

**PLANNING
FOR OUR FUTURE**



**HORSHAM DISTRICT
LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK**

**HORSHAM DISTRICT
LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK
TO 2018**

Consultation Statement

on the

**Land West of Horsham Masterplan
Supplementary Planning Document**

October 2008

This document can be made available in large print or as audio tape on request. Please call (01403) 215549.

**Land West of Horsham Masterplan
Supplementary Planning Document**

CONSULTATION STATEMENT

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

Part A - Consultation on the Land West of Horsham Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)

The aim of the stakeholder consultation process has been to involve the right people with the right expertise at the right time. As a result, a number of stakeholders (e.g. community representatives, infrastructure providers and experts in various issues) have been involved throughout the development of the Masterplan and others have been invited to take part as and when a particular issue is discussed.

In addition, large-scale public consultation has taken place throughout the preparation of the Masterplan through the use of public exhibitions, the publication of documents, use of the Internet and press and the continuous availability of officers to attend meetings and be available to answer queries.

Pre-production Consultation

Pre-production consultation has been on-going since August 2005. In part this has been focussed on the production of the West of Horsham strategic allocation policy within the Core Strategy. However, from March 2006, specific consultation, on the evolving Masterplan and on matters to be included within the SPD, has been conducted by the Council.

The following stakeholder and public events were held to consult on the Masterplan at the Pre-production stage:

- 20th March 2006 – “Visions and Opportunities” a workshop for key stakeholders to discuss the site context, constraints and opportunities
- 6th May 2006 – A collaborative design solutions event for key stakeholders and technical advisers
- 20th May 2006 – A public exhibition at Tanbridge School was held, following an extensive local advertising campaign

The list of attendees of the above stakeholder events and the main outcomes of all three events can be found in the [Stage One Engagement Report](#) which was placed on the Council’s website in July 2006.

Further pre-production consultation events were held in autumn 2006:

- 4th October 2006 – A day of workshop and meetings for technical officers and stakeholders was held, focussing on the community and environmental aspects of the Masterplan
- 31st October 2006 – A guided tour of recent urban extensions was conducted for Council Members and relevant Parish/Neighbourhood Councillors

- 22nd November 2006 – A transport stakeholders consultation event was held with a presentation, workshops and exhibition
- 30th November 2006 A community and leisure stakeholders consultation event was held with a presentation, workshops and an exhibition

Details of the attendees at both of the November 2006 events and summaries of the outcomes can be found in the [Stakeholders Consultation Report](#) which was placed on the Council's website in December 2006.

Two standing stakeholder groups were also established to help guide the Council in its production of the draft SPD and subsequently the final SPD:

- June 2006 onwards – Technical Officers Working Group including relevant Horsham District and West Sussex County Council officers as well as officers from other relevant authorities and infrastructure providers when necessary. This group, and its constituent issue specific sub-groups, has met as and when required.
- March 2007 onwards – Reference Group consisting of key community and political representatives. This group has met monthly. The [terms of reference](#) and the composition of this group may be found on the Council's website.

A presentation on the draft Masterplan SPD was taken to a special (closed) session of the full Council for consultation on the 1st August 2007. On the 11th September 2007 the draft SPD was taken for approval to full Council.

Public Consultation on the Draft SPD

Following approval by the Council on the 11th September, the draft SPD was published on 24th September 2007. This publication was advertised on the Council's website and also in local newspapers (a [copy of the newspaper advert](#) was placed on the website). There was a six week public consultation period where formal representations could be received between 24th September and 5th November 2007.

The following documents were available for public consultation:

- The Land West of Horsham Masterplan Draft SPD
- The Draft Sustainability Appraisal/Strategic and Environmental Assessment (SA/SEA)
- Representation forms detailing the consultation procedures

The documents were made available on the Council's website and with hard copies at the following locations:

- **Horsham District Council Offices**, Park North, North Street, Horsham, West Sussex (8.54-5.20pm Monday – Thursday and 8.45 – 4.20pm on Friday)
- **Horsham Library**, Lower Tanbridge Way, Horsham
- **Southwater Library**, Lintot Square, Southwater
- **Storrington Library**, Ryecroft Lane, Storrington

In addition the following background documents were made available on the Council's website and/or at the District Council offices in Horsham:

- Employment and Business Opportunities Background Paper
- Sustainable Development Background Paper

- Affordable Housing Provision Background Paper
- The Stage One Engagement Report and Stakeholders' Consultation Report (see above)
- Ecological Surveys of land west of Horsham and Land South of Broadbridge Heath
- The Site Archaeological Survey
- The West of Horsham Strategic Location Highways and Transport Feasibility Study (Nov, 2004)
- West of Horsham & Broadbridge Heath: Traffic Parameters and Highway Impact Scoping Note (June 2006)
- West Horsham and Broadbridge Heath: Technical Note - Traffic Impact on the Strategic Highways Network (May 2006)
- West of Horsham Bus Strategy (May 2006)

There were a number of public exhibitions held on both the Broadbridge Heath and Denne side of the development. These included:

- 10th October - Shelly Primary School Broadbridge Heath 4.00pm – 7.00pm
- 12th October - Broadbridge Heath Leisure Centre 12.00pm – 6.00pm
- 13th October - Broadbridge Heath Village Hall 10.00pm – 4.00pm
- 17th October - Peter's Hall, Needles Estate 4.00pm - 7.30pm
- 15th – 26th October – Unstaffed exhibition at Horsham Library

In addition the following consultation event was held for community and technical stakeholders:

- 16th October 2007 - Housing, Community Facilities, Sustainable Construction including a presentation on the draft SPD and exhibition and issue based workshops

Further Consultation

Since the end of the period of public consultation, the Council has sought to keep key stakeholders closely involved with the process of developing the final Masterplan. The following consultation has occurred in this period:

- The Reference Group and the Technical Officers Working Group (and sub-groups) have continued to meet regularly to discuss the outcomes of the consultation on the draft SPD and the production of the final Masterplan
- On 11th March, 27th March and 14th May 2008 formal and informal meetings were held for District Council Members to both keep them informed of progress and seek their input on key aspects of the Masterplan.
- On 23rd September 2008 the completed draft of the final Masterplan was taken to the Strategic Planning Advisory Group for comment. This group is the advisory body for the Cabinet Member for Strategic Planning

The final Masterplan SPD was presented to a meeting of Council for approval on 8th October for adoption and publication on 31st October 2008.

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

N.B. The Chapter references are to the draft SPD which remains available on the Council's website.

Chapter 1: Introduction

There were 6 representations made on the introduction. There was support for the principles in the introduction, especially where it is stated that development should not have a negative impact on the existing local infrastructure, services or facilities. Sport England was particularly concerned to ensure that new sports and recreational facilities are provided to meet the needs of new residents without impacting on existing residents. The County Council Children and Young People's Services was concerned to ensure that the development would not have a negative impact on educational provision for young children and on provision for youth facilities and community sports facilities in general.

