PPNP Consultation and Engagement
Appendix 1

Consultations with residents, land sponsors and statutory bodies
Plumpton Neighbourhood Plan Initial Consultation

Have your say on important topics that will define the future of our village over the next 20 Years

Have your say on...

Parking
Do we need double yellow lines? Accommodating Station Users?

Land Use
More recreational space?

Housing
Big Houses or Small? Single or multi-site? More Affordable homes?

New Facilities
School, Doctors, More Shops? More Play Areas?

Transport
More trains? How to improve bus usage?

Allotments?
Keep or reassign land?

Sports
A 3G pitch perhaps? Sports Pavilion?

Habitat
More Meadows? Future of the Pocket Park

Tuesday 29th April 2014
Drop in between 3pm-8pm to learn more and if you can, stay to hear the Chairman’s at 19:30

Two Important Public Meetings in one at the Village Hall
COME ALONG, LEARN MORE AND HAVE YOUR SAY

Plumpton Annual Parish Meeting

A chance to meet your Councillors and hear what has been achieved over the last year and ask questions.

Plumpton Parish Council
Jean.stewart4@gmail.com
www.plumptonpc.co.uk
**Consultation 1: drop-in event 29 April 2014**

**Raw data**

Following is a breakdown of the themes in the questions. This process involved:

a) Reviewing the post-it notes under each section and defining five key themes that emerged.

b) Counting the number of post-it notes relating to each theme

c) Where comments related to more than one theme, a tick was placed under all three headings.

d) After these initial themes were analysed, more clarity was found by grouping them together under overall thematic headings.

e) Within these ‘master’ themes, the percentage of people defining the kind of change were recalculated as a percentage of the overall people within the overall thematic headings, rather than as a percentage of all the post-it notes in that section.

The raw data are detailed below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Yes to change</th>
<th>No to change</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Need to do all we can to help local businesses thrive – good transport, good broadband, small offices – otherwise village could become a commuter village</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fibre-optic broadband please</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We need super-fast broadband – urgent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faster broadband would encourage more businesses to locate in the village</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No mention here about infrastructure. Before we worry about business development, need to ensure living here is pleasant and basic facilities – water, sewerage, power – are adequate. They are not now.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will we be getting a sewer upgrade? Present one is Victorian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity supply? – currently insufficient &amp; overloaded</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewage will need to be addressed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is anybody looking into public services – i.e. sewers cannot cope with excess rainfall now. Increase in traffic movements</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...be nice to have a hub/small office space to work in Plumpton</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The shop is essential – internet shopping cannot satisfy all daily needs

Business that is relevant to the village should be encouraged, but outsiders should be limited – No more business parks!

Support for the local pubs

Extra houses will disrupt the infrastructure of village

Need grants for new tourism businesses, i.e. cafe & cycle hire

Support some limited business development, possibly office space to avoid risk of being a ghost village during the daytime

Use local businesses – but no industrial or business development

Local shop excellent. Support local businesses / traders when can

Reinstate Winning Post (pub, now converted into housing)

Medical services for larger population

Exhibition in the village for all the local businesses

Invest in tourism – but make sure it doesn’t overrule our rural character

We should encourage businesses to support local buildings in return for some advertising space

Let’s focus on tidying up and making the most of being small. Those who want more facilities can move to a town

Is building more and more closely to each other creating stresses within neighbourhoods and to life in general. Bear this in mind, please

A footpath like that in Westmeston that is walkable in winter to get to The Downs safely – family friendly – to attract more walkers to the village

Local businesses should be encouraged, both by development of small-scale industrial units and also by providing affordable rented houses for tradespeople

Let’s reinforce our village / rural identity in a positive way – e.g. by reinforcing links to National Park (and associated tourist opportunities), farmers’ market etc. and shape business / housing developments around that identity

| The shop is essential – internet shopping cannot satisfy all daily needs | 1 | 1 |
| Business that is relevant to the village should be encouraged, but outsiders should be limited – No more business parks! | 1 | 1 |
| Support for the local pubs | 1 | 1 |
| Extra houses will disrupt the infrastructure of village | 1 | 1 |
| Need grants for new tourism businesses, i.e. cafe & cycle hire | 1 | 1 |
| Support some limited business development, possibly office space to avoid risk of being a ghost village during the daytime | 1 | 1 |
| Use local businesses – but no industrial or business development | 1 | 1 |
| Local shop excellent. Support local businesses / traders when can | 1 | 1 |
| Reinstate Winning Post (pub, now converted into housing) | 1 | 1 |
| Medical services for larger population | 1 | 1 |
| Exhibition in the village for all the local businesses | 1 | 1 |
| Invest in tourism – but make sure it doesn’t overrule our rural character | 1 | 1 |
| We should encourage businesses to support local buildings in return for some advertising space | 1 | 1 |
| Let’s focus on tidying up and making the most of being small. Those who want more facilities can move to a town | 1 | 1 |
| Is building more and more closely to each other creating stresses within neighbourhoods and to life in general. Bear this in mind, please | 1 | 1 |
| A footpath like that in Westmeston that is walkable in winter to get to The Downs safely – family friendly – to attract more walkers to the village | 1 | 1 |
| Local businesses should be encouraged, both by development of small-scale industrial units and also by providing affordable rented houses for tradespeople | 1 | 1 |
| Let’s reinforce our village / rural identity in a positive way – e.g. by reinforcing links to National Park (and associated tourist opportunities), farmers’ market etc. and shape business / housing developments around that identity | 1 | 1 |

Total 28 responses

Percentage of respondents in agreement 64% 36%

Below is the summary data for the different questions and themes.
Display 1: Village identity

- What makes Plumpton special?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quiet, peaceful, green landscape</th>
<th>Safe</th>
<th>Character/community</th>
<th>Facilities/location</th>
<th>Dark skies</th>
<th>Strong emotion mentioned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total 15 comments (some post-it notes with multiple comments)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>percentage</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Why do we live here?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quiet, peaceful green landscape</th>
<th>Safe</th>
<th>Character/community</th>
<th>Facilities/location</th>
<th>Dark skies</th>
<th>Strong emotion mentioned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total 24 comments (some post-it notes with multiple comments)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>percentage</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- How do we feel about living here?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quiet, peaceful green landscape</th>
<th>Safe</th>
<th>Character/community</th>
<th>Facilities/location</th>
<th>Dark skies</th>
<th>Strong emotion mentioned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total 23 comments (some post-its with multiple comments)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first three questions provoked very similar responses. Overall, there was a strong weighting towards a) the rural look aspect of the village, its greenery and tranquillity and; b) the sense of community and character.

Many people used terms like ‘love’ and ‘belonging’ and ‘home’. One resident even wrote about feeling ‘married to the village!’ That strength of emotion also emerged.
as a theme, even when it was not specifically requested. Our parish residents feel very strongly about the village and its qualities, the most important being countryside views and a strong sense of community.

- **What would we like for the future of Plumpton?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quiet, peaceful green landscape</th>
<th>Safe</th>
<th>Character/community</th>
<th>Facilities/location</th>
<th>Dark skies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total 24 comments (some post-it notes with multiple comments)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>percentage</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An overall summary of the post it notes in this whole section, led to the following summary:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quiet, peaceful green landscape</th>
<th>Safe</th>
<th>Character/community</th>
<th>Facilities/location</th>
<th>Dark skies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall re: village identity 172 comments (some post-it notes with multiple comments)</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of posts it mentioning each topic</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Display 2: Housing**

This topic prompted a mix of responses to potential development. The majority of people agreed that some development was acceptable, but had reservations.
Overall, the balance of views about development was as follows.

No one responded that development should happen without conditions. Of those that agreed to development with conditions, there was a theme of resignation – ‘as we have to’ was one example of these comments. The conditions were mainly as follows:

1. Sites should be small and spread evenly around the village, to include sites north and south as well as east and west. There was only one response that conflicted this.

2. Brownfield sites should be used wherever possible and open countryside, views and wildlife protected.

3. Affordable housing should be incorporated to allow housing for young families, young people who want to remain in the village and our older neighbours who may be struggling to maintain larger homes.

Points 1 and 2 may well be linked - the need for smaller developments may come from a wish to retain the parish’s rural character. Of the people who indicated that they didn’t want development at all, five comments specifically referred to Section 106 covenants in place on certain fields in the village. Infrastructure concerns are expanded on the next page.

