILES	JOHN WHILES
JOHN LYTTON & CO	JOHN LYTTON
JONES DAY	ANGELA TURNER
JONES LANG LASALLE	
JOSEPH SULLIVAN & ASSOC.	JOSEPH SULLIVAN
KATE'S CAKES	TIM BREDEN
KEEP RUSPER GREEN ACTION GROUP	A S J RICE
KEMBER LOUDON WILLIAMS	MR R NIGHTINGALE
KING AND CHASEMORE	
KING STURGE	ANN BIRCHALL
KINGSFOLD RESIDENTS ASSOCIATION	JOHN CROCKFORD
LAING HOMES LTD	STRATEGIC LAND MANAGER
LANDMARK INFORMATION GROUP LTD	JAMES TIPPINS
LANGLEY LANE RESIDENTS ASSOCIATION	MARTIN MAY
LARA	MS C GARFIELD
LENNON PLANNING LTD	DES DUNLOP
LES HUMPHREY ASSOCIATES	
LIDL UK	MICHAEL NEWTON
LITTMAN & ROBESON	JOANNE PEARS
LUCAS LAND & PLANNING	STEPHEN LUCAS
MASONS	K. COOKSLEY
McCARTHY & STONE DEVELOPMENTS LTD	MICHAEL TUCKER
MENCAP SOCIETY (HORSHAM & CRAWLEY)	MR JOHN ROBINSON
MID SUSSEX BADGER PROTECTION GROUP	
MID SUSSEX DISTRICT COUNCIL	JUDITH HEWITT
MILL DENE ESTATE RESIDENTS ASSOC.	PAUL CASTLE
MILLER HUGHES ASSOCIATES	
MINISTRY OF DEFENCE	BRIAN SIMPSON
MOBILE OPERATORS ASSOCIATION C/O MONO CONSULTANTS LIMITED	NORMAN GILLIAN MRTPI
MOBILITY TRUST,SUSSEX	MR G BRIDGE
MOLE VALLEY DISTRICT COUNCIL	DISTRICT PLANNING OFFICER
MONKHOUSE & BANNISTERS	
MONTAGUE EVANS	MS K GULLETT
MORGAN COLE	DANIEL SCHARF
MUNTHAM HOME FARM	D BANKS
NATHANIEL LICHFIELD & PARTNERS	WILL EDMONDS
NATIONAL FARMERS UNION (HORSHAM & STEYNING)	JOHN GARRARD
NATIONAL FARMERS UNION (SE REGION)	MR SANDY ABBOT
NATIONAL GYPSY COUNCIL	MR H SMITH (PRESIDENT)
NATIONAL PLAYING FIELDS	RAYMOND COLE
NATIONAL TRUST	JANE ARNOTT
NETWORK RAIL	CHRIS PRICE, TOWN PLANNER
NEWFOUNDOUT PRESERVATION SOCIETY	C/O JAN O KEEFE
NHS EXECUTIVE SE	HEAD OF ESTATES
NORTH WEST SUSSEX BRIDLEWAYS	T PENDLE
NOVARTIS	
O2 UK	PETER FOSTER

STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE
(REGULATION 28 STATEMENT)
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES

Organisation	Name
ORANGE	NIALL TIPPING
ORDNANCE SURVEY SERVICES	PETER SWIFT
OSBORNE HOMES, GEOFFREY OSBORNE LTD	TONY COX
P J Smith Associates	Peter Smith
P R C	ANDY RIFLEY
PARKER DANN	MIKE PARKER
PAULA ROSA KITCHENS	PETER SPEERS
PEACOCK & SMITH	MALCOLM WALKER
PERSIMMON HOMES SOUTH EAST	PETER COURT (STRATEGIC LAND MANAGER)
PH2 PLANNING UNITED	P HODSKINSON
PLANWARE	MATTHEW CARPENTER
POST OFFICE COUNTERS LTD	DISTRICT MANAGER
POST OFFICE PROPERTY HOLDINGS	L. SIMMONS (TOWN PLANNING MANAGER)
PROPERTY ADVISORS TO THE CIVIL ESTATE	
PROPERTY CONSULTANT	PAUL NEWMAN
PULBOROUGH CHAMBER OF TRADE	TED HENNINGS
RAMBLERS ASSOCIATION	MR J SIMMONS
RAMBLERS ASSOCIATION (COUNTRYSIDE)	MR A QUINELL
RAMBLERS ASSOCIATION (SUSSEX AREA)	MR N SLOAN
RAPLEYS	AIDAN THATCHER
Rapleys LLP	Mr Aidan Thatcher
RAWLISON & BUTLER	
READY & ABLE SPORTS CLUB FOR PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES	MR T BEADLE
RH & RW CLUTTONS	TIM HUTCHINGS
RICHARD STUBBS	
RMC GROUP SERVICES LTD	DEREK WHITE
ROBERT TURLEY ASSOCIATES	FAO AMANDA BROWN
ROFFEY YOUTH CENTRE	MRS CHRISTINE FITZGERALD
ROMANY INSTITUTE	DR KENDRICK
ROUNDBOUT - TALKING NEWSPAPER FOR THE BLIND	MRS D HARTLEY
ROYAL & SUN ALLIANCE	KIERAN FLYNN
ROYAL AND SUN ALLIANCE INSURANCE	
ROYAL COMMISSION ON ENVIRONMENTAL POLLUTION	
ROYAL MAIL, BILLINGSHURST	PETER RUSSELL
RPS GROUP	DAVID CHURCHILL
RSPB	MR A COTTON
RSPCA	MR RICHARD GRAVESTOCK
RTPI	
RUDGWICK PRESERVATION SOCIETY	MR STAN SMITH
RURAL HOUSING TRUST	ANDREW SMITH
RUSPER RESIDENTS GROUP	J CHAPMAN
RUSSEL COOKE SOLICITORS	MR M MASKY
RYDON HOMES LTD	JOHN LONGHORN
SANDGATE CONSERVATION SOCIETY	D. J. FILLISTON MBE
SAVE HISTORIC PULBOROUGH	DR ANDREW TILBROOK

STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE
(REGULATION 28 STATEMENT)
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES

Organisation	Name
SCHENECTADY-BECK	BRIAN GOODCHILD
SCOTIA GAS NETWORKS (SOUTHERN GAS NETWORKS)	JOHN HEYBURN
SCOTTISH & SOUTHERN ENERGY	GEOFF FISHER
SEEDA	
SEERA	MIKE GWILLAM
SHOREHAM HERALD	MR A OLIEFF
SILVERTECH INTERNATIONAL	GORDON ELLIOTT
SMITH'S GORE	IAN SMITH
SOCIETY OF SUSSEX DOWNSMEN	THE SECRETARY
SOCIETY OF TRAVELLING PEOPLE	MR T B O'DOHERTY
SOUTH CENTRAL LTD	ROGER LANHAM
SOUTH EASTERN PLANNING SERVICES	MICHAEL GRAY
SOUTH HOLMES ESTATE RESIDENTS ASSOC.	
SOUTHERN WATER	CHRIS KNEALE
SOUTHWATER ACTION GROUP	MRS B MUNFORD
SOUTHWATER ASSOCIATION OF TRADERS	ANN SWAIN
SPORT ENGLAND (SOUTH EAST)	MICK ANSON
STAMMERHAM AMENITY ASSOCIATION	JOHN MACE
STEYNING CHAMBER OF TRADE	VAL WOOD
STEYNING SOCIETY	MR J HUNT
STORRINGTON CHAMBER OF COMMERCE	MR A BRIEN
STRATEGIC RAIL AUTHORITY	TOWN PLANNING TEAM
STRUTT & PARKER	JOHN WRIGHT
SUNLEY HOMES	
SURREY & NORTH SUSSEX BEAGLES	TOM RYAN
SURREY & SUSSEX NHS TRUST	
SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL	RICHARD EVANS
SUSSEX BAT GROUP	MS SHEILA WRIGHT
SUSSEX CLUBS FOR YOUNG PEOPLE	MR I SCOTT
SUSSEX DEAF ASSOCIATION	DOREEN MILLS
SOUTH DOWNS JOINT COMMITTEE	MARTIN SMALL
SUSSEX ENTERPRISE	BETH CARPENTER
SUSSEX GARDENS TRUST	SALLY WALKER
SUSSEX JAPAN SOCIETY	MR J SIMPSON
SUSSEX POLICE (HORSHAM)	CHIEF INSPECTOR CHAMBERS
SUSSEX POLICE HEADQUARTERS	ASSISTANT CHIEF CONSTABLE
SUSSEX WILDLIFE TRUST	JANYIS HYATT
T.P.C.	
TAYLOR WOODROW DEVELOPMENTS LTD	DAVID EDWARDS
TERENCE O'ROURKE PLC	
TESLA ENGINEERING LIMITED	DAVID CRACKNELL
TETLOW KING PLANNING	TRACY-ANN SCANLAN
THAKEHAM VILLAGE ACTION	JEAN LOCKER
THAMES WATER PROPERTY SERVICES	C/O GEORGIE COOK
THE BELL CORNWELL PARTNERSHIP	G BELL
THE BILLINGSHURST SOCIETY	MR R JORDAN
THE BLACKSMITHS ARMS	JASON HOOPER
THE CHARLES SMITH TRUST	MRS P G SIGGS

STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE
(REGULATION 28 STATEMENT)
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES

Organisation	Name
THE COLLEGE OF RICHARD COLLYER	DR J JOHNSTON
THE COUNTRYSIDE AGENCY	MARK CRESSWELL
THE EARL OF LYTTON	ESTATE OFFICE
THE ENVIRONMENT AGENCY	ANN SYMONDS
THE ENVIRONMENT AGENCY	EMMA WINCHESTER
THE ENVIRONMENT AGENCY	HAMISH WILSON
THE FEDERATION OF SUSSEX AMENITY SOCIETIES (NORTH WEST GROUP)	JANET AIDIN
THE HIGHWAYS AGENCY	HOWARD MOORE
THE HORSHAM SOCIETY	OLIVER PALMER
THE HOUSING CORPORATION	FIONA CRUICKSHANK
THE PLANNING BUREAU	Nigel Pugsley, Planning Assistant
THE PULBOROUGH SOCIETY	ROSEMARY WILSON (HON-SECRETARY)
THE RAMBLERS ASSOCIATION	
THE ROMANY GUILD	MR T LEE (GENERAL SECRETARY)
THE ROYAL AIR FORCES ASSOCIATION	AIR COMMODORE EDWARD JARRON
THE SHOWMEN'S GUILD OF GREAT BRITAIN	GEORGE IRVIN
THE SLINFOLD SOCIETY	ADRIAN SKEETS
THE WARNHAM SOCIETY	MRS M DALES
THE WIGGONHOLT ASSOCIATION	JANET AIDIN
THE WILDBROOKS SOCIETY	MR M O S HAWKINS
THE WOODLAND TRUST	TONY CHADWICK
THOMAS EGGAR	PETER BUSBY
TIDEY & WEBB LTD	
T-MOBILE	ANDREW MADDOCK
TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT	IAN JEFFREY
TRANSCO	PHIL CHALMERS
TRUFFLES	MR P R TOMPSETT
VLH ASSOCIATES	VIC HESTER
VODAFONE LIMITED	NICK GREER
W T LAMB HOLDINGS LTD	THE MANAGING DIRECTOR
WATES RESIDENTIAL	
WAVERLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL	PETER HARTLEY (PRINCIPAL PLANNER)
WEALD VALE ASSOCIATION	GWG MORFEY
WEALD VALE ASSOCIATION LTD	MR G W TRIBE
WEALDEN IRON RESEARCH GROUP	MR J S HODGKINSON, CHAIRMAN
WEATHERALL GREEN & SMITH	J MYCROFT
WEST CHILTINGTON RURAL PRES.SOC	MR G HOWELL
WEST SUSSEX ASSOCIATION FOR DISABLED PEOPLE	MRS L E WILLIAMS
WEST SUSSEX COUNTY COUNCIL	STEVE BROWN
WEST SUSSEX COUNTY TIMES	
WEST SUSSEX GAZETTE	
WEST SUSSEX INVESTMENT	MIKE COGSWELL
WESTBURY HOMES (HOLDINGS) LTD	MR PHIL HULL
WEY & ARUN CANAL TRUST LTD	
WOOLF BOND PLANNING	STEVE BROWN
WORTHING & SOUTHLANDS NHS TRUST	

STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE
(REGULATION 28 STATEMENT)
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES

Organisation	Name
WORTHING BOROUGH COUNCIL	CLARE MANGAN
WORTHING GUARDIAN	
WS PLANNING	MARGARITA BLOEM

Individual Respondents to the Preferred Options General Development Control Policies document, and those consulted as part of the additional Issues and Options consultation that do not appear on the above list have also been notified of its Submission.

STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE
(REGULATION 28 STATEMENT)
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES

SECTION O: PARISH & NEIGHBOURHOOD COUNCILS WITHIN HORSHAM

All Parish and Neighbourhood Councils were sent copies of the General Development Control Policies Submission document.

Amberley Parish Council		Mrs C Whittington, The Clerk, 4 The Willows, Amberley Road, Storrington, Pulborough, West Sussex, RH20 4RJ Email: whittingtonbuild@aol.com Tel: 01903 741014
Ashington Council	Parish	Mrs K Dare, The Clerk, Honeysuckle House, London Road, Ashington, Pulborough, West Sussex, RH20 3JR Email: karendare@tiscali.co.uk Tel: 01903 893740
Ashurst Parish Council		Mrs H Roxby, The Clerk, 4 Shooting Field, Steyning, West Sussex BN44 3RQ Email: spc@steyningcentre.fsnet.co.uk Tel: 01903 814802
Billingshurst Council	Parish	Mrs E Berry, The Clerk, Council Office, The Billingshurst Village Hall, Roman Way, Billingshurst, West Sussex, RH14 9QW Email: clerk@billingshurst.gov.uk Tel: 01403 782555
Bramber Parish Council		Mrs A Hyde, The Clerk, Briarburn, Lower Station Road, Henfield, West Sussex, BN5 9UR Email: annehyde@tiscali.co.uk Tel: 01273 491902
Broadbridge Parish Council	Heath	Mrs T Hooker, The Clerk, 2 School Close, Horsham, West Sussex, RH12 4UA Email: bbhpc@tiscali.co.uk Tel: 01403 265748
Coldwaltham Council	Parish	Mrs S Norman, The Clerk, 7 New Place Road, Pulborough, West Sussex, RH20 2JD Email: clerk.coldwalthampc@tiscali.co.uk Tel: 01798 873509
Colgate Parish Council		Mrs E Dunsbee, The Clerk, 11 Chennells Way, Horsham, West Sussex, RH12 5TW Email: colgate.parishcouncil@virgin.net Tel: 01403 269305
Cowfold Parish Council		Mrs J Wright, The Clerk, 117 Acorn Avenue, Cowfold, Horsham, West Sussex, RH13 8RT Email:
Denne Council	Neighbourhood	Mrs W Glanfield, The Clerk, 4 Coltsfoot Drive, Horsham, West Sussex, RH12 5FH Email: wendy@wenmike.fsnet.co.uk Tel: 01403 264014
Forest Council	Neighbourhood	Mrs M Vinall, The Clerk, Church View, 40 Rookwood Park, Horsham, West Sussex, RH12 1 UB Email: fnc.horsham@tesco.net Tel: 01043 269265
Henfield Parish Council		Mr P Hill, The Clerk, Henfield Hall, High Street, Henfield, West Sussex, BN5 9DB Email: office@henfield.gov.uk Tel: 01273 492507
Itchingfield Council	Parish	Mrs J Critchley, The Clerk, 33 Smugglers Way, Barns Green, Horsham, West Sussex, RH13 0PP Email: jancritchley@itchpc.freemove.co.uk Tel: 01403 731596
Lower Beeding Council	Parish	Mrs P Brown, The Clerk, 1 Patchings, Horsham, West Sussex, RH13 5HJ Email: lbpcc@tesco.net Tel: 01403 262179
North Horsham Council	Parish	Mr T O'Hara, The Clerk, Roffey Millennium Hall, Crawley Road, Horsham, West Sussex, RH12 4DT Email: parish.clerk@northhorsham-pc.gov.uk Tel: 01403 750786
Nuthurst Parish Council		Mrs T Rowe, The Clerk, 24 Heron Way, Horsham, West Sussex RH13 6DQ Email: tracyrowe@nuthurstparishcouncil.freemove.co.uk Tel: 01403 249315
Parnham Parish Council		Mrs G Rowe, The Clerk, Pine Cottage, Rackham, Pulborough, West Sussex, RH20 2EU Email: glenysrowepc@aol.com Tel: 01903 744115

STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE
(REGULATION 28 STATEMENT)
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES

Pulborough Council	Parish	Mrs L Hoff, The Clerk, Parish Council Office, Pulborough Social Centre, Swan View, Pulborough, West Sussex, RH20 2BF Email: clerk@pulboroughparishcouncil.gov.uk Tel: 01798 87532
Rudgwick Parish Council		Mrs B Kenward, The Clerk, 6 Pathfield Road, Rudgwick, Horsham, West Sussex, RH12 3HS Email: ClerkRudgwick@aol.com Tel: 01403 822678
Rusper Parish Council		Mrs C Sowden, The Clerk, Medlands, Partridge Lane, Rusper, Horsham, West Sussex, RH12 4RW Email: Claresowden@btopenworld.com Tel: 01293 871164
Shermanbury Council	Parish	Ms C Page, The Clerk, 49 Little Oak, Partridge Green, Horsham, West Sussex, RH13 8JY Email: shermanbury@hotmail.co.uk Tel: 01403 711502
Shipley Parish Council		Mrs J Nunn, The Clerk, Rosemary Cottage, Dragons Lane, Shipley, Horsham, West Sussex, RH13 8GD Email: shipley.pc@virgin.net Tel: 01403 741329
Slinfold Parish Council		Ms B Turner, The Clerk, PO Box 360, Horsham, West Sussex, RH13 5GW Email: clerk@slinfoldpc.fsnet.co.uk Tel: 01403 266768
Southwater Council	Parish	Mrs C Tobin, The Clerk, Beeson House, 26 Lintot Square, Faribank Road, Southwater, Horsham, West Sussex, RH13 9LA Email: catherine@southwater.net Tel: 01403 733202
Steyning Parish Council		Mrs L Spiers, The Clerk, The Steyning Centre, Fletchers Croft, Steyning, West Sussex, BN44 3XZ Email: clerk@steyningparishcouncil.fsnet.co.uk Tel: 01903 812042
Storrington & Sullington Parish Council		Mrs I Marshall, The Clerk, Sullington Parish Hall, Thakeham Road, Storrington, Pulborough, West Sussex, RH20 3PP Email: storringtonpc@btconnect.com Tel: 01903 746547
Thakeham Parish Council		Mr J Denman, The Clerk, Thakeham Parish Council Office, Storrington Road, Thakeham, Pulborough, West Sussex, RH13 0TR Email: clerk@thakehampc.plus.com Tel: 01798 815305
Trafalgar Neighbourhood Council		Mrs J McMillan, The Clerk, 20 Hillside, Horsham, West Sussex, RH12 1NG Email: julie.andymc@btinternet.com Tel: 01403 264302
Upper Beeding Council	Parish	Mrs I Caygill, The Clerk, Ladymeade, Hyde Street, Upper Beeding, Steyning, West Sussex, BN44 3TG Email: upperbeeding.parishcouncil@virgin.net Tel: 01903 810316
Warnham Parish Council		Mr G Benham, The Clerk, Rose Cottage, 33 Ferring Street, Ferring, Worthing, West Sussex, BN12 5JN Email: gerry@benham21.freeserve.co.uk Tel: 01903 245217
Washington Council	Parish	Mrs L Quirk, The Clerk, Oakhurst, Harbolets Road, West Chiltington, Pulborough, West Sussex, RH20 2LG Email: washingtonpc@talk21.com Tel: 01798 812332
West Chiltngton Council	Parish	Mr T Thomas, The Clerk, The Reading Room, Church Street, West Chiltington, Pulborough, West Sussex, RH20 Email: wcpcclerk@aol.com Tel: 01798 817301
West Grinstead Parish Council		Mrs H Dayneswood, The Clerk, The Parish Office, Village Hall, High Street, Partridge Green, Horsham, West Sussex, RH13 8HX Email: westgrinsteadpc@tiscali.co.uk Tel: 01403 710270
Wiston Parish Council		Mrs A Gordon-Johnson, The Clerk, Wiston Estate Office, Chanctonbury Ring Road, Wiston, Steyning, West Sussex, BN44 3EA Email: agj@ppublicns.wanadoo.co.uk Tel: 01903 812129
Woodmancote Council	Parish	Mrs C Warren, The Clerk, Tithe Barn, Brighton Road, Woodmancote, Henfield, West Sussex, BN5 9ST Email: christine@warren5116.fslife.co.uk Tel: 01273 492986

**STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE
(REGULATION 28 STATEMENT)
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES**

All adjoining Parish Councils were informed by letter of where and when the General Development Control Policies Submission document was available to view. In addition, Wisborough, Loxwood and Cranleigh Parish Councils as they potentially could be affected by policy DC46

Parish Council	Name	Position	Address1	Address 2	Address 3	Postcode
LANCING PARISH COUNCIL	MRS R J WICKENS ESQ	THE CLERK	THE PARISH HALL	SOUTH STREET, LANCING	WEST SUSSEX	BN15 8AJ
IFIELD VILLAGE CONSERVATION AREA ADVISORY CTTEE	JENNY FROST (SECRETARY)	SECRETARY	CROSSHILL	IFIELD GREEN, IFIELD	CRAWLEY	RH11 0NH
WISBOROUGH PARISH COUNCIL	MRS LOUISE DAVIES	PARISH CLERK	NINE ACRES, NEWPOUND LANE	WISBOROUGH GREEN	WEST SUSSEX	RH14 0EF
ABINGER PARISH COUNCIL	MRS D BAKER	PARISH CLERK	17 EVELYN COTTAGES, ABINGER COMMON	DORKING	SURREY	RH5 6JE
OCKLEY PARISH COUNCIL	MRS L K FLETCHER	PARISH CLERK	61 HEATH WAY	HORSHAM	WEST SUSSEX	RH12 5XF
CAPEL PARISH COUNCIL	MRS J COKE	PARISH CLERK	FIELD HOUSE, VICARAGE LANE	CAPEL	SURREY	RH5 5LN
NEWDIGATE PARISH COUNCIL	MR A R WARNER	PARISH CLERK	CHEYNE WOOD, BROAD LANE	NEWDIGATE	SURREY	RH5 5AS
CHARLWOOD PARISH COUNCIL	MRS QUANTICK	PARISH CLERK	54 LESBOURNE ROAD	REIGATE	SURREY	RH2 7LD
ALBOURNE PARISH COUNCIL	MR K ADDISON	PARISH CLERK	OAKWOOD HOUSE, THORNDAN DRIVE	WARNINGLID	WEST SUSSEX	RH17 5SX
BALCOMBE PARISH COUNCIL	MR R GRIEG	PARISH CLERK	11 FOXWELLS	BALCOMBE	WEST SUSSEX	RH17 6LZ
BOLNEY PARISH COUNCIL	JANET WRIGHT	PARISH CLERK	117 ACORN AVENUE	COWFOLD	WEST SUSSEX	RH13 8RT
CUCKFIELD RURAL PARISH COUNCIL	MRS E BENNETT	PARISH CLERK	18 LUXFORD ROAD	LINDFIELD	WEST SUSSEX	RH16 2LZ
FULKING PARISH COUNCIL	MRS S TRIST	PARISH CLERK	THE PERCH, EDBURTON ROAD	FULKING		BN5 9LP
BURY PARISH COUNCIL	MRS ALISON MILLER	PARISH CLERK	KESTERS HOUSE, THE STREET	BURY	WEST SUSSEX	RH20 1PA
FITTLEWORTH PARISH COUNCIL	MR PETER HENDERSON	PARISH CLERK	DYERS COTTAGE, LITTLE BOGNOR	FITTLEWORTH	WEST SUSSEX	RH20 1JT
LOXWOOD PARISH COUNCIL	MR PETER EVANS	PARISH CLERK	12 WEALD COURT, STATION ROAD	BILLINGSHURST	WEST SUSSEX	RH14 9RS
DUNSFOLD PARISH COUNCIL	MRS L R ENTICKNAP	PARISH CLERK	SETHERN, RAMS LANE	DUNSFOLD	SURREY	GU8 4NR
ANGMERING PARISH COUNCIL	MR R HUSKISSON	PARISH CLERK	5 ORCHARD WAY	FONTWELL	WEST SUSSEX	BN18 9AP

**STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE
(REGULATION 28 STATEMENT)
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES**

CLAPHAM PARISH COUNCIL	MRS CAROLINE TOMKINS	PARISH CLERK	7 WOODLAND CLOSE	CLAPHAM	WEST SUSSEX	BN13 3XR
FINDON PARISH COUNCIL	MRS S M BLAND	PARISH CLERK	VERONA, 4 STEEP LANE	FINDON	WEST SUSSEX	BN14 0UF
SLAUGHAM, HANDCROSS & PEASE POTTAGE PARISH COUNCIL	MR N RIGGLESWORTH	PARISH CLERK	PAGEBANK, 4 THE RISE	PARTRIDGE GREEN	WEST SUSSEX	RH13 8JD
ALFOLD PARISH COUNCIL	MRS L R ENTICKNAP	PARISH CLERK	SETHERN, RAMS LANE	DUNSFOLD	SURREY	GU8 4NR
CRANLEIGH PARISH COUNCIL	MRS P WHITEHEAD	PARISH CLERK	COUNCIL OFFICES, VILLAGE WAY	CRANLEIGH	SURREY	GU6 8AF
SOMPING PARISH COUNCIL	MRS KATE RHODES	CLERK	101 ALDSWORTH AVENUE	GORING BY SEA	WEST SUSSEX	BN12 4UT
STOPHAM PARISH MEETING	COL SIR BRIAN BARTTELOT	CHAIRMAN	STOPHAM PARK	STOPHAM	WEST SUSSEX	RH20 1EB
BURPHAM PARISH MEETING	MR W AUSTIN		THE GRANARY, WEPHAM	BURPHAM	WEST SUSSEX	BN18 9RQ
HOUGHTON PARISH MEETING	MR P LOOKER		MARSH ACRES, SOUTH LANE	HOUGHTON	ARUNDEL	BN18 9LN
PATCHING PARISH COUNCIL	CLLR R METCALFE		GREEN OAK HOUSE, COLDHARBOUR LANE	PATCHING	WEST SUSSEX	BN13 3XE
SOUTH STOKE PARISH MEETING	MR RYAN HAYDON		ORCHARD COTTAGE	OFFHAM FARM, ARUNDEL	WEST SUSSEX	BN18 9DP
COOMBES PARISH MEETING	MISS J PASSMORE		CHURCH FARM, COOMBES	LANCING	WEST SUSSEX	BN15 0RS