One consultee commented that the area of land including the Leisure Centre, Tesco and other uses (known as 'the Quadrant') should have been included in the Masterplan as it is considered that this site will play a key role in serving the community.

Three respondents used representations on this Chapter to express a preference for the Alternative Option, with two citing the traffic implications of Option 1 as the primary reason.

How issues were addressed

The SPD will cover the need for the new development to avoid a negative impact on existing infrastructure and provision and set out the need for new infrastructure and facilities to ensure that the level of provision is maintained. Infrastructure as well as education, sport and leisure facilities will be provided to meet the needs of the new residents so as to also benefit the existing community.

The final Masterplan will refer to the Broadbridge Heath Retail Park and other land uses in the Quadrant in terms of the context of the developments site. However, these areas lie outside of the Core Strategy Policy CP7 area and cannot therefore be formally included within the scope of the Masterplan.

Issues relating to traffic management are covered under Chapters 4 and 5 below.

Chapter 2: Visions for development and role of the Masterplan

One consultee believed that west of Horsham should be designed within the broader Gatwick sub region in mind and should incorporate the necessary infrastructure to ensure wider sustainability objectives are met including where necessary financial contributions towards infrastructure improvements around the employment hub of Crawley.

Two further respondents supported the Chapter including the intention to ensure adequate educational provision for the new communities and also the vision for a development in which leisure and recreation acts as a focal point for both new and wider communities of Broadbridge Heath and Horsham.

How issues were addressed

The issue of financial contributions to the Highways Agency for mitigation of the wider transport infrastructure is being considered in relation to the overall package of infrastructure and mitigation measures that the development will need to fund. Whether this particular contribution will be paid and the level of the contribution is beyond the scope of the SPD and will be negotiated at planning application stage.

Chapter 3: Site Description

There were concerns from one consultee over the description of the ecology of the site and the possible impact of the developments on the landscape. It was argued that there should be more account taken of the existing wildlife corridors.

How issues were addressed

Ecological surveys have been carried out on the development site. The surveys have identified areas of ecological interest. Where possible, the areas that have been identified as areas of high ecological value will be retained and where possible enhanced as part of the development. This includes important hedgerows and areas which contain important mature trees. Important wildlife corridors will have the potential to support a number of protected species. These areas could be used if any relocation of habitats needs to take place due to development on the site. The existing wildlife corridors will be retained wherever possible as part of the development.

Chapter 3: Services and Facilities

It was considered in one representation that the whole of the floodplain, including the Riverside Walk along the banks of Boldings Brook and the River Arun, should be classified as an area of nature conservation importance in order to protect the unique ecology of the area.

How issues were addressed

The SPD will require the development to take into account the Green Networks that are designed to protect and enhance the site. They are also designed to enable people within the development to be in easy reach of open and green spaces. The area along Boldings Brook and the River Arun could potentially be designated as a local nature reserve pending any additional work to be carried out on the viability of the proposal for a more formal nature protection designation. However, the designation of a local nature reserve will not be formally proposed within the SPD.

Chapter 3: Population

No representations were received.

Chapter 3: House Prices

No representations were received.

Chapter 3: Constraints/Opportunities

Gas pipeline – One representation argued that the new development's proximity to the gas pipeline would represent an unacceptable hazard due to the risk of explosion or sabotage.

How issues were addressed

The Council has taken the best possible advice on the risk presented by the gas pipelines from their operator (Southern Gas Networks) and set out in the draft SPD the relevant restrictions that will be applied. These are still considered to be the most appropriate in this case and will be restated in the final Masterplan.

Horsham Sewage Works Odour – Several representations were supportive of the coverage of the odour issue in the draft SPD, although amendments were requested. Southern Water (SW) suggested that reference to the 600m consultation zone should be clarified, as should the impression in the text that SW were leading the feasibility study which was not in fact the case. There was also a need to clarify the remit of the SW study mentioned in Paragraph 3.14. SW's main concern was to make explicit the message that any upgrading of the sewage treatment works should be funded by planning gain, as SW's capital investment could not be guaranteed to cover this project. This point was disputed in the representation by Berkeley Strategic which pointed to the existing odour problems in western Horsham and argued that a major part of the funding should come from SW. They also argued that the area of informal open space indicated on both option masterplans was not required by the PPG 17 Assessment and should be made available for development.

Three further consultees raised the odour issue with a common thread being the need for the SPD to ensure that the existing odour problem is dealt with as well as that for the new development. One representation claimed that the odour zone extended up to 1.2 km from the treatment plant.

How issues were addressed

The sewage treatment works will have remediation works undertaken to decrease the existing odour zone. SW is submitting a bid for further funding for this project that reflects the existing problem. There will be the capacity within the sewage treatment works for the proposed increase in dwellings using this sewage works. The land shown as informal open space will be shown in the eastern side of the development will be shown as residential in the final Masterplan.

Flooding – A range of comments were made, with those from the Environment Agency being supportive of the approach, albeit highlighting the need to refer to all types of flooding including overland flow rates and the affects of infrastructure failure. The Environment Agency also sought the retention, with appropriate buffering, of all the minor water courses on site.

Other comments took issue with the draft SPD. Berkeley Strategic thought that the text, referring to 1 in 100 year flood levels with 20% allowance for climate change, was inconsistent with what was shown on the two masterplans which was based on the 1 in 1000 year floodplain. It was also thought that the outcomes of the detailed floodplain modelling study being undertaken would show the floodplain to be smaller in extent than was shown in the draft SPD Masterplan.

Other consultees sought clarification on several aspects of the text in addition to seeking a requirement for sufficient balancing ponds for the site and a commitment to preserve the old floodgates for their historic value. Two respondents thought that the draft SPD had failed to set out sufficient safeguards to avoid the new developments causing additional or exacerbated flooding in the future.

How issues were addressed

The definition of the floodplain to be indicated on the final Masterplan will be based on the 1 in 1,000 year floodplain. The text has also been checked for any inconsistency in definition and has been amended to reflect the concerns of the Environment Agency. The other requested clarifications have been carried out. At this stage, the location of the old floodgates has not been included on the Masterplan as the Council would require more information on the whereabouts of this feature which was not referred to in the site archaeology report (see below). The need for balancing ponds (and wider sustainable urban drainage systems) has been included

in the text. The Council has worked closely with the Environment Agency as well as the developers to ensure that sufficient safeguards will be put in place to avoid flooding and these parties are agreed that the approach set out in the final Masterplan are the most appropriate.

Ecology of the Area – Two consultees made detailed representations on the need to fully consider the site’s ecology. The Woodland Trust sought the careful retention of all ancient woodland and veteran tree specimens with the early identification of important sites and individual specimens to be retained. It was thought that more consideration was also needed of the impact of the development on the interconnected habitat networks in the area and the adjacent and nearby woodlands that might be subjected to increased pressure. The second respondent questioned how complete the ecological surveys were and the level of information about these that was available to the public. They also sought further commitments to preserve existing grasslands, woods and scrubs.