A number of residents felt new, affordable housing would be acceptable for particular age groups: 33% supported new homes for families/young people, and 28% for older people.

**Sub-topic: Infrastructure**

The infrastructure concerns were collated from all the boards, since they came under housing, other matters, business and transport. Presented below are the range of topics raised as needing attention as part of any village development.
The need for gas, and the cost of oil, was most prevalent, followed by poor broadband connectivity.

The balance of specific issues presented here relates to the concerns highlighted in the housing section, where infrastructure investment was a condition of development.

**Display 3: Business**

The following themes emerged from comments on businesses and business opportunities within the parish.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Broadband</th>
<th>Utilities</th>
<th>Business premises needed</th>
<th>Business premises discourage</th>
<th>Tourism investment</th>
<th>Create business advertising opps</th>
<th>Support for local businesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total 28 responses</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of respondents in agreement</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Residents were very supportive of local businesses and shared ideas for improving the economic activity of the village through tourism (cafe and cycle hire) in order to capitalise on the links to the South Downs National Park. Infrastructure once again emerged as a concern, and space, broadband and utilities were all mentioned. Some residents said they didn’t want Plumpton to become a ‘dormitory status’, with only commuters living here.

Overall, the balance of post-it notes recommending some development and changes was nearly twice as many as those wanting to maintain the status quo.
Yes to change  | No to change  
---|---
Total 28 responses | 18 | 10  
Percentage of respondents in agreement | 64% | 36%  

### Display 4: Transport

Residents raised a wide range of concerns about transport issues, some in direct conflict with each other.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>More speed limits</th>
<th>No to speed limits</th>
<th>More parking space</th>
<th>Control parking</th>
<th>More trains / buses</th>
<th>Shop an issue</th>
<th>Train parking an issue</th>
<th>Accident concern</th>
<th>Encourage greener transport</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total 83 responses</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Many felt that extra speed limits were necessary, such as extending the 40-mph limit throughout the parish, in the areas outside the two settlements. However some felt this was unnecessary and were particularly opposed to the introduction of a 20-mph zone within Plumpton Green.

Again, many people commented on transport on other display boards, as summarised below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>More speed limits</th>
<th>No to speed limits</th>
<th>More parking space</th>
<th>Control parking</th>
<th>More trains / buses</th>
<th>Shop an issue</th>
<th>Train parking an issue</th>
<th>Accident concern</th>
<th>Encourage greener transport</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total 37 responses</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A grand total, combining the comments in total but calculating the percentage from the largest sample size (due to the likelihood that people will have raised their points in more than one display point) is as follows:
The same weight and balance of opinion across the issues emerged in all three analyses, with parking, including around the station, being the main concern.

**Display 5: Leisure activities**

The following themes emerged in residents’ views about maintaining and developing leisure activities:

- Broadband access and utilities
- Provision of fitness activities
- Provision specifically for children and teenagers
- Provision specifically for older people
- Access to green spaces
- Support for clubs and societies
- Improved use of village facilities such as the village hall green and the pavilion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Wifi &amp; utilities</th>
<th>Fitness activities</th>
<th>Young people</th>
<th>Older people</th>
<th>Access to green spaces</th>
<th>Support clubs societies</th>
<th>Better use of / improve village facilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>percentage</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Display 5: Public spaces and wildlife**

Residents were invited to note their priorities and thoughts about public spaces and wildlife in the parish. The following themes emerged:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Preserve wildlife</th>
<th>Preserve natural spaces</th>
<th>Nature reserve</th>
<th>Carbon neutral</th>
<th>Trees and hedges</th>
<th>Concern about housing</th>
<th>Total in favour of conservation as a village priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
The vast majority (90%) of responses favoured conservation, of some form, as a parish priority, which dovetails with the perception of Plumpton Parish as a rural community. Of these, some referred particularly to the wildlife, others to trees and hedges, and others to the need for ‘natural’ public space. Two responses in particular highlighted a need to avoid overly managed open spaces and the emphasis was on natural, as opposed to ‘green’ (this word wasn’t used at all).

**Display 6: Other matters**

Residents were asked an open question about matters, other than housing, that concerned them in the parish. The themes emerging from the post-it note responses were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Infrastructure</th>
<th>Transport</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Families</th>
<th>Older people</th>
<th>Businesses</th>
<th>village GP needed</th>
<th>Clubs and pubs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total 78 responses</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Issues involving transport were the most important, followed by the school. Many residents were concerned about a fall in educational standards at the school in recent years, but were also hopeful that things were improving. The transport concerns and ideas were migrated to the transport section, as above.
Letter from the Chairman, Plumpton Parish Council

29 April 2014

Dear Plumpton residents,

Those of you who came along to the village hall on Tuesday really showed your interest and support for the neighbourhood plan process which Plumpton has just started. I hope that you now have an understanding of what that process is and how the end product is to be shaped by the opinions of the many, not just the few.

The village has a history of involvement of its residents and some five years ago the village action plan showed that to its best with a response rate of 82% to the questionnaire. Under the very clear guidance of Tom Hawthorne, Carole Nicholson and a small central team - a very large group of volunteers was able to make the vision a reality - look at what that delivered in terms of the ongoing benefits for the village.

The Neighbourhood Plan puts that sort of involvement at a new level of legal standing and in terms of land use, can offer a real way to influence what happens "on the ground".

To achieve that, we need to be very focused and inclusive so expect to see lots of information coming your way. This is a totally transparent process for all to see, participate in and help to deliver.

The working group and Parish Council, both of which I am honoured to lead at this time, urge you to be part of this exciting opportunity.

With kind regards

Paul Nicholson

Chairman, Plumpton Parish Council & Neighbourhood Plan Working Group

paul.nicholson@plumptonpc.co.uk
PLUMPTON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

PUBLIC MEETING

Tuesday 16 September
3.00pm to 8.00pm
Village Hall

Drop in any time from 3.00pm to 8.00pm to meet the Steering Group, discuss the findings from the consultation event in April, see how the Plan is progressing, and find out how you can get involved.

YOUR VILLAGE – YOUR FUTURE
Consultation 2: Drop-in event 16 September 2014

Detailed breakdown

Using display boards and tables, we invited residents to answer the following questions (number of responses in brackets):

- What would we like for the future? (85 responses)
- What do we like about Plumpton and Plumpton Green now? (92)

The following key topic areas were presented and commented on for strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and risks.

- Economy and Local Business (23)
- Environment (27)
- Transport (24)
- Housing (46)
- Heritage (20)

The numbers in brackets refer to the number of post-it notes that were left on each display board and table. Many people left responses to more than one question, and some responses had to be re-allocated because they were not relevant to the question (i.e. refurbishing the Pit Stop in the Housing section). For this reason, the numbers and percentages should be interpreted as qualitative themes, indicating the balance of opinion, as opposed to absolute numbers.

The following is a breakdown of the themes in the questions. This process involved:

a) Reviewing the post-it notes under each section and defining around 5 key themes that emerged;

b) Counting the number of post-it notes that adhered to each theme;

c) Some post-its fell under more than one theme, for example one post-it note said: ‘Housing should consider fields, smaller sites and the needs of residents,’ and a tick was placed under all three headings;
d) After these initial themes were analysed, more clarity was found by grouping them together – for example, ‘opposed to change’ vs ‘encouraging change’;

e) Within these ‘master’ themes, the percentage of people defining the kind of change were recounted as a percentage of the overall people within the master theme, rather than as a percentage of all post-it in that section;

Results

Display 1: What would we like for the future?

We had 85 responses that fell into the following categories:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local groups and facilities</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retain natural countryside and wildlife</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retain dark skies</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small discreet affordable development</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No development</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport &amp; infrastructure problems solved</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retain character of village</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of these responses, just over half (58%) seemed wary about the role of development in the village and just under half (42%) seemed to expect a positive contribution. This is less in favour of development than the previous consultation in April, which found 36% of responses against change.

The positive responses highlighted opportunities to invest in infrastructure and transport links, including pavements, as well as community life such as clubs and sports.

Five people commented that they wanted the station gates to stay. However, this is a matter for the Southern Rail Network and does not fall within the control of the
Neighbourhood Plan. Since this consultation, the gates have been replaced with modern barriers.

