

**MINUTES OF AN EXTRAORDINARY MEETING OF
NORTH HORSHAM PARISH COUNCIL
HELD ON THURSDAY 27th OCTOBER 2016 AT 8.00pm
AT HOLBROOK TYTHE BARN, PONDTAIL ROAD, HORSHAM**

Present: Councillors:- A. Britten, Mrs K. Burgess, P. Burgess (arrived late but gave apologies), N. Butler, J. Day, Mrs R. Ginn*, Mrs F. Haigh, R. Knight, M. Loates*, R. Millington, Miss H. Ralston, T. Rickett, D. Searle, Ms A Smith*, S. Torn*, R. Turner, I. Wassell, R. Wilton and Mrs S. Wilton

* denotes absence

In attendance: Parish Clerk - Pauline Whitehead BA(Hons) FILCM

With the agreement of the Council, the Chairman deferred the public forum until after the proposed, initial response to planning application DC/16/1677 for 2,750 dwellings on land in the north of Horsham had been read out, to enable those present to hear the comments that had been made and to give clear understanding to the Councillors of what was proposed for agreement.

FC/070/16 Apologies for absence

The Council received apologies and reasons for absence from Cllr. Mrs R. Ginn and Cllr M. Loates. Cllr Ms. A. Smith and Cllr S. Torn did not attend nor gave apologies.

FC/071/16 Declarations of interest

There were no declarations of interest.

The Chairman, assisted by colleagues, read the proposed, initial comments to DC/16/1677 circulated with the agenda.

FC/072/16 Public Forum

There were thirty four members of the public present. The Chairman thanked those who were in attendance. Members of the public expressed support for the comments highlighted in the initial response to planning application DC/16/1677 and appreciation for the in depth work that had been done by North Horsham Parish Council so far. Concern was raised regarding lack of clarity surrounding essential services within the application, such as schools and health facilities. The pressure on basic services caused by additional dwellings was also of concern. The lack of regard to the strategic importance of this development in relation to the A264 and impact on the wider roadwork in the South East was raised along with poor infrastructure for cycling. It was suggested that when the working groups reconvene they consider the potential disruption that will be inevitable when large mains are installed to provide utilities and whether the existing infrastructure relating to this is fit for purpose.

Members of the public were concerned about increases in traffic pollution caused by stationery traffic at the Littlehaven railway crossing and the road structure on the crossing which frequently needs repair.

Questions were raised about the viability of the development following the announcement earlier in the week that a second runway would be built at Heathrow airport as opposed to Gatwick.

There was grave concern regarding the Community Infrastructure Levy payments that have been set at zero by Horsham District Council on this development.

There was scepticism that the comments raised by the Parish Council and community organisations would be taken seriously by Horsham District Council and West Sussex County Council. Local District and County Councillors reassured those present that the application was being closely scrutinised at the outline application stage and that everyone was working together to try to get the best for the North Horsham community.

Several members of the public offered their advice and support to the Parish Council and expressed an interest in joining the working groups. They were advised to contact the Clerk.

FC/073/16 Planning application DC/16/1677 – Development north of Horsham

North Horsham Parish Council unanimously RESOLVED to submit the response to planning application DC/16/1677 that had been circulated with the agenda (subject to the correction of any typing or numbering errors) to Horsham District Council. (Copy attached to minutes)

There being no other business, the Chairman closed the meeting at 9.40.p.m.

..... Signed

.....Dated



North Horsham Parish Council

Roffey Millennium Hall,
Crawley Road, Horsham,
West Sussex, RH12 4DT

Tel: 01403 750786 (Office & Hall Bookings)
Roffey Millennium Hall, North Heath Hall
HolbrookTythe Barn

Email: parish.clerk@northhorsham-pc.gov.uk

Website: www.northhorsham-pc.gov.uk

Development Control (North)
Horsham District Council
Parkside
Chart Way
Horsham
West Sussex
RH12 1RL

28th October 2016

Dear Sirs,

Re:- Planning Application DC/16/1677 – Development on land north of Horsham

North Horsham Parish Council has given due consideration to Planning Application DC/16/1677 and puts forward **initial** comments below. The Parish Council is aware that there are likely to be amendments made to the application before it comes before the Horsham District Council (HDC) Development Management (North) Committee Meeting and will continue to monitor and comment on this application throughout the process.