How issues were addressed

The site will, where possible, retain the existing woodland and other important ecological features. The final SPD sets out the need for the developers to carefully plan for the retention of important features, both for their ecological value and to enhance the amenity value to residents. This will include the need to protect ancient woodland and to conserve the ecological value of High Wood Hill. The ecology surveys were provided in summary on the Council’s website and the full versions are available for inspection at the offices of the Council. Before commencing development on-site, detailed ecological and habitat surveys will be required to ensure that important features can be preserved and protected species can be relocated if required.

Areas of Archaeological Interest - A number of comments were made by the County Archaeologist. These highlighted the need for care in developing areas around identified sites. The comments also expressed a need for the importance of cultural heritage to be included as part of the development. Mitigation measures were proposed. It was also stressed that some additional locations of possible, though as yet untested, archaeological interest have been identified. Further information on these locations was sought.

How issues were addressed

The Council has an agreed position with the County Archaeologist that where it is not possible or appropriate to preserve historic features in situ, they will be comprehensively recorded prior to any development work on site. The detailed planning applications will be required to include a proposed archaeological preservation and mitigation strategy for the Masterplan area that will need to be agreed with the Council and County Archaeologist.

Chapter 4: Why two Masterplan approaches?

One representation did not support the principle of a new grade-separated junction on the A24 and suggested that the need for the new east-west road to rise to around 7 metres above ground level will cause considerable visual intrusion and significantly increase the urban appearance of the southern edge of the new development. Furthermore, the very tight space on the east side of the new A24 junction as the road descends again was thought to cause considerable design problems which would compromise the overall appearance of the development and be visually intrusive. There were also concerns that the junction will create significant visual intrusion into High Wood Hill.

How Issues were addressed

The possibility of delivering the development using an at-grade junction has been exhaustively explored, but as a result of fundamental Highway Authority objections, this approach has had to be ruled out. The junction design that is proposed in the final Masterplan has been fully tested and has been approved by the Highway Authority. It has been designed sensitively to minimise any impact on High Wood Hill and the overall landscape and character of the area, whilst still meeting the relevant highway and safety standards.

Chapter 4: Common elements to the Preferred Approach and Alternative Approach

Many of the common elements outlined in this section were supported. There was approval for the commitment to deliver a mix of housing types particularly smaller homes. There was also approval for the 40% affordable housing target. Three consultees supported the comprehensive bus strategy, with one requesting that the new buses serve the existing Broadbridge Heath Retail Park. There was also support for the recognition of the need for traffic calming on the Billingshurst Road in Broadbridge Heath although one consultee commented that this aspect should receive a higher priority to ensure it was not forgotten. Another consultee requested that traffic calming measures avoid speed humps which can cause problems for bus services and discomfort for passengers. Chicanes were suggested as an alternative.

The commitment to retain both Mill Lane and Old Wickhurst Lane also attracted support, although there was a request that Old Wickhurst Lane should be upgraded to a public bridleway to confirm right of way for cyclists and equestrians. Another consultee requested the retention of the Mill Pond for its historic and amenity value.

Two elements attracted objections. The first was the suggestion that Mill House could be identified for use as a pub which was thought to represent an over commercialisation of this rural feature. The second was a general objection to the need for new roads south of the existing areas of Broadbridge Heath. This consultee pointed to the likely increase in traffic noise and pollution that would result.

How Issues were addressed

The final Masterplan does not have the section titled 'Common Elements' as there is only one Masterplan within the final SPD.

There will be a separate consultation on traffic management measures along Billingshurst Road once the SPD has been adopted.

The east – west link road will have a buffer between the carriageway and the residential dwellings to assist with noise attenuation. The Council is putting a great priority into the promotion of travel by non-car modes so as to reduce the level of traffic generated by the new developments. The new bus service will be an intrinsic part of this approach, although the possibility of linking the service to the Broadbridge Heath Retail Park will need to be a matter of negotiation between the bus operators and the developers at the planning application stage as the SPD is not designed to set out the detailed route for this service.

The final Masterplan has been amended to reflect the need to secure the use of Old Wickhurst Lane by equestrians and cyclists. There are no proposals for the Mill Pond, which lies outside the CP7 area. The pub/restaurant will be located within the new village centre at Broadbridge Heath, as requested, as opposed to being located at Mill Cottage.

Chapter 4: Preferred Approach Masterplan

There were a number of comments made on the preferred approach. This incorporated an approximately equal mix of support and objection to certain aspects of the draft Masterplan and to the preferred option as a whole.

The main reason for support for the preferred approach was the lack of a barrier between the existing and the new development and the separation of through traffic from local traffic within the development achieved by re-routing the majority of traffic to the south of the development. This was thought to create a quieter environment and allow for the existing and new communities to integrate more successfully. Option 1 was also thought to result in an A24 junction that would be better able to cope with future traffic growth.

Objections raised included concerns over the dual carriageway cutting through the new development and creating unacceptable levels of noise within the development itself. Option 1 was also thought likely to increase the levels of traffic travelling through Broadbridge Heath, particularly on the Billingshurst Road, due to the increased journey times that would be caused by the new road layout. A number of consultees thought that high levels of traffic calming would be essential on this route. There were also concerns that the severance of the existing A264 would result in increased rat-running through Warnham village and possibly other rural areas. In addition, one objector was concerned about the loss of passing trade for the Broadbridge Heath Retail Park.

Several consultees objected to one or more aspects of the preferred approach whilst supporting it as a whole. One of these wished to see the southern dual carriageway designed more as a 'high street' in the way that Option 2 had envisaged. The straight line indicated for this road caused concerns as it was thought to encourage higher traffic speeds which would require a good deal of noise attenuation. Two respondents thought that crossings over this road at Mill Lane and Old Wickhurst Lane would need to be wide and open underpasses to allow safe crossings. An underpass was also considered the best crossing option for the A24 at the new junction.

Regarding the land to the east of the A24, there were concerns over how integration would be achieved between Horsham and the new development. It was thought that directing all vehicular traffic out onto the A24 would be to the detriment of the vitality of Horsham town centre. A second consultee requested that the Masterplan show clearly that access through Henderson Way would provide an emergency route for people from the new development. This representation also called for the new community building and sports pitches east of the A24 to be relocated closer to the road connecting the two halves of the developments and to be orientated to exploit the waterfront potential.

There was some concern over the potential loss of the tranquil and rural character of the riverside walk areas east of the A24. One consultee called for the Masterplan to resist any 'urbanising' influences such as tarmac paths or formal children's play areas. Two responses called for any bridges required to be clear span so as to avoid contributing to flooding or providing obstructions to the river flow. These bridges should also continue to allow the floodplain to act as a wildlife corridor.

Two respondents were concerned to see that no land had been identified for the expansion of Tanbridge House School. However, the County Council welcomed the reference to an extension of the school and suggested that this should amount to one

hectare. This was thought to be best located to the south of the school and should be in an area that benefit from suitable drainage to be used all year round. The County considered that reference should have been made to their detailed feasibility study on the extension of the school. However, another commentator expressed concerns over the extension/relocation of Tanbridge House School as it was considered that this is a 'District facility' and should not be provided as part of the development.