In the previous consultation in April, the following responses were collected:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Quiet, peaceful green landscape</th>
<th>Safe</th>
<th>Character/community</th>
<th>Facilities/location</th>
<th>Dark skies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total 24 comments</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(some post-its with multiple comments)</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This shows that the same themes are broadly in place and that there is now more focus on what housing development could do for us. There is a significant concern about the damage to ‘rural character’, ‘green fields’ and ‘dark skies’, which has remained consistently high in the minds of villagers.

**Display 2: What do we like about Plumpton/Plumpton Green now?**

We had 92 responses to this question and they fell into the following categories:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quiet/peace &amp; landscape</th>
<th>59</th>
<th>64%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safe</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities &amp; location</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dark skies</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Love the village just as it is</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Below is a similar question from the April consultation, to show the consistency of answers: How do we feel about living here?
The answers again are consistently referring to the rural location and the need to retain the village character and countryside. 13% of people in the September consultation asked that the village didn’t change at all, which is a higher proportion than in April and may reflect the growing understanding that development sites are being proposed and will be actioned.

**Display 3: Local economy and business**

We had 23 responses to this theme in the fullest category, as some people only responded to one category.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths (9 responses)</th>
<th>Rail links</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The skills and trades in village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Facilities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weaknesses (23 responses)</th>
<th>Broadband capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local businesses struggling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poor public transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of amenities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opportunities (20 responses)</th>
<th>Business development (e.g. tourism)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improved transport and pathways</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community collaboration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Threats (1 response) | Multi-national companies (e.g. Tesco) |

Residents had slightly contradictory opinions within this theme, as some considered the facilities and transport links to be excellent, when related to trains, the shop and local tradesmen. Others identified a lack, related to buses, broadband and road/walking travel.

(The broadband issue will hopefully be resolved soon as is not a feature of the Neighbourhood Plan.)

This theme elicited the same approach to development as above – that development could contribute to village improvements to road and infrastructure.
The response rates above demonstrate that there is a weight of positive thinking towards the impact of development on the local economy and business.

**Display 4: Environment**

We had 27 responses to this theme in the fullest category, as some people only responded to one category.

| Strengths (16 responses) | Unspoilt countryside and wildlife  
|                         | Dark skies  
|                         | Footpath network and leaflets |
| Weaknesses (6 responses) | Lack of wild flowers  
|                         | Lack of bee keepers  
|                         | Lack of pavements and signpost |
| Opportunities (15 responses) | To consider wildlife in development  
|                                 | To improve flood defences |
| Threats (27 responses) | Any development is a threat  
|                       | Wildlife and countryside are in jeopardy  
|                       | Privacy and damage to existing property  
|                       | Flooding |

On balance, residents seemed to think that development of the village would be, on balance, a threat to the environment and likely to cause damage. However, some people did suggest that development projects could be done sympathetically.

**Display 5: Transport**

We had 24 responses to this theme in the fullest category, as some people only responded to one category.

| Strengths (9 responses) | Railway  
|                         | Buses  
|                         | Car sharing |
| Weaknesses (24 responses) | Parking (availability and danger of bad parking)  
|                         | Junctions and speeding issues  
|                         | Lack of buses  
|                         | Lack of late night trains |
| Opportunities (9 responses) | Limit speed  
|                                 | Improve parking  
|                                 | Cycle routes  
|                                 | Creating pavements |
| Threats (15 responses) | Increasing bottlenecks at Half Moon and Plough Junctions  
|                         | Increased parking  
|                         | Increased speeding |
Residents considered, on balance, there to be significant weaknesses in the transport system for Plumpton / Plumpton Green. This needs to be accounted for in significant development plans, which at the moment are seen as more of a threat than an opportunity.

**Display 6: Housing**

We had 46 responses to this theme in the fullest category, as some people only responded to one category.

| Strengths (8 responses) | Visually attractive  
|-------------------------|---------------------  
|                         | Good spread of housing  
|                         | Rural community  
| Weaknesses (19 responses) | Services and infrastructure insufficient for large developments  
|                         | Flooding risk  
| Opportunities (30 responses) | Affordable housing for young families and older people  
|                         | Develop local nature reserves  
|                         | Improve flooding  
| Threats (46 responses) | Risk of damaging public trust if covenants not honoured  
|                         | Countryside and wildlife damage  
|                         | Flooding risk  
|                         | Traffic and parking  
|                         | Risk to village character  

Residents seemed to perceive a greater threat than opportunity from housing development and this has polarised since the April consultation, again potentially due to the reality now being apparent (the developer’s leaflets, for example, showing potential sites).

The following summary from the last event still stands:

1. Sites should be small and spread evenly around the village, to include sites north and south as well as east and west. There was only one response that conflicted this.

2. Brownfield sites should be used wherever possible and open countryside, views and wildlife protected.

3. Affordable housing should be incorporated to allow housing for young families, young people who want to remain in the village and our older neighbours who may be struggling to maintain larger homes.
4. In April, five people mentioned the covenants and in the September consultation 7 people directly referred to the covenant.

Display 7: Heritage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Historic landscape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beautiful countryside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Well connected footpaths</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Racecourse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amenities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Saying hello and smiling is part of the way of life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Has always been somewhere where people get involved and volunteer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>People talk to each other and say x2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Safe place for children to grow up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beautiful location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community feel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opportunities</th>
<th>Village walking groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More on at racecourse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Park and ride scheme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community involvement from pub find out who owns pit stop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pit stop chance to promote Plumpton at south downs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Getting people to work together re parking village walking groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More on at racecourse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Park and ride scheme (x2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community involvement from pub leaflet on how to use defib (x3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
<th>No bonfire society</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No plumpton signage on B2116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No village carnivals anymore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pit stop in terrible condition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pit stop in poor repair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pit stop looks dangerous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not enough flowers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Threats</th>
<th>Old Plumpton not part of village</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Risk to landscape and wildlife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pocket park risks natural habitat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Light pollution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suburban dormitory feel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Threat to walking from reduced access to fields and loss of countryside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Loss of historic landscape and network of hedges etc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dilution of family-friendly feel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beautiful location – no over development of natural habitats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community feel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis

In the April 2014 analysis, an overwhelming 90% of responses favoured conservation, of some form, as a village priority, which dovetails with the indications from the
Village Identity board of Plumpton as a rural community. Of these, some referred particularly to the wildlife, others to trees and hedges and others to the need for natural public space. Two responses in particular highlighted a need to avoid overly managed open spaces and the emphasis was on natural, as opposed to just ‘green’, which wasn’t mentioned at all.

The same sentiments are expressed in the current set of responses, which have raised significant concerns about the possibility of damage to the environment that development may bring. While a large number of people are positive about the opportunities that development can bring in terms of affordable housing and contributions to infrastructure, the needs of the wildlife and landscape must be addressed in the Neighbourhood Plan.
We had an amazing turnout for our consultation meeting in September on the Neighbourhood Plan. So far a total of 174 residents have contributed their views about what makes Plumpton a special place to live and what kinds of development you want that would sustain Plumpton as a thriving rural community.

We analysed the many post-it notes you left on the displays. You told us what you treasured about Plumpton now – the quiet/peace and landscape and the strong sense of community.

You also told us what you wanted for the future: retain natural countryside and wildlife (22%); local groups and facilities (15%); retain dark skies (12%); transport and infrastructure problems solved (12%). You also said you were willing to accept small, discreet, affordable development (15%). What matters most to you is that any development retains the character of the village (21%). Only two per cent opposed any development at all.

Taken with all the other comments (which you can find on the Parish Council website – details below), we feel we now have a very clear message from Plumpton residents about your priorities and preferences.

Our next step will be to agree an overall vision for our Neighbourhood Plan and the policies governing future development that we think it could include. We’ll also review all the land available for development in the parish so we can propose sites where we think new housing might best be built.

We’ll send out a questionnaire to the whole parish in November to get your views on the policies that we think would achieve this vision. Your responses will guide the final draft Plan.

We will carry out a full consultation with the parish on the final draft early next year. The final Plan will then go to Lewes District Council (LDC) and to an independent examiner, who will check that the proper legal process has been followed and that it conforms with local strategic policy.