1. Transport

1.1 North Horsham Parish Council supports Horsham District Council's findings that "The key to unlocking the potential of North Horsham is a comprehensive travel plan for rail, roads and public transport focusing on connectivity to the town centre" (Horsham Place Plan 2016:17) and recommends that **strong consideration should be given to re-routing the A264 north of the development site and providing a natural boundary to the development north of Horsham. This would allow the existing A264 to be downgraded to a distributor route. Whilst this may be costly, it would provide a better, sustainable solution for the longer term and into the future.** This development has a huge impact on the residents of Horsham and its surrounding communities and the developer has a duty to offer appropriate solutions to challenges within the highway infrastructure.

1.2 The stretch of the A264 affected by the proposed development is an important part of the wider transport system that forms a part of the route from the south coast northwards to London via the M23 or via the sub-standard A24 towards Dorking and Leatherhead. Still to be completed developments at Kilnwood Vale, west of Horsham (Broadbridge Heath) and in Southwater, have already increased pressure on major routes, especially the A264, and will continue to do so. There is evidence that traffic has slowed as a result. Smaller roads in the vicinity of the development are used to avoid congestion on the major routes. Many of the smaller roads are extremely narrow and pass through rural hamlets and communities or through residential areas of Horsham already congested with traffic.

1.3 It would appear that the proposed road layouts are based on reducing financial outlay rather than on providing good infrastructure solutions. A comprehensive precedent has been set by the development west of Horsham which has not impeded the traffic flow on the A264 and it is important that the best solutions are sought and financial investment is maximised for the benefit of local residents.

1.4 Traffic on the A264 should not be unduly impeded by vehicles accessing, exiting and crossing into the new development, resulting in additional congestion on major routes and the road networks in adjacent parishes.

1.5 There must be sufficient, safe, prominent, visible and accessible crossings on the A264 for non-motorised traffic (pedestrians and cyclists) to reduce dangers to users and encourage car use to be at a minimum. In addition, pedestrian access from the east and south of the proposed railway station is inadequate and would not encourage residents to access the station on foot, this is expanded on later in this document.

1.6 Buses should not be directed along Pondtail Drive and Pondtail Road both of which are narrow and unsuitable for this purpose. A foul sewer routed along Pondtail Road could exacerbate the flooding that already takes place there.

1.7 The Parish Council wishes to raise strong concern that ancient woodland (Bush Copse) will be potentially sacrificed for a roadway to allow a free flow of traffic around the site and questions if other cultural and heritage features on the site may be lost to future generations. "Planning permission should be refused for development resulting in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats, including ancient woodland" (National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) para 118).

1.8 Significant buffering is included within the plans for the new development, but the line of trees currently forming a noise barrier on the south of the A264 will be breached to facilitate the additional access and does not take into account the noise from additional traffic. Consideration should be given to improving the buffer to the south of the A264.

2. The proposed road system

2.1 North Horsham Parish Council challenges the evidence used to support the road structure proposals and how the development would be phased (Design and Access Statement pg. 144; 08). The evidence doesn't appear to take account of the cumulative effect of other developments already underway or anticipate further development.

2.2 The Parish Council requires further details of the supporting evidence, including the dates and times of the surveys. The Parish Council strongly recommends that an up to date survey is undertaken to take account of recent development and with realistic forecasts in anticipation of potential development where planning permission has been given

2.3 Has consideration been given to new technological advances in relation to electric cars and the installation of charging systems?