Several comments related other aspect of the Masterplan for the land west of the A24. One argued for four rather than three hectares of sports pitches to be indicated west of the A24. Another suggested that the Broadbridge Heath village community building would need expanding and that the Sea Cadets should be relocated elsewhere to give other local groups more space. This respondent thought that the planned new community centre for the developments should be split either side of the relocated Shelley Primary School.

There was concern raised that the preferred approach would result in new housing abutting the existing settlement of Broadbridge Heath to the detriment of existing views into the open countryside. The preferred approach was nevertheless considered to be desirable for this consultee as the traffic would be reduced for the existing dwellings to the north of the Broadbridge Heath Bypass.

It was considered by one respondent that the Masterplan should show the land to the south of the Broadbridge Heath bypass near to the high pressure gas pipeline as an area for a mixed use of residential and open space. An area for a youth facility was thought to be better located nearer to the central part of the new neighbourhood to make it accessible to all.

Two general issues were commented on in this part of the SPD. There are concerns with the sustainability of the travel patterns residents of the new development will create. It was considered that a large proportion of the development will be commuting out of the development to work in locations such as Crawley and it is therefore considered that a more focused sustainability approach was needed.

Sport England objected to the location of the playing fields shown on the west of the A24. They believed that the location of the sports facilities should, where possible, be clustered together to create a sports hub. This would be more beneficial in terms of management and economies of scale for supporting infrastructure, such as parking and changing facilities. They also considered that the extension of sports facilities at Tanbridge House School should result in opportunities for use by community groups.

How the Issues were addressed

The final Masterplan is based on the preferred approach. The east – west link road will have a 40mph speed limit and therefore some of the concerns raised regarding speed and noise will have been alleviated. A separate consultation will be held on traffic management through the village of Broadbridge Heath after the adoption of the Masterplan SPD. The final Masterplan will set out the need for safe crossings of the southern dual carriageway at Mill Lane and Old Wickhurst Lane which will help to ensure that the southernmost area of development is not isolated from the new community north of the dual carriageway. An underpass crossing is not likely to be practical here, nor under the A24, due to the width of the roads and bunds. However, the form of the crossings, including that over the A24 at the new junction, will be determined at the planning application stage.

The integration of the development east of the A24 with Horsham will be ensured through a comprehensive approach that will maximise accessibility through non-car

modes of travel. Several new pedestrian and cycle links will be created, including into Henderson Way, and the new bus service will be routed through to central Horsham via Hills Farm Lane. Emergency access for the development will be secured via a bridge over the river as it was not practicable to use Henderson way for this purpose. The priority for the Council in this aspect is to ensure that the new bus service is frequent and attractive enough to offer a genuine alternative to the car that will help to ensure that Horsham town centre benefits from the custom created by the new development.

The Council has taken the need to protect the tranquil and natural character of the River Arun floodplain into consideration when preparing the Masterplan. Although new bridges will be required, the advice of the Environment Agency will be heeded regarding the form of bridge that will have the least impact on the hydrology and ecology of the area. Amendments have been made to the Masterplan in respect of the location and orientation of the new community building east of the A24 to take Denne Neighbourhood Councils comments into account.

Consideration of the comments made by the County Council and others has led to the extensions of Tanbridge House School being indicated on the final Masterplan with an area of one hectare.

West of the A24, reference is made for the need to improve and expand the Broadbridge Heath Village Centre building and the location and size of the new Shelley Primary School is shown as required by the County Council. Further consultation with Broadbridge Heath Parish Council since the publication of the Draft SPD has resulted in an agreement that the new community centre should not be split either side of the new School. This is to ensure that the centre retains a congruence and identity and that it relates well to both the new community and to the existing development.

The concerns regarding the loss of countryside views were noted. However, the development shown on the final Masterplan has been designed to both ensure maximum integration between the new and old communities as well as minimising the impact on the existing residential areas of Broadbridge Heath. The area of land immediately south of the existing A264 is shown as open space and cannot be shown as residential development within the final Masterplan due to the gas main easement present on this part of the site. The youth facilities will be located near to the new A24 junction within the new village centre.

Reflecting the wishes of a number of consultees, including Sport England, the three hectares of sports pitches west of the A24 will be shown adjacent to the Broadbridge Heath Leisure Centre.

Concerns regarding the need for sustainable transport options have been reflected in the strong requirements within the SPD for a high quality new bus service that will connect well to Horsham Station. In addition, the maximum possible emphasis is being placed on creating opportunities for travel by cycle and by foot within and beyond the new development.

Chapter 4: Alternative Approach Masterplan

WSP on behalf of Countryside made a detailed representation in support of Option 2 and objecting to Option 1. One of the factors covered was highway safety which was considered to be more successfully achieved under the Alternative Approach according to the Stage One Highway Safety Audit. In addition, the Alternative Approach was considered to be fully deliverable whereas the Preferred Approach

was dependent on the use of third party land that had not yet been secured. A further point made concerned the level of additional rat-running through Broadbridge Heath that would be caused by the new development. This was argued to be less under Option 2 due to the use of two east-west routes for through traffic, including the downgraded bypass. Finally, this representation suggested that the quality of the overall urban design would be higher under Option 2 due to the absence of a dual-carriageway and noise buffering which was considered to act as a barrier and was thought unlikely to have an attractive street frontage compared to the two Option 2 east-west links which would be designed with a 'high street' character.

Several other respondents also supported Option 2. Their arguments predominately concerned the likelihood that the closure of the existing Broadbridge Heath bypass would increase the rat-running through the village whereas Option 2 would provide more choice for through traffic, especially that coming from the A281. One of these consultees also drew attention to the need for Option 1 to use third-party land and the likely greater cost of this Option.

A number of objections were raised to the alternative approach in this part of the draft SPD. These were mainly on the basis that it would provide for poor integration between the existing community and the new development and also that Option 2 would provide insufficient separation of local and through traffic. Further objections to the Alternative Approach centred on the bisection of the new primary school catchment area by the downgraded bypass. This was thought by two consultees, including the County Council, to be likely to cause safety problems for children and an increase in the level of children being driven short distances to school.

An objection was raised by the Environment Agency as they wished to see further detailed work that demonstrated that the proposed Fire Station is located outside of the 1 in 1000 year floodplain.

In addition there was support for commitments in the draft SPD to require safe crossings for pedestrians any cyclists and for the emphasis on creating a network of safe cycling routes within the new development and between it and existing built up areas.

How the issues were addressed

The alternative approach will not be included in the final Masterplan. Therefore, many of the issues raised in the representations on this section of the draft SPD have been dealt with. In continuing to pursue Option 1, the Council has been very careful to ensure that the major concerns raised regarding this option can be adequately and appropriately addressed. The new road layout and A24 junction have been subjected to on-going and in-depth safety testing and have been shown to meet the Highway Authority's safety standards and criteria. In addition, the Council will be requiring a robust and comprehensive package of traffic management measures that will be subject to separate community consultation. Further work has been done also to ensure that the third-party land required to deliver Option 1 is capable of being secured. Finally, the Council does not accept that the road layout planned within Option 1 will lead to a lower quality of urban design. The Design Principles and Character Areas SPD that will accompany the Masterplan will set out clear requirements for design that will seek to ensure that a high quality of development is achieved. This design will make the best of the potential to separate local and through traffic to ensure that the development integrates well with Broadbridge Heath and creates an attractive and people-friendly community.