The final stage is a public referendum on the Plan, which LDC will conduct. This is when you will have the final say. If we’ve done our job well, we’ll be confident that you’ll approve the Plan. If it is approved, we hope it will be in place early next summer. This process is governed by the Localism Act 2011. You’ll have heard about ‘windfall developments’. We know there is some concern that some housing developments could go ahead before LDC publishes its Core Strategy. Without wishing to be alarmist, we feel you should be aware of the facts.

The wording of the Core Strategy has been changed since the earlier draft. Instead of 50 houses being allocated to Plumpton, it now reads ‘a minimum of 50’ houses. We have been advised by LDC that only housing built on sites officially allocated for development in the Core Strategy will count towards this target. Until the Core Strategy is approved, any planning applications for new housing in the village will not count as part of the allocation set out in the Strategy as the housing will not be part of the strategy.

LDC is in a weak position to oppose any planning applications received before the Core Strategy is approved. This is because, under its existing policies, it can only demonstrate a housing supply rather less than the Government requires. In these circumstances LDC policies that might restrict developments before the Core Strategy is approved will carry little weight.

This is a situation created by government planning policy. Other villages locally are facing a similar problem. The Parish Council and the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group will continue to express our strongest concerns to LDC.

The Core Strategy is currently being examined by a planning inspector for the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government. You can download the summary at http://www.lewes.gov.uk/Files/plan_CS_Submission.pdf. The examination process includes public hearing sessions, which anyone is welcome to attend. You can find out more at www.lewes.gov.uk/corestrategyexamination.

LDC hopes the Core Strategy will be approved and come into force in early 2015. We hope our Neighbourhood Plan will be approved in the summer. We are working on it as fast as we can but it is a complex process.

You’ll find regular updates on our progress on the Parish Council website at www.plumptonpc.co.uk and in the parish magazine. Please feel free to ask us questions. Volunteers to help us put the Plan together are always welcome too. Please contact the parish clerk Sarah Jeffers with any queries and she will make sure they get to the right person. Sarah.jeffers@plumptonpc.co.uk/01444 441 302

Plumpton Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group

November 2014
27 November 2014

Dear land sponsor

Ref: Site in Plumpton Parish

Thank you for responding to the Plumpton Parish Neighbourhood Plan ("PPNP") “call for sites” exercise earlier this year. The next stage in producing the PPNP is to invite you, as the owner or agent (the “land sponsor”) to explain how the site you proposed could be developed.

We are holding a meeting on 6 January 2015 in the Plumpton Green Village Hall between 18.00 and 22.00 and anticipate each of the land sponsors will explain their sites to the PPNP Steering Group in a short presentation with questions to follow. The meeting will be attended by members of the public who will also be given a short time in which to ask questions. You are invited to be present during the whole meeting to hear the other presentations if you wish but you are free to leave after your own presentation.

Your presentation must be in Powerpoint format on a memory stick and equipment will be available for your use. We ask you to bring 6 hard copies of the presentation to the meeting as well. Please ensure that your presentation will last no longer than 10 minutes and there will be 5 minutes allocated to PPNPSG and public questions.

The minimum content requirements for your presentation are:
- Location address, grid reference
- Location map
- Site size in hectares
- Current use of the land proposed
- Planning history of the site
- Proposed property numbers by type (detached, terrace etc)
- Number of affordable homes including ownership structure
- Access including vehicular, pedestrian and bicycle
- Parking arrangements
- Utilities and infrastructure requirements
- Environment including flood risk control, contaminated and other land considerations

Your presentation will only be able to refer briefly to the issues above; your written presentation should cover these points in detail.
Following the meeting, the PPNPSG will review and assess each presentation against specific criteria designed to meet the needs of the parish in the period to 2030. We will send you an overview of the objectives of the PPNP as soon as possible which will help guide you towards those criteria.

Each Land Sponsor will be contacted following this review with the results of the assessment.

Should you need any further guidance in any matter referred to above please contact Paul Nicholson.

Please complete the attached Land Sponsor Acceptance Form and return it to the Parish Clerk by 19 December 2014. This will ensure timings can be set and the logistics co-ordinated for the meeting.

The PPNPSG would like to thank you for your interest in the future of Plumpton and it looks forward to hearing your presentation.

Yours faithfully

Paul Nicholson

Chairman, Plumpton Parish Council & Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group

paul.nicholson@plumptonpc.co.uk
01273 891725
www.plumptonpc.co.uk
www.plumptonpc.co.uk/neighbourhoodplan
Plumpton Parish Neighbourhood Plan

Land Sponsor Presentation

Tuesday 6th January 2015 18.00 – 22.00

Plumpton Green Village Hall, 1 Westgate, Plumpton Green BN7 3BQ

LAND SPONSOR PRESENTATION ACCEPTANCE FORM

I am able/not able to present to the Plumpton Parish Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group (“PPNPSG”).

Landowner’s name: .................................................................

Address: ...................................................................................

Telephone no.: .................................................... E-mail: ..................

Agent’s name: ...........................................................................

Company name: ........................................................................

Address: ..................................................................................

Telephone no.: .................................................... E-mail: ..................

Site address: ............................................................................

The PPNPSG will provide lap top, projector and screen for the presentation. Please bring your presentation on a memory stick.

Return this form by 19 December 2014 preferably by e-mail to the Parish Clerk as below.

Sarah Jeffers
Parish Clerk
8 Heasewood
Bolnore Village, Haywards Heath
West Sussex RH16 4TJ
sarah.jeffers@plumptonpc.co.uk
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>Agent</th>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mr Kenyon and Mr Maxwell-Gumbleton</td>
<td>Parker Dann</td>
<td>Land south of Riddens Lane</td>
<td>18.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mr and Mrs Avery</td>
<td>Weald Designs</td>
<td>Land to north east of Wells Close</td>
<td>18.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mr and Mrs Bowden</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Fallbrook, Plumpton Lane</td>
<td>18.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Glenbeigh Developments Ltd</td>
<td>Barton Willmore</td>
<td>Land at Little Inholmes Farm</td>
<td>19.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Mr Awbery c/o Mr Davis</td>
<td>JJ Hatfield and Co Ltd</td>
<td>Land to the rear of Plumpton Primary School, North Barns Lane</td>
<td>19.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Cala Homes</td>
<td>Paul White</td>
<td>Land to rear of Oakfield, East of Station Road</td>
<td>19.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Break**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>Agent</th>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Mr MacLaren</td>
<td>Written presentation</td>
<td>Drews Farm, Plumpton Lane</td>
<td>20.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Mr and Mrs Walker</td>
<td>SG discussion. Sponsor not present</td>
<td>Inholmes Farm</td>
<td>20.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Mr Guy Thomas /Emma Innes-Whitehouse</td>
<td>SG discussion with Sponsor</td>
<td>6 Acres east of Station Road (N of Old Police House)</td>
<td>20.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Sir E Cazalet</td>
<td>SG discussion. Sponsor not present</td>
<td>Land adjoining Inholmes Farm</td>
<td>21.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Round up and close 21.15**
THE PLUMPTON PARISH NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN SURVEY JANUARY 2015

Please complete this survey to help shape the future of our Parish
Dear Resident

The preparation of Plumpton Parish Neighbourhood Plan (PPNP) was launched in spring 2014 with the setting up of a Steering Group, comprising parish councillors and parishioners, under the remit of the Parish Council. The PPNP will give residents of the Parish influence over the development of housing, facilities, business, green spaces and the like in the period to 2030. The PPNP will be integrated into the planning approval process by Lewes DC and all development applications will be assessed against the criteria set out in the PPNP.

The aim is to bring the draft PPNP to the Parish to vote in a referendum sometime in the second half of 2015 and there is much work to be done to achieve that timetable. This survey is one part of that work and your help in completing it is essential to the PPNP’s success.

Two public consultation events have been held in the Village Hall during 2014 and the feedback from those has helped shape the vision for the future of the Parish.

This survey gives you the chance to express your views. Please complete it on behalf of your household, and if you have young adults or younger children (under 17s) then please get them to complete the separate Young Person’s Survey at the back of the main survey.

You can copy that one page and let your children complete one each.

All surveys are being collected from each household during the week 19 - 23 January 2015. Please either leave your completed survey safely for collection in your porch (out of the rain please) or have it handy when the doorbell rings.