2.4 The Parish Council would be pleased to see a response to the consultation from Highways England regarding the proposed road system.

3. Proposed new roundabout on A264 at Langhurstwood Road

3.1 The proposed roundabout at Langhurstwood Road is considered to be ill conceived, relying on existing infrastructure that was not intended for significant traffic flows and is therefore not fit for this purpose. In particular, Pondtail Drive was never intended as a through road. It is narrow and it leads onto a local road structure that is already at capacity during peak times. There is considerable concern for those residents on Pondtail Drive who will lose significant amenity and

be subjected to increased noise and vibration from traffic including buses and lorries should the proposal go ahead.

3.2 The distance between the roundabout on Pondtail Road and the proposed new roundabout is relatively short. The impact of the restricted length is significant traffic build up both on the A264 and on Pondtail Road. There would be increased risks to the safety of road users because Pondtail Road narrows to enable traffic to navigate the bridge under the railway line and this is an area where there has been a history of flooding. Buses travelling along the narrower part of Pondtail Road would especially pose a danger to oncoming traffic.

3.3 A roundabout slowing traffic at Langhurstwood Road would lead to congestion further along the A264 and on the A24, but it is considered acceptable to have an access onto and leaving the new development for vehicles only at this point.

3.4 There is potential to provide a bridge to enable cyclists and pedestrians to cross to and from Langhurstwood Road/ Pondtail Road over the A264. This must be grade separated to ensure the safety of pedestrians and cyclists, to provide good non-motorised access to and from the new development and to ensure that the flow of traffic on the A264 is not impeded.

4. Northlands Road to Old Holbrook

4.1 It is recommended that this junction becomes an access for pedestrians and cyclists between the existing settlement in North Horsham and the new development as an alternative to Pondtail Drive. This access allows more direct access to North Heath Lane.

5. Rusper Road

5.1 The Parish Council was disappointed that the diagrams within the planning application did not reflect reality.

5.2 In order to access the town centre and residential areas to the east of Horsham, traffic exiting the A264 from the Rusper Road roundabout is likely to encounter the railway crossing at Littlehaven station which causes significant congestion and tailbacks and therefore is not suitable as the main access for the new development for all traffic. It is also not suitable for additional traffic, as properties open directly onto Rusper Road itself and there would be significant impact to residents who live in and around that area, as noise and vibration from traffic is likely to increase. However, this was the Parish Councils' favoured route for buses as it links with Littlehaven Railway Station and leads to the main Horsham station.

5.3 As the Rusper Road roundabout is shown currently as the access point on the new development for schools and Littlehaven Station, it would be logical instead to install a two-level system (graded) at this point whereby only cyclists, pedestrians and buses could cross the A264 from Rusper Road, without impeding the flow of traffic on this major route for those travelling from the south coast to Gatwick and areas where employment opportunities are more prevalent.

5.4 A proposed cycle/pedestrian footbridge has been included in the plan at the Rusper Road roundabout by the developers, however, there is insufficient room to land the footbridge where it has been shown, as that is where any additional car lanes will be sited. In addition, there is no room for any pavement from the Rusper Road roundabout down to the Giblets Road roundabout, where Rusper Road leads into Horsham.

5.5 The rampart of the Motte and Bailey in Lemmington Way, owned by Horsham District Council, which is very close to the A264 boundary fence and an existing dwelling which is on the site of the proposed road works, calls into question whether significant expansion of the roundabout is appropriate. There are also areas of archaeological significance on the development site itself. It is incumbent on HDC to ensure that local heritage features are protected appropriately. A better

solution would be to include a left-hand filter from the A264 into Rusper Road (south) and a left-hand filter from Rusper Road (south) onto the A264.