Detailed modelling of the floodplain is ongoing. It may be necessary to remodel part of the floodplain to ensure that it does not include the fire station site. This work will be checked and signed off by the Environment Agency.

Chapter 5: Alternative Approaches

An objection was raised over the lack of reference to Newbridge Nurseries within the draft Masterplan. It was thought that this feature should be identified along with land adjacent for its expansion.

Support was given for 'two new communities' approach outlined and for the objective to integrate the new development on the Broadbridge Heath side with the existing community.

How the Issues were addressed

Newbridge Nurseries is referred to as an existing well established business within the development area. The west of Horsham development includes the expansion of two communities, one to the east of the A24 and the other to the south of Broadbridge Heath as part of a comprehensive development. The integration of the new development with the adjacent existing communities together with links between the communities are addressed in the Masterplan. These linkages include the provision of good quality, attractive and appropriate physical linkages but it also seeks to provide appropriately located facilities that help to foster the social links that are essential in facilitating community cohesion.

Chapter 5: Addressing the Principles of Development – The Options Available

No representations were received.

Chapter 5: First Principle Integration and Sense of Community

There were a number of representations made in support of the 'two communities approach' with integration between the existing and new communities on each side of the A24. One consultee argued for the inclusion of the 'Quadrant' area within the policy area. This was thought to strengthen the integration of new and existing developments and to help foster a sense of community.

The County Council supported the need to follow a 'two communities approach' overall, although several suggestions were made to improve the Masterplan. One centred on the synthetic turf pitch located at Tanbridge House School that was effectively part of the Broadbridge Heath Leisure Centre's sports provision. There was concern that the expansion of the Leisure Centre west of the A24 would serve to isolate this facility and it was suggested that other facilities should be located on the School site to draw together the provision east of the A24. In addition, a request was made for the provision of a range of supported housing units for people with physical and mental health needs. Evidence was set out on the representation to justify this requirement as part of the affordable housing provision. Finally, there was a request to ensure that the design of the new development considered and related to 'The Design Principles' published by the West Sussex Design Commission in March 2007.

How the Issues were addressed

After considering the consultation responses, the Council has decided, to follow the 'two communities approach' in the final Masterplan. However, this will not include the 'Quadrant' as this area is outside the CP7 policy area and is not within the remit of the SPD to cover beyond its overall relationship to the main development area.

The final Masterplan does not include leisure centre facilities east of the A24. It follows the advice of Sport England (see above) that a single 'sports hub' south of the

existing Leisure Centre has strong advantages in terms of sharing of resources and reducing the number of journeys.

The evidence provided regarding the need for supported housing has been considered and, after further work to show how these could be provided and the appropriate level for this development, the supported housing requirements are referred to in the final SPD and in the supporting document on affordable housing provision.

The production of the Design Principles and Character Areas SPD, which will accompany the final Masterplan considers the recommendations of the West Sussex Design Commission. Accordingly this document has influenced the section of the Masterplan that covers design issues.

Chapter 5: Second and Third Principle – Highway Network

There were a number of objections and supports for the preferred highways network.

The main reasons for supporting the second and third principle were based on the need to minimise the impact of the development on the existing highway network, separating local and through traffic and integrating the new development with the existing Broadbridge Heath community. It was also thought that the infrastructure should make the development accessible for a range of transport modes. One consultee specifically supported the downgrading of the existing A264 in order to allow enhanced pedestrian, cycle and bus access to Broadbridge Heath Retail Park. Another supported the principles whilst considering the list of 'pros and cons' within Table 5.1 to be incomplete.

A number of objections were raised to these principles, particularly by the County Council which considered that the Preferred Option could not be safely delivered unless the southern slip roads of Farthings Hill junction were closed and unless it was demonstrated that the junction design would allow sufficient capacity for future traffic flows and for the growth of non-car modes of travel. Nevertheless, it was thought that the concerns raised could be addressed in order to achieve a safe and satisfactory solution but that would require further work including: an agreed modelling methodology; detailed junction analysis; a detailed strategy for non-car modes of travel and; further safety and design audits.

The County Council also considered that the draft SPD lacked clarity over the bus strategy proposed and over the forms of transport that were proposed to be permitted to use the links through to Hills Farm Lane. There was also an objection to several of the 'pros and cons' noted within Table 5.1 and finally an expectation that the detailed design of the development would comply with relevant national and County Council guidance.

A number of comments centred on the need to promote sustainable travel patterns within and beyond the development. One consultee questioned the emphasis given to traffic flow and speed at the expense of design quality and the needs of other forms of transport. They considered that a 'high street' approach to design should be applied to the overall highway layout as shown in Option 1. Another consultee stressed the need for safe road crossings for pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians as well as the need for Old Wickhurst Lane to be upgraded to a bridleway that would offer a legal right of use for cyclist and equestrians. A third consultee considered that insufficient emphasis was given on the need to avoid the traffic generated by the new development impacting on the wider transport infrastructure, particularly that within the Crawley area. It was considered that further opportunities to enhance bus services in the area should be exploited and that there was a need to prepare a

transportation investment strategy that incorporated the likely impacts and requirements of the strategic development West of Crawley. Further it was thought that the West of Horsham developers should be required to pay contributions towards strategic bus serve enhancement, such as a Fastway extension.

One respondent supported the proposed measures to reduce traffic generated, specifically as the link to Hills Farm Lane, but objected to the indicative location of that link due to the presence of what was thought to be a blind bend and the potential of that area to flood. This consultee also asked for safeguards to be included that would ensure that existing mature trees were protected from any of the road building required on the site. It was also thought that a further section was needed to set out requirements to protect the floodplain and natural areas during construction.

Other issues were commented on, including support for the details given in this section on the phasing requirements and an expectation that developers would be made to keep to the requirements set out in Paragraph 5.34. Surrey County Council commented on the need to clarify the potential impacts of the development on the A24 traffic flows and finally there was an objection to the mention in the SPD (Option 5, page 39) that lighting may be required on the road leading to Robin Hood roundabout.

How the Issues were addressed

The Council has continued to work closely with the County Council since the publication of the draft SPD in order to resolve the highway issues raised by consultees. Both Councils have jointly commissioned detailed design and highway safety audits to rigorously test the safety and deliverability of the highway solutions included in the final Masterplan. The County Council supports an option 1 based approach in the light of this further technical work.

Further detail regarding the proposed bus strategy is included in the final SPD although discussions will continue between the developers, the bus operators and the Highway Authority at the planning application stage.