Keep up to date with the PPNP by visiting www.plumptonpc.co.uk/neighbourhoodplan

Remember this is:

“Your Parish........Your Future”.

January 2015

The Plumpton Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group

Every completed survey collected by the deadline of 23 January 2015 will be entered into a raffle draw. There are two prizes of £50 vouchers to be won. Entry into the raffle is conditional on you providing your contact details on the last page of this survey.
Section 1: Heritage and Infrastructure

This topic is concerned with our attitude to the shaping of the future of our Parish both in physical structure and in our personal relationship with our community.

1. Plumpton can be described as a Scarpfoot or linear parish, being long and narrow and having developed from the foot of the Downs. Would you:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer yes or no</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prefer to maintain this characteristic with any development on a north-south axis?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer to see the shape of the village change and expand widthways on an east-west axis?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. How would you wish to see the Parish develop?

   Please indicate your preferences in relation to all of the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>No particular view</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Parish should grow in order to encourage an increase in services such as public transport, a doctor’s surgery, mains gas, more shops etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Parish should encourage residents to live and work locally where possible e.g. by encouraging potential employers to set up business premises within the parish.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Parish should encourage visitors by promotion of tourist attractions such as tea rooms, holiday cottages etc. and events such as country fairs in order to boost the local economy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Which of the following aspects of our parish life would you like to see preserved?

   Please indicate your preferences in relation to all of the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>No particular view</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Absence of street lighting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our clubs and societies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Train services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Post office and store
Pavilion
Village Hall
Primary school
Any others - please specify

4. In your view, what are the 3 most important aspects of our Parish's heritage (the order is not important)?

1
2
3

Section 2: Landscape and Biodiversity

We hope to find out whether the countryside and its wildlife is a significant feature of why you live in Plumpton and how much you use it and to seek a mandate for ensuring that developments cater for wildlife to the maximum.

5. How significantly do the following contribute to your quality of life in the Parish?

Please indicate your preferences in relation to all of the following: Very Significant No particular view Not Significant

Local countryside and its wildlife
Footpath access to the countryside
Cycle access to the countryside
Views of the Downs

6. Would you like to see an emphasis on incorporating significant accommodation for wildlife as a feature of new developments, including in the built structures? (for example, design of garden area to allow free movement of wildlife, incorporation of purpose-built bird nest boxes, creation of areas or features that compensate for habitat lost in development.)

Yes No
7. Which Local Open Space(s) do you particularly value? (this could be a field or woodland that you and your family cherish or an area where you walk, cycle or ride, or an area you admire. It could be somewhere where your children play or that you just value within the community. It could be as simple as a wide verge or an area displaying wildflowers and wildlife.)

Please give specific address or location including grid reference if possible:

Section 3: Housing and development

During the period to 2030 Plumpton Green must accept a minimum of 50 new homes. There is no way that this situation can be avoided. Through the PPNP the Parish Council will gain the ability to have significant input as to the type of homes built, the format of developments and where they are built.

The proposed Lewes District Council Core Strategy indicates that developments of greater than 3 units must include some ‘affordable homes’ both rented and for shared ownership. With developments of over 10 units, 40% must be affordable.

Your views on the best way to accommodate such development are vital to ensure that the Parish develops in a way that is acceptable to the majority and satisfies perceived needs.

8. Would you favour:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All new home development being built in one phase on a single site?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development phased over a period with, say 10-20 or lower homes being erected at a time?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9. What type(s) of homes do you consider appropriate to be developed?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please indicate your preferences in relation to all of the following:</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Small units with 1 or 2 bedrooms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Medium units with 2 or 3 bedrooms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Larger homes with 4 to 5 bedrooms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Warden assisted accommodation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Combination of a (small units) &amp; b (medium units)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Combination of a (small units), b (medium units) &amp; c (larger homes)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Should the homes include flats in small blocks?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Would ‘retirement homes’ be desirable?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Do you think a care/nursing home would be an asset if commercially viable?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The PPNP also offers the opportunity to determine how housing and other community assets such as community centres, pubs and shops could be delivered and managed in such a way so as to ensure long term community benefit. For example, land may be protected which ensures that the housing or other assets developed on it will be for the benefit of the community in perpetuity.

10. Would you support a community led approach to the delivery and management of housing and other community assets in the PPNP?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

If you would like to know more about community led housing and asset management then please contact the clerk for further information.
Section 4: Business and Employment

The Parish hosts a number of businesses owned and/or run by individuals right through to large businesses such as the Racecourse and Plumpton College which have a measurable impact on the economic activity in the Parish and beyond. How would you like the business and employment opportunities in the Parish to develop?

11. Would you like to see more business and employment opportunities in the Parish?

| Yes | No |

12. If Yes to Q11 above, what type of business/employment would you like to see?

Please tick all that apply:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agriculture</th>
<th>Retail</th>
<th>Leisure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tourism</td>
<td>Business support services e.g. IT, legal, finance</td>
<td>Trades</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please state)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. Would you support land being identified as part of the PPNP for future business development?

| Yes | No |

14. If you own or run a business in the Parish how important are the following potential benefits from the PPNP?

Please indicate your preferences in relation to all of the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Increased parking</th>
<th>Very important</th>
<th>No particular view</th>
<th>Not important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Better public transport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High speed broadband</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More patronage from residents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section 5: Transport and Access

A wide range of concerns was raised about transport and access issues in the public consultation events. The issues raised were the need for more parking spaces, particularly at the village shop and the railway station, more control over parking generally, speed limits, additional transport services and more environmentally sensitive transport opportunities.

15. In your opinion, how well maintained and serviced are the following in the Parish:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please indicate your preferences in relation to all of the following:</th>
<th>Very well maintained</th>
<th>No particular view</th>
<th>Poorly maintained</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roads and roadsides</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Footpaths</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycle paths</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridleways</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. How do you feel about introducing paid-for parking?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>No particular view</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At the station</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At the playing field</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section 6: Sustainable energy

The Parish, individually or with others, could develop a range of sustainable energy sources and providers. Although this can’t be included in the policies for the PPNP due to its uncertain delivery, we would like to know how you feel about taking this forward.

17. Please indicate how important developing these opportunities are to you:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please indicate your preferences in relation to all of the following:</th>
<th>Very important</th>
<th>No particular view</th>
<th>Not important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Currently, the Parish is reliant on energy sources such as oil, LPG and electricity for its energy and heating needs. Should developers be required to contribute to a sustainable energy fund to pay for the Parish to be connected to the national gas network?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should developers be required to invest in a sustainable energy fund to enable the Parish to reduce its dependence on non-sustainable energy sources and reduce energy bills (i.e. through establishing a community-owned solar energy park)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should developers be required to pay a levy to offsite local renewable energy sources to meet a minimum percentage of predicted energy use of residential/non-residential developments?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THANK YOU FOR COMPLETING THIS SURVEY

Contact Details

(required in order to enter the raffle)

These details will be used solely for the purposes of the prize draw associated with this survey and will not be passed on to any third-party or used to associate your survey responses to you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address/Post Code</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact phone number</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1: How old are you? 6-8 □ 9-11 □ 12-13 □ 14-15 □ 16-17 □

2: Where do you live? Plumpton □ Plumpton Green □

3: What do you like **most** about living here?

4: What do you like **least** about living here?

5: Will anything stop you from setting up a home in Plumpton when you grow up? Yes □ No □

If yes, what is it?

6: Do you use any bus service from within Plumpton? Yes □ No □

If Yes,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Which route(s)?</th>
<th>Does the timetable meet your needs?</th>
<th>Yes □ No □</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What would make the service better?

7: Do you use the train from Plumpton? Yes □ No □

8: Do you feel there are enough groups and events for young people in the Parish? Yes □ No □

If no, what additional opportunities would you like to see?
9: Are the facilities within the Parish adequate for young people? Yes □  No □

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>If no, what additional facilities would you like to see?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

10: Do you regularly walk/run/cycle around Plumpton? Yes □  No □

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>If yes, do you have any comments about the roads, bridleways, pavements and footpaths?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Thank you for completing this survey.
The revised draft pre-submission Plumpton Parish Neighbourhood Plan has been published for consultation. Come to the open events to find out what it proposes for our village’s future:

- 21 June 7–9.30pm at the Pavilion
- 16th July 11am–4pm at the Village Hall

Copies are available online at www.plumptonpc.co.uk/neighbourhood-plan
Hard copies can be read at the Half Moon, Fountain and Plough, the Station, Village Hall, Village Shop and Church Annexe

Your Parish – Your Future
PLUMPTON PARISH DRAFT NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN RESPONSE FORM

Thank you for taking the time to feedback on the draft Neighbourhood Plan.