6. New junction between Rusper Road roundabout and the Moorhead roundabout (Crawley Road) currently shown as Left in and Left out

6.1 The new junction between Rusper Road roundabout and the Moorhead roundabout (Crawley Road) currently shown as left in and left out would be a better place for a roundabout to access the new development (but no access south into the existing residential areas off Bartholomew Way) as this would give more direct access to sports pitches, leisure facilities, railway station, schools and business park. It would also avoid traffic from the East having to travel on the A264 as far as Rusper Road roundabout and traffic exiting from the business park and railway station having to exit left and double back at the Moorhead roundabout.

7. Moorhead roundabout

7.1 Moorhead roundabout accesses the most suitable route for traffic into Horsham, as far fewer homes open out onto the roads. Currently the reverse camber on the roundabout and the speed of vehicles, especially lorries, travelling west towards the Great Daux roundabout on the A264 from Crawley has caused numerous accidents and ways of designing out those flaws need to be considered seriously to improve safety and reduce the potential for traffic congestion.

7.2 Improvements are required to increase the potential capacity for traffic travelling along the A264 without deviation from the west northwards and vice versa at this roundabout. This could include dedicated left turn carriageways on the A264 to enable traffic to turn from the north into Crawley Road and from Crawley Road west onto the A264.

7.3 Concern was expressed regarding the safety aspects of traffic turning in and out of Earles Meadow from the Moorhead roundabout and the dangers posed by vehicles turning across fast moving traffic near a blind corner.

8. Cycle and pedestrian access additional to that included above

8.1 All cycle routes should adhere to guidance in the Sustrans Design Manual (April 2014) and be 2 metres wide.

8.2 Proposals for pedestrian and cycle access using grade separated routes at Langhurstwood Road, Old Holbrook and Rusper Road will supplement the access route near the football pitch at Shottermill across the A264 which appears to be included as part of a footpath route within the new plans.

8.3 To improve the spinal route within the application to enable pedestrians and cyclists to travel unhindered from Roffey to Wimlands Road or to Warnham Station, it is considered that a footbridge that runs opposite the Earles Meadow turn on Crawley Road across the A264 to link in to the proposed 'east /west spinal route' would encourage more people to use it effectively. This could link in with the underpass close to the railway line in some way and could address the current lack of access for pedestrians and cyclists from the East/ Roffey and improve the internal linkages for pedestrians and cyclists from the business park and railways station so that they are not forced on to either a circuitous route to access crossing points or on dark, exposed paths across fields and parks to retail and residential areas.

8.4 In order to use the underpass close to the railway line, significant improvements, including safe, all weather access routed away from the road should be developed. This would enable residents south and east of the railway line to access the proposed railway station by foot or on a non-motorised vehicle. The underpass should be upgraded to include lighting to allow for safer and more inviting pedestrian and cyclist access to the proposed railway station.

9. Wimlands Road/ Emergency Access

9.1 Wimlands Road is crossed by the main rail line to London and has a level crossing, therefore its suitability as the emergency route for evacuating the carriageway on the A264 in case of an emergency and for accessing the new development is questioned and evidenced reassurances are required.

10. Internal Road Design

10.1 There is concern that insufficient parking is provided for residents and visitors which will lead to parking on and blockage of the main, arterial roads which should be discouraged.

10.2 The Parish Council would recommend there are no parking courts, but if these are included, Secured by Design principles should be used so that group car parking is easily accessible, easy to use, attractive and well lit.

10.3 Street lighting should be low level and unobtrusive.

10.4 Consideration should be given to adequate provision to allow refuse collection to be undertaken with minimal disruption to traffic flow.

10.5 The proposed new entrance to the development off the A264 will have to be suitable to take traffic currently using the first part of Langhurstwood Road which will be blocked off. This includes significant vehicle movement (including heavy lorries) to Brookhurst Wood Landfill site (Biffa and Viridor), Langhurstwood Quarry (Weineberger Brickworks) and the proposed development of Wealdon Brickworks to provide a Recycling and Incineration Unit (Brittaniacrest). Has Horsham District Council satisfied themselves that the design of the access road is sufficiently robust?