The final Masterplan has been written to ensure that the needs of all road users are taken into consideration. In addition, a wide range of measures are being required that will seek to ensure that travel by sustainable means will be actively promoted and prioritised within the development. The requirement for high standards of urban design is referred to in the Masterplan SPD and they are set out in more detail in the Design Principles and Character Areas SPD. However, it is not possible to apply a 'high street' approach with direct access onto the southern link road, which will need to be a dual carriageway.

Requirements have been included within the final SPD for safe crossings over new and existing roads at key locations, including intersections with Mill Lane and Old Wickhurst Lane. However, in taking this approach a balance has had to be found between the need to provide ample crossings and the need to ensure that the southern link road forms a functioning part of the Strategic Road Network as the County Council has required. Although there is a full expectation that Old Wickhurst Lane will be used by cyclists, the SPD will not require an upgrade to bridleway status as this is a matter for the Highway Authority to determine. This approach will however be supported if the County Council is minded to make the change.

The desire to see the fullest possible promotion of sustainable transport modes is strongly supported by the Council, with the key approaches to promoting travel by non-car modes being set out under the Fourth Principle. The developers will be

required to provide a frequent and attractive bus service that should be supported towards commercial viability in the long-term. The exact location where the bus route will cross the River and link up with Hills Farm Lane will be subject to further work prior to any planning application to ensure that highway safety concerns and environmental impact are taken into account. Traffic modelling will take into account the impact of the development on the wider transport infrastructure, and any mitigation measures will need to be agreed with the County Council and the Highways Agency at the planning application stage.

The final SPD sets out the need to protect important trees and ecological features.

Chapter 5: Fourth Principle – Alternative to Car Travel

There was considerable general support for the principle of alternative car travel and particularly for the bus strategy; however there were also a number of comments and objections raised. Whilst there was support for a dedicated shuttle bus service through the development, one consultee felt that the service should be a cross town service, linking key areas of Horsham rather than just the town centre. It was also thought that the suggested timings were insufficient for the operation of the service and more layover time would be needed. Another respondent looked specifically for a school bus for the Arunside School and another thought that more should be done to ensure that the service met the needs of local businesses. One consultee thought that a commitment was needed to ensure that the proposed sports facilities would be accessible by non-car modes. Regarding the route of the buses, there was support for both the preferred link to Hills Farm Lane and also for the possible alternative through Henderson Way.

On the subject of links for cyclists, pedestrians and equestrians, one consultee considered that the footpaths should be wide enough to accommodate a number of people side by side and with a push chair. It was argued also that there should also be good cycle linkages throughout the development with the emphasis on cyclists having a well signed and shared facility with pedestrians rather than segregated facilities. Another consultee looked for a commitment to provide good safe links to quiet rural beyond the development, including a new link between Mill Lane and Christ's Hospital Station.

Network Rail believed that the proposed growth in population would create a need for major improvements to Christ Hospital Station as well as the need to provide additional parking at Horsham Station. They also called for the closure of the 'at-grade' level crossing (Baker's Crossing) at Parthings Farm.

How the Issues were addressed

The new bus service will be required to serve a number of key locations including the Station, Hospital and Collyers College in addition to the Bus Station and Carfax. Timings of the bus given in the draft SPD were indicative only and any detailed timings would need to be agreed with the bus operators at a later stage. Although it is unlikely that a 'school bus' could be secured from developer funding, it is the intention of the Council to ensure that the new bus provides a service for Arunside School, although the whether there is a need for an additional bus stop is beyond the scope of the SPD. The route of the buses is confirmed in the final Masterplan as involving a river crossing into Hills Farm Lane. The technical feasibility of the alternative route into Henderson Way was exhaustively tested by the Council, but was ultimately found to be undeliverable due to land ownership complexities and the fact that the roads involved were of insufficient design specifications to allow for buses to pass each other.

The final SPD sets out the requirements for foot, cycle and equestrian links and emphasises the need for these to be convenient, safe and legible for all potential users. The footpaths and road layouts will need to be designed in accordance with latest national guidance in the Manual for Streets. Whilst the Masterplan does show links beyond the development into the countryside, there are no specific requirements for the upgrading of any footpaths or other rights of way outside the CP7 Policy area. Nevertheless, the SPD will encourage the developers to work with the County Council and other stakeholders to ensure that high quality and useful links can be provided for new and existing residents. The Council is likely to support any proposals the County Council may have to upgrade links in connection with the new development.

Horsham Station will be the main station used for the development as the bus service will have a direct link. With the emphasis on accessing the Station by non-car modes, it was not felt appropriate to require the developers to provide for additional car parking at Horsham Station. Although there is likely to be an increase in patronage at Christ's Hospital, the final SPD does not support access to this Station by car and again it was felt that car parking enhancements were not an appropriate requirement. The Council has worked with the developers and with Network Rail and Southern Rail to investigate the need for additional cycle storage at both Horsham and Christ's Hospital, but no request was made for such facilities by the rail undertakers. The Council has agreed to support Network Rail's request for the closure of Bakers Crossing on safety grounds. Access to Parthings Lane will remain possible through the tunnel under the railway which is located just 80m from Bakers Crossing.

Chapter 5: Fifth Principle – Community Services and facilities

Whilst there was support for the contents of this principle, a number of suggestions for changes were made. On the Denne side of the development there was an objection to the perceived low level of community services provision relative to the Broadbridge Heath side. It was suggested that the SPD should make it clear that pitches will be for general community use and not just for selected sports clubs. In addition a request was made for youth activity area provision east of the A24. It was thought that the new community building on this side should provide a river frontage and include a café/shop for local residents. Another consultee suggested that the draft SPD did not require enough allotments and that more should be allocated in the area of the sports pitches east of the A24.

One of the respondents argued against the need to set a quantitative requirement for informal open space as the 11ha area within the floodplain that was to be secured for community use was thought to be adequate. It was also thought that the large area of open space shown within the sewage treatment works odour zone should be shown as residential development as a resolution to the odour problems was expected to be put in place.

Regarding the Broadbridge Heath side, one respondent argued that there was no reason why the new development should have to fund the relocation of the scouts and sea cadets from the Broadbridge Heath village centre. This was disputed by another consultee who argued that a firm commitment was needed to find a new home for these youth groups. There was an objection to references to finding a new home for the Horsham Football Club and a request that any enhancement of the leisure centre, a district sports facility, should not be at the cost of local provision. A suggestion was made that larger neighbourhood play areas should be required as they caused less nuisance for neighbours than did smaller 'local' play areas. In addition there was a call for greater allotment provision and for the provision to be

made available to existing residents that were on a lengthy waiting list. Finally, there was thought to be a need for small and medium sized meeting rooms at the Broadbridge Heath Village Centre that should be reflected within the SPD.

Tanbridge House School felt that, due to capacity issues and constraints of their existing site, there should be an extension to the school for playing pitches which would allow further capacity expansion within the main site. One consultee considered that any new playing field provision should be specifically for dual use and shared with the local community. However, another representation stated that in the short term there was no need to expand the school and in the longer term, instead of expanding Tanbridge House School, an additional secondary school should be built at Southwater.