Some guidance notes to help you complete it in a way that will assist the Steering Group in finalising the document:

- While the final referendum will only be open to registered voters, at this stage the Steering Group are keen to get the widest range of input. To achieve that, this form is available to all individuals (i.e. not simply one per household), regardless of age, but only one form per individual will be accepted.
- Please note that anonymous forms cannot be considered and will therefore be ignored.
- If you choose to feedback, then please complete Part A and Part B – while this exercise is primarily qualitative in that it seeks your views, it is also useful to take the opportunity to gauge the overall support for the draft plan.
- Part C is optional, but must be completed if you have indicated in Part B that there are specific policies you do not support – the Steering Group need to know why a policy is not supported in order to consider any amendments to it.
- It would assist the Steering Group in collating responses if you would use the electronic version of the form, available from the Neighbourhood Plan website (www.plumptonpc.co.uk/neighbourhood-plan/), and keep your comments constructive and as concise as possible. If you wish to make several comments on the electronic form, please insert additional rows in Part C as required. For paper forms, simply use as many copies as required.
- The closing date for responses is 31 July 2017. Please return the form by one of the following methods: a) dropping into the box at Plumpton Post Office and Store, b) by email to np@plumptonpc.co.uk, c) or by post to the Parish Clerk: Anita Emery, Plumpton Parish Council, Elm Cottage, Church Street, Hartfield TN7 4AG

PART A – Respondent details (must be completed)

Name:

Postcode:

Connection to Plumpton: Resident in Parish YES/NO

Business within Parish........................................YES/NO

Landowner of Land within Parish.................YES/NO

Other (e.g. a planning consultant or similar representing any of the above) – Please specify below

PART B – Summary of overall support
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Do you support the draft plan? (Please delete the answer that does not apply)

Yes/No

If you answered ‘Yes’ to the above, then the Steering Group will presume you support all the policies within the plan, but if that is not the case, then you can indicate so below. You are also free to add comments in Part C.

If you answered ‘No’, then the Steering Group need to know which policies you do not support (and why)? Please make that clear below (on the electronic form, simply delete all the policies that you are happy with, to leave those you do not support. On the paper form, just indicate [e.g. by ticking, circling or similar] those policies that you do not support). Then complete section C to provide the reason why you do not support that policy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy 1: Spatial Plan for the Parish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy 2: New-Build Environment and Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 3: Associated Infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 4: Provision of Adequate Parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 5: Landscape and Biodiversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 6: Sustainable Drainage and Wastewater Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 7: New Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 8: Local Employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 9: Plumpton Village Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 10: Plumpton College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 11: Plumpton Racecourse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 12: Community Facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 13: Local Green Spaces and Open Spaces</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## PART C – General

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments on general sections of the documents</th>
<th>Page and/or paragraph number</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Suggested improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comments on specific policies in the draft plan</td>
<td>Policy and/or page or paragraph number</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Suggested improvement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OUR VILLAGE – OUR COMMUNITY.
Help shape its future.
The Parish Council would like to thank all residents who responded to the Draft Neighbourhood Plan. In raw numbers, there were more positive responses than negative and, as might be expected, the replies expressed conflicting views on some elements of the plan. A lot of questions and concerns are already addressed in the supporting documents, particularly the Strategic Environment Assessment and Site Assessment reports, although it is understandable that not everyone has the time to wade through these.

First, it is worth restating that a neighbourhood plan can only guide the planning process. It does carry some weight, but cannot override national planning policy, or local (Lewes District Council and East Sussex County Council) strategic and planning policies.

Here, we'll try to answer some of the most common themes and concerns that came out of the consultation process.

1. Why can't we put a cap on the numbers of houses?

   *Unfortunately, neighbourhood plans cannot dictate a maximum number of houses that can be built.*

2. Why has the plan exceeded the 50 demanded by Lewes District Council?

   *This was always a minimum number, and LDC has told us that they may still have a shortfall in the total number of houses they are expected by the government to build in the planning period. Therefore, LDC is advising parishes preparing a neighbourhood plan to allocate housing above their minimum to ensure that the minimum requirement is fulfilled and protect us, if additional housing is needed, from speculative development outside the plan.*

3. The sewage infrastructure is inadequate to cope with the extra housing.

   *Planning laws require that no development can be granted planning permission without the necessary infrastructure capacity in place. We are continuing to raise these concerns with Southern Water.*

4. Why is there no policy for the school?

   *A neighbourhood plan does not have any powers over provision of school facilities. This is the remit of East Sussex County Council and the education authorities.*

5. The plan would mean removal of the Brighton Garage, yet it claims to support local businesses.

   *Some time ago the landowner of the site was granted planning permission for the demolition of the garage building and the development of two homes to replace it. The plan supports viable businesses. The premises are on a short-term lease, and can be terminated at short notice, so the business is not viable in the long term. Residents have also expressed concern that it causes congestion on Station Road, as it has no parking and cars waiting to be serviced are parked along Station Road.*

6. The access to Riddens Lane onto Station Road is not safe to accommodate additional traffic.

   *The Parish Council acknowledges concerns about this junction but the overriding authority here is East Sussex Highways, who have already given their approval to the proposed development. Therefore, we cannot prevent development on these grounds.*

7. Why is the Glebe included when it may not be available for five years?

   *This site may not be available for several years, but it will become available within the planning period (to 2030) and therefore it meets the criteria for availability. We do not expect all the sites to be developed at once.*

8. Why is the Nolands site excluded?

   *The Nolands site was assessed with the other sites in the revised development plan. The Parish Council decided that the density of housing proposed for the site was unacceptable (45, according to the leaflet delivered around the village), and that the 40 houses spread across the Glebe and Oakfield sites are at a more acceptable density that is in keeping with the rural nature of our village. The developers of these sites have agreed to a density far lower than is permitted by planning law, allowing much greater accommodation of wildlife habitats and landscape features. Furthermore these sites will not be developed at the same time, unlike Nolands.*

7. How can the Rectory and Church environs be protected?

   *The plan already includes a policy to protect the Rectory. The Parish Council is in discussion with developers to ensure any development proposals respect the environs of the Rectory and Church, which are an important historical feature in the village.*
8. The three sites together, at Wells Close, the Glebe and Oakfield, exceed the residents’ expressed wishes to have distinct, smaller developments. Only two sites have a common boundary (the Glebe and Oakfield), and the Plan policies include the requirement that the developments should be separated by landscape buffers. The three sites will not be developed at the same time.

9. The racecourse site would give a precedent to further possible development on the site. We recognise residents’ concerns about this site. We also recognise the importance of supporting the survival of the racecourse. Unless the access problem is resolved, this site cannot go forward as the plan cannot recommend a site that is not deliverable.
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10 January 2017

We were delighted to welcome two new members to the Parish Council – Stephen Morris and Nick Satchel, who were both co-opted onto the Council by unanimous vote. Stephen is new to the Council, Nick has previously served as a parish councillor. This brings the Council up to full strength again.

Plumpton College: The Chair reported back on a meeting with the Principal at Plumpton College, Jeremy Kerswell, to discuss the recent slurry discharge and resulting pollution of Plumpton Hill Stream. The Principal assured us that the College is currently working on proposals to make good the impact on the environment and fish stocks. He also agreed to attend the next council meeting, on 14 February, to answer questions from residents. The College is conducting a major review of the impact of its farming practices on the environment, and the Principal said he would welcome input from village residents with expertise in this field. If you have any questions for the Principal, please attend the next parish council meeting.

2017/18 budget. We agreed the budget for 2017/18, totalling £549,963.00. This means a 5% increase on the precept (as in previous years), amounting to some £3 per household for the year.