10.6 Housing design along the access road should be designed to mitigate noise and vibration from the heavy traffic movements. A zone of landscaping may help to reduce impact on residents to give some distance and segregation, but careful design is imperative if housing is to be built in this area. This includes consideration of dust and pollution from emissions which could have an environmental/health effect on residents.

10.7 Concern was raised regarding the width and design of internal roads especially those linking to the business park.

11. Viability of public transport

11a. Railways

11a.1 Is there potential to improve connectivity from North Horsham to Warnham station?

11a.2 Clarification on what will happen if the railway station is not built is required and should that be the case, does the finalised transport layout still work? If the station isn't built, then reassurance would be required to confirm that the money allocated for this would be invested in highways infrastructure and not more dwellings.

11a.3 The land allocated for the railway station and its parking should include use for a Park and Ride facility in phase 1 of the development to encourage residents on the new development to access Horsham without using their cars.

11a.4 It has been stated that if a new station is to be built in North Horsham another one between Horsham and Crawley must close. Kilnwood Vale has been promised a station and improvements have recently been made at Littlehaven Station, therefore in reality, the station at North Horsham appears to be reduced in priority. What evidence is there for the viability of the station?

11a.5 Littlehaven Station will need further improvements as new development is likely to increase demand, especially if the proposed railway station is not built. It is strongly advised to consider improvements on the London bound platform and to review the entrance and exit to the Horsham bound platform which is currently narrow and on a slope. Access to Littlehaven Station from housing development may necessitate improvements to footpaths in the vicinity and to consideration of a pedestrian footbridge to cross the railway line safely. Privately owned land adjacent to Littlehaven Station could provide parking solutions.

11b. Buses

11b.1 A good public transport system with ideal walking distances to bus stops (400 metres) from the start of construction would minimise the impact on the new residents and on existing infrastructure.

11b.2 Consideration should be given to a Park and Ride facility adjacent to the proposed new station to incorporate into existing bus routes. The existing bus routes 23, 98 and 200 could easily link to the facility and provide improved connectivity between the new development, Crawley and Horsham.

11b.3 The Parish Council recommends that buses are routed along Rusper Road to connect to railway stations and to reduce the use of cars.

12. Phasing

12.1 The Design and Access Statement indicates that phasing has been carefully considered and takes account of early delivery of key infrastructure, including the education and transport elements. Liberty pledge early delivery of infrastructure where possible and in consultation with key stakeholders to ensure that infrastructure is delivered in an appropriate and timely manner. A programme of delivery for the highway infrastructure will be agreed and the sequence of works, including the delivery of the new junctions on the A264. (DAS pg. 144 S8). The Parish Council would like more clarity around this and information on the phasing of the business park which is vital for the viability of the development. It is crucial that affordable housing, education facilities and public transport is delivered proportionally as the development is built to address housing need in Horsham and to ensure that new residents are able to establish positive community links and travel habits.

13. Flooding

13.1. It is noted that SuDS (Sustainable drainage systems) are used wherever possible, however, the Parish Council has concerns that water draining into the streams on site could create a problem downstream in the town or further along the River Arun, Does HDC have evidence that this will not cause a problem?

13.2 The Parish Council has concern regarding the level and intensity of contaminants from water being discharged into the natural water system and the resulting effects on wildlife habitats in the local area, especially Warnham Nature Reserve – site of local value and wealth of wild life.

13.3 HDC must be satisfied that the development will not increase the likelihood of flooding in the area and that there will be no detrimental effect on the water table. Should the drainage profile of the area be changed and it became more prone to flooding this could have a consequence on the ability of homeowners to gain insurance cover.

14. Green spaces

14.1 The Parish Council need assurance that open spaces that are already in existence, for example the Riverside Walk, will be preserved within the ethos that they were originated, i.e. that the walk or other rural footpaths will not be diverted through development.

14.2 There needs to be clarity on who will be responsible for green spaces, recreational facilities and trees both in the day to day management and long term. This may be something to explore with the Parish Council, but ongoing management will require a level of finance to support it.