There was also support for the replacement of Shelly Primary School, however this was only considered a suitable requirement if the site provided was a serviced facility of sufficient size with the school being made available at no cost to the County Council taking into account receipts from the sale of the existing site for alternative development. It was also thought that Arunside School would need to be expanded and although this was thought to be possible within its existing site, a detailed study would be needed to confirm this point.

Two points for the proposed fire station were raised: In respect of the area allocated for fire station development, any new roundabout built on the A24 needed to enable the Fire & Rescue Service to have both southbound and northbound access onto the A24; In addition, in order to ensure a timely emergency response back into Horsham from the proposed new fire station site, the Fire & Rescue Service will require access northbound from the A24 onto the Farthings Hill roundabout and slip road.

How issues were addressed

Careful consideration has been made within the final SPD to provide appropriate and necessary community facilities. The community building to the east of the A24 will incorporate a café/shop; subject to their viability. It will be designed so the room space within the building can be used in a flexible manner. In addition a youth activity area has been identified near the community building and a BMX track identified south of the Fire Station. The sports pitches east of A24 are intended for community use.

The district wide facilities will remain within the development. However, their provision will in no way be a substitute for any local facilities that need to be planned as part of the development. It will not be considered appropriate to require the relocation of the sea cadets, although the Council will work with the Parish Council to explore opportunities to help resolve this issue.

The final SPD has identified four larger 'Neighbourhood' play areas across the site and the location of these sites has been planned in consultation with local stakeholders and leisure officers from the Council.

The allotments that are being provided within the development are based on what is required for the new development itself. This is vital in order to comply with national policy on planning obligations. The development is not able to provide for any existing deficiencies. The Council will seek through negotiation permission for existing residents to use the new allotments alongside new residents.

Tanbridge House School will have a 1 ha extension for the use of playing fields. This will be located as an extension to the existing school site. Evidence of the need for

this was demonstrated by a capacity study which was undertaken at the school. The orientation of the playing field was determined through consultation with the School and the County Council as education authority. It is intended that these will be available for community uses whilst being managed by the School.

A 2.5 form entry primary school is required by the County Council and is shown on the final masterplan for the relocation and necessary expansion of Shelly Primary School. Contributions will be required in order to pay for the provision of additional school places at Arunside Primary School or other local schools, such as St John's Primary School, although this provision will be within the existing school sites.

The junction will be designed to take into consideration the needs of the Fire Service and other emergency services.

Chapter 5: Sixth Principle – Wildlife, Habitat and Landscape

There was general support for references within the Sixth Principle to retaining and enhancing the existing habitats and biodiversity within the site, including the protection of wildlife corridors which was particularly supported. However, some responses argued for further commitments that went beyond what was being sought in the draft SPD. There were requests for the strengthening of some of the wording and for a commitment that all building will be in harmony with the landscape. Other representations called for specific mitigation measures to protect habitats and species and for the inclusion within the SPD of a fully worked up 'green strategy' which would include the designation of some areas as new nature reserves and the establishment of buffer zones that would be available for multiple use as well as offer undisturbed areas for wildlife. Another consultee called for the inclusion of a 'green networks strategy'.

How issues were addressed

The final SPD sets out a clear need for the development to retain and enhance habitats and protect important ecological features where possible and to create links between areas of open space as well as ensuring that open spaces are easily accessible to all across the development. The final SPD also makes it clear that where an impact on natural areas and biodiversity is unavoidable, mitigation measures will be required.

It was considered that many of the representations were calling for policy stances of the type that are already included within other 'higher level' LDF documents such as the Core Strategy and the Development Control Policies Document, particularly policies DC5, DC6 and DC9. Any development west of Horsham would have to comply with this existing policy and it is not appropriate to repeat policy statements within the final SPD. In addition, some of the recommendations made were of a very detailed and specific nature and the Council's view is that such requirements would be beyond the scope of a Masterplan SPD and would be better considered at the detailed application stage.

Chapter 5: Seventh Principle – Employment and Business

There was a call for the provision of further employment and business uses within the development to provide people with the opportunity of working locally and to reflect the needs of the local economy. There was also a concern that the draft Masterplan neglected the need for a large amount of employment development within the West of Horsham. The approach taken was thought to contradict research conducted by Sussex Enterprise.

How issues were addressed

The development, although large, is constrained in its ability to provide for uses other than those already identified within the Masterplan. There is insufficient evidence to support the provision of large areas of employment in the west of Horsham development area. However, the final Masterplan provides for smaller flexible employment units and for home working in addition to the employment created at the other identified public, retail and community services included within the development in accordance with the advice of the West Sussex Economic Partnership.

Chapter 5: Eighth Principle – Sustainable Construction

There was considerable overall support for the Eighth Principle although a number of respondents felt the requirements went too far, whilst others considered that they did not go far enough. Those stressing the former emphasised the difficulty and ambiguity of relying on an ‘average’ level of the Code for Sustainable Homes (CSH). They also questioned the appropriateness of setting targets within an SPD and in particular targets which ran ahead of the Government’s national timetable for carbon emissions reductions in new build homes. This approach was considered to place undue burdens on the developers and prevent an ordered approach to putting the investment and supply chains in place that would allow the ambitious national programme of targets to be met. Two representations considered that the SPD was overly prescriptive in specifying the types of technology that would be likely to be appropriate. They felt that it would be better for the SPD to require only that viability and feasibility assessments are carried out in order to determine the best approach for achieving carbon emissions reductions.

Other representations thought that the requirements went too far and argued that the cost of delivering the required level of sustainable construction would be likely to either reduce the overall of community facilities that could be achieved within the s106 package or would render the homes unaffordable as premiums would have to be charged to cover the costs of enhanced sustainable construction methods and renewable energy. One respondent felt that the homes that would be built to the highest levels of the CSH would necessarily involve a compromise of good design in other respects.

A range of suggestions were made detailing how the Council should go further in its requirements under this section. One considered that rainwater harvesting tanks should be required on all homes and another felt that the number of credits within the BREEAM assessment method for non-residential buildings should be stipulated to ensure that sufficient technology would be applied to achieve high levels of water conservation and efficiency. A further comment asked for developers to be required to assess the potential for rainwater harvesting and grey water recycling within the development and that a proportion of non-residential buildings should be required to meet the ‘excellent’ BREEAM standard.

How issues were addressed

In the light of rapidly evolving Government policy on this issue and particularly the new PPS on Planning and Climate Change, the Council considers that the requirements set out in the draft SPD need to be reviewed. Therefore the final SPD includes requirements in line with the national timetable for carbon emissions reductions and ensures that they comply with national policy within the context of what the developers have themselves agreed would be reasonable to achieve. The final SPD avoids being prescriptive, but does require that the developers fully assess the viability and feasibility of the relevant energy generation and water conservation technologies before using the evidence to put a strategy in place for achieving high overall levels of sustainable construction.