Neighbourhood Plan. The Chair and Vice Chair gave an update on progress with the Neighbourhood Plan. This is slow but steady. The Steering Group is currently reviewing the Sustainability Appraisal and Strategic Environment Assessment reports, in the light of responses to the Section 14 consultation. The outcomes of the reviews, the consultation responses and how the Plan addresses these will be published in due course. Meanwhile, the implications of the Newick Secretary of State ruling (as summarised very well in the letter in last month’s magazine) has clearly changed the context in which the Plan is being prepared, and the Steering Group is giving this serious consideration. It continues to investigate the feasibility of the two sites south of the railway, but LDC and ESCC are clear that a safe pedestrian crossing must be provided at the level crossing, which involves negotiations with the landowners on the north and south sides. Chris Burges has stepped down as secretary due to ill health and lack of time. The SG continues to welcome contact from anyone interested in joining and contributing to its work.

Speed limits. We agreed to renew our application to East Sussex County Council for a 40mph speed limit north from the Plough and south from the Half Moon to the 30mph limit at the entrance to the village. This had been agreed back in 2015, subject to matched funding being available from ESCC, but was put on hold due to lack of funds. We also agreed to raise our campaigns for lower speed limits with our MP Maria Caulfield, who has offered to meet with us to discuss the train strike and other local issues. Meanwhile, we are going to investigate the feasibility of installing our own, informal speed limit signs.

Pocket Park. Councillors visited the Pocket Park last month, while it was possible to fight our way in through the brambles. We agreed to organise a community rubbish clearing day on Saturday, 18th February, and to hire a skip for the quantities of domestic rubbish dumped there. Volunteers are needed to help. Meet 11am at the entrance (by the allotments). Bring tough gloves and sturdy footwear, and snips to cut back the brambles.

Sports Pavilion. We approved the plan by the Playing Field Committee to use the funds held for a new pavilion to renovate the existing building. A plan has been drawn up to institute a programme of repairs over the next eight months. This will include upgrading the external fabric, an electrical survey, a new floor, reconfiguring the changing rooms, upgrading the kitchen, putting in a new disabled access, and installing insulation. Thanks to Steve Bodsworth for his very helpful advice on the work needed.

Cont. page 5
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Update February 2017

1. What has been happening since June?
The Steering Group (SG) received many responses to the consultation in June last year. These responses came directly from residents, planning agents on behalf of residents, statutory bodies (LDC, ESCC, and SDNP etc) as well as developers. To answer these responses fully, we needed to complete a robust review of the Site Assessment and Strategic Environment Assessment reports which has taken a considerable amount of time to work through, but we were hoping to have completed this by the end of February.

2. Local planning decisions
Over the last few months there has been a clear change in the political environment as regards national and local housing supply strategy.

A number of recent court decisions relating to neighbourhood plans have changed radically the environment in which we are finalising our neighbourhood plan. The most important is the ruling by the Secretary of State on Newick, which has obliged Lewes District Council to over-ride the Newick neighbourhood plan, after it was adopted, and grant planning permission to a development of a further 50 houses that was not included in the plan. The decision made clear that neighbourhood plans did not take precedence over planning law, and where there was a need for housing, and development land was available that met LDC sustainability criteria, then planning permission should be granted.

In the light of the Newick ruling, and the comments we received, we have to ensure that our assessments of each site are completely objective and robust, and be mindful that any land included in the LDC Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) (which is updated regularly as new sites come on-stream) may be developed, whether it is in the neighbourhood plan or not, and the units on these sites would be in addition to those in the plan.

3. Sites
The owners of site 2.5, south of the railway (east side), have reluctantly withdrawn their land from the plan. Similarly, at the time of writing the Racecourse site is not achievable in the eyes of LDC since the pedestrian access required has not been agreed. If a site is not achievable it cannot be included as a primary site in a neighbourhood plan.

We have recently been made aware that we need to include in our site assessment process the site at Nolands Farm, which was originally excluded from the draft neighbourhood plan because it had no access. The developers have found a way to create access.

Therefore, taking these two facts into consideration means there will be changes to the draft plan on which we consulted in June, and this is what the Steering Group is considering now.

4. The growing housing target
We have been told that LDC has been instructed by the government to find land within the district for an extra 200 houses on top of their original target. It is likely that Plumpton will have to accept some of those 200, although we do not know how many. Our draft plan made provision for more than the minimum 50 houses, but, in the light of the new target, we may have to demonstrate that Plumpton is willing to accept a larger number, in return for control on where new houses are built and the extent of any future development within this planning period (to 2030).

5. Limits of neighbourhood planning policy
Neighbourhood plans were initially sold to local communities with the promise that they would give them control on the number and the location of any new housing in their village. It is clear now that the government is retracting this local control.

However, the SG still firmly believes that it is better to have a neighbourhood plan than to have no plan at all. The SG will continue to do all it can to include in the plan as many residents’ preferences as possible while being cognisant of modern planning principles so that the plan will pass both LDC scrutiny and subsequently the planning inspector, and the final referendum.
PLUMPTON PARISH NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN
UPDATE 2

Readers will remember from the February update that a steering group (SG) of the Parish Council has been working on a Neighbourhood Plan for the parish for the past two and more years, and last June we published a draft plan for consultation. The consultation generated a lot of feedback from residents, statutory bodies, landowners as well as developers. In addition, we have had to be mindful of other factors, including change of policy at government level, recent challenges to local planning decisions, and the loss of one site and addition of another. As a result, the SG has had to substantially reconsider this draft plan. This update aims to explain why the plan has changed and give some background as to how the SG arrived at the recommended sites listed below.

We want to emphasise that this new plan will go out to formal consultation, so all residents will have plenty of time to give us their responses to it, should they wish. Then, after the consultation stage, the plan has to be accepted by Lewes District Council before going before the independent examiner. Only if it passes these stages does the plan go to referendum, when all residents of the Parish will have a vote. A simple majority in favour will mean the plan becomes real.

Challenges

1. In November last year, Sajid Javid, the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government, granted planning permission for a housing development in Newick that was not in its Neighbourhood Plan. This decision was appealed and the Secretary of State has, very recently, accepted that his ruling was inconsistent with a previous decision and decided not to fight the appeal. However, this does not mean that the developer, as an interested party, will do the same. At the time of writing, the implications for other neighbourhood plans are unclear. What is clear is that decisions made in a plan can be challenged and have to be defensible.

2. We have had clear guidance from Lewes District Council that it regards some of the sites in our original plan as less sustainable than others in the LDC Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (SHELAA). We also know that sites that are deemed sustainable, achievable and available could still be given planning permission, even if they are not in our neighbourhood plan. If a site is considered less sustainable, then clearly its inclusion in our neighbourhood plan is less defensible, especially when other more sustainable sites are available.

3. LDC has also advised us that they would prefer any development to be within a Neighbourhood plan boundary extending from the railway in the south to the Old Police House and Trillium in the north, as they wish to preserve the current green spaces around the village settlement.

4. As already reported, one site south of the railway has been withdrawn and the Racecourse site has not yet resolved the issue of pedestrian access, so cannot be included as a primary site.

5. The site at Holms Farm, which was initially submitted to the neighbourhood plan process for a development of 20 units, was at the time unable to provide access. A solution has now been found for access, making this site now deliverable. The site initially submitted to us has been withdrawn and the owners have put forward a new proposal for a larger site that would offer approximately 50 units.

6. The settlement of Plumpton Green is required to provide a minimum of 50 units up to 2030 through allocation. We are aware that LDC will have to allocate 200 additional units across the district in its Local Plan Part 2 process. As the SHELAA process revealed, there are several sites in Plumpton Green that are sustainable, available and deliverable. Therefore, we believe that some of these additional homes could be allocated on sites in the parish. Even though LDC has not made any decision to date on this matter, it has advised us that allocating sites for more than the minimum required would put us in a stronger position to guide development in our Parish up to 2030.

Continued on page 18
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PLUMPTON PARISH NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN
UPDATE 2 continued

Discussion with developers and changes made

Throughout this process there has been constant dialogue with developers and their planning agents and they have shown some flexibility and goodwill to fit in with the wishes of the village. However, it has to be recognised that commercial realities mean not all of our preferences can be met. That said, some landowners have accepted a reduction in housing density to fit in with our wishes and, in the case of the Strawlands site, we have agreement on a provision for low-cost housing specifically for our older residents.

The new plan and allocation

You told us in the village survey that you wanted sites to be small in scale and spread across the village.