14.3 How will proposed facilities fit in with those already in existence in Horsham? There is concern that new facilities may impact on the viability of existing leisure centres, multi courts, sport and leisure provision, halls and community centres already in existence in Horsham.

14.4 Sports facilities should have non-invasive lighting to protect nearby housing from light pollution and adequate changing facilities available.

14.5 Are HDC and Sport England satisfied that the provision of land for sport replaces what has been lost within North Horsham from development on land previously designated for sport e.g. Jackdaw Lane?

14.6 The size of the sports hub is not commensurate with the development and described as being a 'destination' facility which implies that it will attract visitors from outside the immediate area. This puts additional pressure on the transport system in and around the development. The application indicates that a commercial leisure centre facility (e.g. a private gym) may create an additional 78 Full Time Equivalent jobs. More details of the proposals for leisure are required as it is of significant size.

15. Ecology

15.1 The Parish Council echoes the concerns of the Woodland Trust regarding the threat that development poses to ancient woodland on the site.

15.2 The area is a natural habitat for Pipistrelle Bats which in the UK are protected by law. It is illegal to damage, destroy or disturb any bats or roosts without having taken the necessary precautions. The Council requests a bat survey to be undertaken along with a similar survey to ascertain if other protected species are in danger from the development.

16. Archaeology, historic and cultural features

16.1 Attention is drawn to significant sites of local heritage and scheduled monuments on or near to the development site. These include the Motte and Bailey (on Lemmington Way), the Moated House Farm (linked to the Motte and Bailey), the moat north of Graylands Farm and The Castle Earthworks. These are part of Horsham's heritage and should be retained for the benefit of future generations.

17. Building design

17.1 There should be continuity in design and adherence to the Sussex vernacular. The sample of building design and materials appears to be sympathetic to local design, but the Parish Council echoes concern raised by the Horsham Society that there is a risk of nostalgia and rural idyll. Design should be cohesive and in compliance with standards set down within the Horsham Design Statement and monitored closely.

17.2 Houses should include access points for broadband and TV reception to avoid unsightly satellite dishes or large aerials.

17.3 It would appear that higher density and lower cost housing is close to the access road and that there is not a good mix of lower cost and higher priced housing in proximity to each other.

17.4 A settlement of this size should include provision for a good mix of housing size and tenure to allow intergenerational integration and ensure a balanced community. There does not appear to be any detail of accommodation to meet other needs, such as retirement housing, nursing homes, life time homes to meet the needs of the physically disabled or those with learning difficulties. At a

minimum, it should include one purpose built sheltered housing complex which promotes independent living with onsite support facilities in a safe and secure environment similar to Highwood Mill on the West of Horsham strategic site. There is evidence that the number of Horsham's population that is 85 years and over will double between 2014 and 2034 (Horsham Place Plan 2016 pg. 12)

No of Bedrooms	Market Housing	Social Rented		Intermediate Housing		Total	%
		Flats	Houses	Flats	Houses		
1	39	41		105		185	6.7
2	327	91	189	127	51	785	28.6
3	731		29	67	67	894	32.5
4+	828				58	886	32.2
Total	1925	132	218	299	176	2750	100.0
%	70.0	4.8	7.9	10.9	6.4	100.0	

17.5 Has a housing needs survey been done and if so what is actually needed?

17.6 Only 39 one-bedroom market properties are included within the proposals. There is anecdotal evidence that 1 and 2 bed roomed properties and bungalows are required for single occupancy and for downsizing.

17.7 A development of this size would usually require a church or place of worship which could also provide community support.

17.8 Attention is also drawn to the Horsham District Hotel and Visitor Accommodation Study (July 2016: i) which suggests that there will be a shortage of hotel accommodation in Horsham to meet the requirements of local companies. This may work in tandem with the creation of the new Business Park.