The requirement made for the achievement by non-residential buildings of the ‘very good’ level of BREEAM has not been altered as it was considered to be the highest requirement that could be required under the circumstances.

Chapter 5: Ninth Principle – Retail Development

Support was offered for the provision of small retail units proposed by the draft SPD. There were however, objections raised over the comprehensiveness of the Masterplan and the exclusion of meaningful references to wider facilities, such as Tesco and the Broadbridge Heath Retail Park, was lamented. It was considered therefore, that in the interests of the comprehensive planning of this area and the successful integration of the new with the existing community, the Council should produce a further Supplementary Planning Document dealing with the existing shopping and sports facilities not substantively dealt within the Masterplan. This SPD should commence at the earliest opportunity.

Other respondents suggested that the new neighbourhood centre must incorporate adequate space for car parking and that the new village centre on the Broadbridge Heath side should not be split either side of the school as shown in the draft SPD but should be concentrated near the junction between the A264 and Old Wickhurst Lane.

How issues were addressed

The area surrounding Tesco, Broadbridge Heath Retail Park and the West Sussex County Council Depot will be dealt with in a separate SPD to be produced after the Masterplan SPD has been adopted.

The parking provision for the community buildings will be based on the West Sussex County Council parking standards and will reflect the need for some journeys to be made by car. Further consultation with Broadbridge Heath Parish Council since the publication of the Draft SPD has resulted in an agreement that the new community centre should not be split either side of the new School. This is to ensure that the centre retains a congruence and identity and that it relates well to both the new community and to the existing development.

Chapter 6: Other Policies Influencing the Masterplan

There was support for a minimum density of 30 dwellings per hectare, with higher densities near to facilities, which is consistent with Government guidance. It was thought that this should relate especially to the area on the draft Masterplan shown as a youth facility south of Broadbridge Heath, which was considered to be suitable for dwellings at higher densities.

How Issues were addressed

Higher density housing will be located towards the centre of the development and around the community centre. Towards the periphery of the development area and to the south, there will be lower densities. The land shown on the draft Masterplan as a youth facility will not be identified for residential development, primarily as the high pressure gas pipe runs through the site.

Chapter 6: Core Strategy Policy CP3

There was an objection made regarding the requirement to apply the Lifetime Homes Standards to all dwellings of CSH Level 4 or above. It was pointed out that the Government has yet to decide if the Lifetime Homes Standards should form a part of the Code for Sustainable Homes.

Reflecting on the design guidance within the draft SPD, it was considered that too much was made of the need to respect the existing character of the established

residential areas, and of the role of the local vernacular and design characteristics typical of dwellings within the District. There was considered to be no local vernacular and no typical dwelling within the area. This respondent argued that pastiche and 'clip art' design was to be avoided, as were frequent changes of finish and design intended merely to introduce variety. There needed to be much more emphasis on encouraging good contemporary architecture.

The Community Safety Officer suggested that there has been general acceptance that the design and layout of buildings are a major factor affecting crime and disorder and that the implementation measures to reduce crime and anti-social behaviour should be planned at the design stage.

How issues were addressed

Reflecting the evolving Government policy on this issue which is likely to result in Lifetime Homes Standards becoming a part of the CSH, no additional requirements are made for Lifetime Homes in the final SPD.

The approach of the Council has been to limit the design guidance within the Masterplan SPD to the essential points and to explore the need for good design in more detail within the Design Principles and Character Areas SPD. This SPD document will cover the relevance of the local character and vernacular and the need to avoid pastiche or bland design. The Design Principles and Character Areas SPD also addresses the issue of designing out crime and anti-social behaviour which is considered to be an important aim for the overall design approach.

Chapter 6: Core Policy CP12

There was an objection raised to paragraph 6.35 which sets out that the District Council will expect affordable housing to be secured through the provision of nil-cost serviced land. This expectation is based upon the approach to affordable housing provision set out within the adopted Planning Obligations SPD (June 2007). The main grounds for concern were that it is unproven that this method will best deliver the Council's affordable housing objectives and it is thought that it is more likely to inhibit the delivery of affordable housing to the detriment of those in housing need. It was thought that the approach is flawed and illogical. It was recommended that the SPD needed to be less prescriptive and leave it to the developers to decide how best to deliver affordable housing.

How issues were addressed

The Council based its approach in the draft SPD on the sound evidence that was gathered during the production of the Core Strategy and the Planning Obligations SPD, both of which are now adopted policy. Therefore, the final SPD will continue to reflect this approach. However, in recognition of the changing economic circumstances, the Council is prepared to be as flexible as possible within the constraints of policy at the planning application stage and it will consider more innovative approaches where these will be clearly more capable of achieving the overall affordable housing objectives set out in Policy CP7 and in the Masterplan SPD.

Chapter 6: Core Policy CP2

Southern Water was supportive of the objectives of this part of the draft SPD, including the intention to require the use of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS). It was considered that the implementation of such systems is a realistic option for the site. However, there was a recommendation to consider additional factors in the design of the system including topography, run-off rates and ground conditions in relation to the size, type and density of development.

The planning authority was advised to note that SuDS require long term maintenance and rely on facilities that are not adoptable by sewerage undertakers. Developers should therefore be required to ensure that arrangements exist for long term maintenance. In addition, the failure of SuDS needed to be recognised as this could lead to inundation of foul sewers with surface water run-off. Finally, it was argued that if SuDS proved to be unsuitable for the development, surface water should be drained separately from foul water.

How issues were addressed

The final SPD has been amended to cover most of the points raised in the above comments. The long term maintenance requirements of SuDS have been noted within the SPD. Other points, such as the suitability of SuDS, will be considered at the planning application stage.

Chapter 6: Core Policy CP13

Southern Water commented on the sewerage infrastructure within the site and has undertaken investigations that have indicated that the Five Oaks Wastewater Pumping Station will need to accommodate the additional flows arising from the development that will be the responsibility of the developers to fund. They also believe that the Masterplan should include policies that will secure pre-construction agreements on utility infrastructure to co-ordinate a whole site approach. This will help to promote a single sustainable sewage network. It was argued that the SPD should make it clear that all sewerage infrastructure to be adopted should be designed to Southern Water's specifications.

It was also considered that the transport infrastructure enhancements, including strategic bus enhancements and upgrades to the A24/A26/M23 should be included within the SPD, so as to mitigate the effect of the development on the strategic road network given the potential employment destination flows.

How issues were addressed

The final Masterplan sets out the requirements for the developers to deliver water supply and drainage networks in the manner suggested by Southern Water. Southern Water has confirmed that the programmed enhancements to the wastewater treatment works will allow the development to be drained without the need for additional financial contributions although some aspects of the existing drainage infrastructure will need to be upgraded.

Chapter 7 – Next Steps

No representations were received.

Glossary

No representations were received.

Appendix 1

One representation was received over the incorrect location of a hedgerow south of Tanbridge House School on the draft Masterplan Map.

How the issue was addressed

The hedgerow shown south of Tanbridge House School identified on the draft Masterplan has been correctly identified in the final Masterplan.