18. Affordable Housing

18.1 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), Horsham District Planning Framework (HDPF) and Strategic Housing Market Assessment all recommend 35% Affordable Housing on new development.

18.2 The distribution of home sizes appears to be a reasonable match to the SHMA requirements. (see overleaf)

No of Bedrooms	Social Rented Housing				Intermediate Housing				Total	SHMA 2014 Ref 1	
	Flats	Houses	Total	%	Flats	Houses	Total	%			
1	41		41	11.7	105		105	22.1	146	17.7	20.0
2	91	189	280	80.0	127	51	178	37.5	458	55.5	45.0
3		29	29	8.3	67	67	134	28.2	163	19.8	20.0
4+						58	58	12.2	58	7.0	10.0
Total	132	218	350	100.0	299	176	475	100.0	825	100.0	
% Flats/Houses	37.7	62.3	100.0		62.9	37.1	100.0				
% Social/Intermediate Ref 2			42.4				57.6				

However, **Ref 2:** HDPF Paragraph 6.8 page 56

“The overall housing tenure target is to provide 70% of the total as Social/Affordable rented properties and 30% as Intermediate/shared ownership properties.”

On this basis, the Social Rented should be 578, so there is a shortfall of 228 homes. In addition, the proportion of Affordable Homes should be 35% so the total number should be 963, with 674 Social Rented, giving a shortfall of 324 homes in this tenure.

18.3 In 2011 the breakdown of housing in Horsham was as follows: -

72% home ownership (this was a declining figure)

13% social tenants

14% private tenants

1% shared ownership

18.4 Planning application DC/16/1677 includes affordable housing as follows: -

30% local need (5% below the recommended amount)

Of that 30% 5% is contingent on the business park being built. (Reducing the potential to 25% and reducing the overall percentage of affordable housing if land for the business park is used for housing)

Of the proposed 30% 12.7% is affordable rental, 5% is shared ownership, 4.7% is discount market and 7.3% is private rented.

18.5 The total area of the site is 231.80 hectares of that 83% is being put to residential land use. (36%) The proportion of the site being offered for affordable housing is extremely small.

Whilst only 30% of the total number of houses will be categorised as affordable, it has been identified that this will represent a £5.66 million deficit to the developer which they are willing to

carry. However, the amount of affordable housing is less than is considered necessary for the development and the amount is not acceptable.

19. Construction

19.1 Given that there will be 381 construction workers on site what arrangements will be made to ensure they don't cause disruption to local residents? This includes excess noise and inconsiderate parking?

19.2 The Parish Council needs assurance that HDC considers that there are adequate tyre washing facilities.

20. Retail

20.1 The scale of the retail area is not commensurate with the development and will attract those from outside the development to visit, especially those from Kilnwood Vale which has no facilities. This has an impact on traffic on the surrounding roads and on roads within the development. Is there sufficient car parking and facilities to allow deliveries by lorry?

21. Business

21.1 There are concerns regarding the feasibility of a business park for high value manufacturing and technology as there is spare capacity of office provision within Horsham (with some offices being redesigned as housing) and surrounding towns that could be more attractive. The Parish Council is concerned that the units could be used for warehousing. Further clarification of the evidence base for the business park is required.

21.2 Major long standing employers have left Horsham in recent years, e.g. Novartis and Applied Materials) however, there is a proposal for a life science business park to be developed on the old Novartis site. Could this affect the viability of a similar type of business park on the outskirts of Horsham? The Parish Council is keen that the development encourages local enterprise and promotes stronger communities.

21.3 Is there provision for sufficient car parking and delivery by lorries?

22. Employment

22.1 Employment growth is dependent on high value businesses (Horsham Place Plan pg. 15) and it has been estimated that the employment space is likely to create 3,500 to 4,000 new jobs. (Horsham Place Plan 2016 pg. 17). The Planning application refers to employment opportunities through the retail outlets and the commercial leisure centre providing 468 Full Time Equivalent jobs. What evidence is there that there is suitable skilled labour to fill these jobs? Greater understanding of the business park and the number of jobs that will be provided is required.

23. Education

23.1 Policy SD8 states that 2 primary schools and a secondary school will be included in the planning application. DC/16/1677 indicates "on the school campus on the east of the site will be a secondary school, primary school (singular) and special educational needs. Land north of the proposed school campus could be acquired by West Sussex County Council if future expansion became a reality. A second primary school is proposed in the western part of the site." (Folder 1; Application documents; pg. 18 sections 3.4 – 3.43) Clarification is required as to what the developer will actually provide, land or the actual facilities.

23.2 Depending on the phased building of the development, there is a potential for those in the west of the area to have no definitive route to the larger school campus. Access to the school for those in the extreme west of the site is across the busy access road.

23.3 Additional school places are vital to cope with the increased need from all of the development around Horsham. This will be even more urgent when the development north of Horsham is built.

23.4 A strategic view of school provision for Horsham should be undertaken to take into account where the need for school places is and where provision is made and plans made accordingly. Currently the cost of school transport is very high and a strategic overview may offer a solution to reduce costs, reduce travel times and reduce road congestion.

24. Health

24.1 It is extremely disappointing that there is a lack of specified commitment to health within the application. Acknowledgement is given to the work of the Clinical Commissioning Group and their effort to ensure that an appropriate health facility commensurate to the size and needs of the local population is provided is supported.

24.2 Horsham is roughly 15 miles from all of the main hospitals in the surrounding area, therefore, a health facility such as a walk-in centre would be of benefit.

24.3 Concern was expressed regarding all transport links to the hospitals but especially public transport links which are not only difficult, often including many changes, but extremely costly.

24.4 Consideration should be given to using one of the business units adjacent to the A264 to be used as a fire/ ambulance /Police station for quick and easy access to major roads and Horsham.

24.5 There is significant concern about pressure on existing services such as schools, doctors' surgeries, dentists etc.

25. Community

25.1 The community centre should complement existing community facilities in Horsham and clarity surrounding its purpose, target audience and who manages and is responsible for it in the long term is needed. Should the Parish Council or another organisation be approached to explore long term management there is a question around financial contribution.

25.2 Concern was raised regarding the physical divide that Old Holbrook provides which segregates the new development. The resulting two distinct areas have individual characteristics of lower density and higher density housing. Reassurance was required to ensure that there would be links which would integrate the three areas to create a cohesive community.

26. General points

26.1 The Parish Council would like to better understand how development of Gatwick Airport and the proposed development at Wealdon Brickworks for a Recycling and Incineration Unit may influence this development and who would review it? It is noted that Gatwick Airport has not objected to the application on the grounds of noise as the development was outside their specified noise contours, however, it was recommended that potential house buyers were advised that there could be aircraft noise.

26.2 The Parish Council requires a better understanding of the process by which the developer can be held accountable for delivering what has been promised in the application.

26.3 Assurance is required from HDC that if a facility isn't built the land will not be used for more housing.

26.4 Currently the area north of the A264 is part of North Horsham Parish, however, the development is of a suitably significant size to warrant having its own Parish Council. Do HDC have any thoughts about this?

26.5 How will the large developments west of Horsham be impacted by the development in North Horsham and will the impact reach to Kilnwood Vale and Southwater?

26.6 It is disappointing that the developer chose to hold its public exhibition in Horsham (Park Barn on 30th September 2016 and 1st October 2016), that it was poorly signposted and badly attended. The venue was away from a bus route and with limited paid car parking which may have restricted the ability of some local residents' to attend. It was felt that the standard of exhibition material was very poor and that there was a heavy reliance on artistic impressions. It is hoped that a further exhibition will be held in North Horsham

The Parish Council will submit further comments in due course.

Yours faithfully

Pauline Whitehead BA(Hons) FILCM
Clerk to the Council