After much discussion, the SG has decided not to include any development on the Nolands site. The density of the site was not considered in keeping with the rural character of the village and, at 50, the number of units proposed substantially exceeded the preferred 20 limit expressed by residents in our original survey. The developers did show a degree of flexibility to try and help the SG but the development would not have been commercially viable at just 20 units.

The sites to the north of Trillium and the Old Police Houses are less sustainable (in terms of access) than those nearer the village centre, and they are also outside LDC’s notional planning boundary. We have therefore decided it is unwise to include them in the plan as other, more sustainable sites nearer to the village centre might then successfully get ‘windfall’ planning permission.

The land at Little Inhollins Farm is covered by a section 106 agreement preventing development until 2074. The Steering Group considers the agreement was made in good faith and should be honoured.

We are offering a recommendation that delivers 68 housing units:

1. Strawlands 12 (for older people only)
2. Glebe 20
3. Oakfield 20
4. Ridders Lane 16

We are proposing the racecourse site (5) for 19 units, as a reserve site. Despite being south of the railway and outside LDC’s notional planning boundary, it offers the significant benefit of parking for station users and would support the racecourse as an important Parish business by providing a much-needed cash injection. As reserve site, it would only be used if one of the sites included in the plan proved to be undevelopable and the current issues around access are resolved to the satisfaction of the statutory bodies, or if LDC required us to deliver more houses.

The SG will aim to get the new plan and associated documentation published for consultation as soon as possible.

Thank you for your support:

Steering Group
Plumpton Parish Neighbourhood Plan

UPDATE 2 continued
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2. We have had clear guidance from Lewes District Council that it regards some of the sites in our original plan as less sustainable than others in the LDC Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (SHELAA). We also know that sites that are deemed sustainable, achievable and available could still be given planning permission, even if they are not in our neighbourhood plan. If a site is considered less sustainable, then clearly its inclusion in our neighbourhood plan is less defensible, especially when other more sustainable sites are available.

3. LDC has also advised us that they would prefer any development to be within a Neighbourhood plan boundary extending from the railway in the south to the Old Police House and Trillium in the north, as they wish to preserve the current green spaces around the village settlement.

4. As already reported, one site south of the railway has been withdrawn and the Racecourse site has not yet resolved the issue of pedestrian access, so cannot be included as a primary site.

5. The site at Holms Farm, which was initially submitted to the neighbourhood plan process for a development of 20 units, was at the time unable to provide access. A solution has now been found for access, making this site now deliverable. The site initially submitted to us has been withdrawn and the owners have put forward a new proposal for a larger site that would offer approximately 50 units.

6. The settlement of Plumpton Green is required to provide a minimum of 50 units up to 2030 through allocation. We are aware that LDC will have to allocate 200 additional units across the district in its Local Plan Part 2 process. As the SHELAA process revealed, there are several sites in Plumpton Green that are sustainable, available and deliverable. Therefore, we believe that some of these additional homes could be allocated on sites in the parish. Even though LDC has not made any decision to date on this matter, it has advised us that allocating sites for more than the minimum required would put us in a stronger position to guide development in our Parish up to 2030.

Continued on page 18
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PLUMPTON PARISH NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN
UPDATE 2 continued

Discussion with developers and changes made

Throughout this process there has been constant dialogue with developers and their planning agents and they have shown some flexibility and goodwill to fit in with the wishes of the village. However, it has to be recognised that commercial realities mean not all of our preferences can be met. That said, some landowners have accepted a reduction in housing density to fit in with our wishes and, in the case of the Strawlands site, we have agreement on a provision for low-cost housing specifically for our older residents.

The new plan and allocation

You told us in the village survey that you wanted sites to be small in scale and spread across the village.

After much discussion, the SG has decided not to include any development on the Nolands site. The density of the site was not considered in keeping with the rural character of the village and, at 50, the number of units proposed substantially exceeded the preferred 20 limit expressed by residents in our original survey. The developers did show a degree of flexibility to try and help the SG but the development would not have been commercially viable at just 20 units.

The sites to the north of Trillium and the Old Police Houses are less sustainable (in terms of access) than those nearer the village centre, and they are also outside LDC’s notional planning boundary. We have therefore decided it is unwise to include them in the plan as other, more sustainable sites nearer to the village centre might then successfully get ‘windfall’ planning permission.

The land at Little Inhollins Farm is covered by a section 106 agreement preventing development until 2074. The Steering Group considers the agreement was made in good faith and should be honoured.

We are offering a recommendation that delivers 68 housing units:

1. Strawlands 12 (for older people only)
2. Glebe 20
3. Oakfield 20
4. Ridders Lane 16

We are proposing the racecourse site (5) for 19 units, as a reserve site. Despite being south of the railway and outside LDC’s notional planning boundary, it offers the significant benefit of parking for station users and would support the racecourse as an important Parish business by providing a much-needed cash injection. As reserve site, it would only be used if one of the sites included in the plan proved to be undevelopable and the current issues around access are resolved to the satisfaction of the statutory bodies, or if LDC required us to deliver more houses.

The SG will aim to get the new plan and associated documentation published for consultation as soon as possible.

Thank you for your support:

Steering Group
Plumpton Parish Neighbourhood Plan
Site 1
Wells Close/Strawlands
12 units for older people

Site 2
The Glebe
20 units

Site 3
Land behind Oakfield
20 units

Site 4
Nolands Farm
50 units

Site 5
Land behind school
20 units

Site 6
The Racecourse
19 units plus car parking

Site 7
Riddens Lane
16 units

Site 8
Little Inholmes Farm
20 or 40 units

Site 9
Land below Inholmes Farm
12 units

Site 10
Land north of the Old Police House
15–20 units
**Plumpton Neighbourhood Plan Consultation**

19th June to 31st July

**Open events:**
21st June 7.00pm - 9.30pm in the Pavilion
16th July 11.00am - 4.00pm in the Village Hall

The draft Neighbourhood Plan and supporting Site Assessment and Sustainability Appraisal/Strategic Environment Assessment reports are near to completion and will be published for formal consultation from 19th June to 31st July.

Printed copies of the reports will be available at the Station, Village Shop, Church Annex, Half Moon, Fountain and Plough, and the school.

Copies will also be available online at [http://www.plumptonpc.co.uk/neighbourhood-plan/](http://www.plumptonpc.co.uk/neighbourhood-plan/).

**Your Village, Your Plan**

**The Fletching Singers**

Present their Summer Concert for 2017

Welcome Summer Joys
For their Summer Concert on Sunday June 20th The Fletching Singers will perform Welcome Summer Joys, with music by Brahms, Britten, Schumann and Elgar.

The choir is delighted that they will be joined on this occasion by Eloise Irving (soprano), Sara Gourlay (alto), Neil Jenkins (tenor) and John Hancorn (bass).

The audience is invited to bring a picnic to enjoy in the beautiful grounds of Cumnor House School during the long interval.

**DATE:** Sunday June 19th
**TIME:** 6.30 pm
**PLACE:** Cumnor House School Theatre
**Tickets (£12)** available online from [www.ticketsource.co.uk](http://www.ticketsource.co.uk) or from 01825 712462, or from a choir member or at the door

The Fletching Singers registered charity number 1104305

**MARK WATTS DRAINAGE**

Septic Tank Problems...

- Blocked soakaway?
- Drains backing up?
- Obnoxious smell?
- Septic Tank Conversions
- Treatment Plant Installations
- Servicing of Treatment Plants

MARK WATTS DRAINAGE
01273 812 331 - 0790 593 747

**Stuart & Roger Moulds**
Trading As South East Roofing Contractors
A family run roofing company with over 50 years’ experience.
Full insurance cover.
Qualified staff trained in flat, single ply, cold application systems.
Sanding & Tiling, leadwork, chimneys.
Contact Stuart on 07786837406 or 01273 470733
Email: info@southeastroofingcontractors.co.uk

**Parish magazine June 2017**

**PPNP consultation and engagement 80**
Plumpton Parish Council has approved the draft pre-submission Neighbourhood Plan 2017 prepared by its Steering Group to go forward to public consultation, at its meeting on 13th June.

The six-week consultation runs from 19th June to 31 July.

Copies of the draft Plan and supporting documents are available online on the Parish Council website at www.plumptonpc.co.uk/neighbourhood-plan

Copies of the consultation response form can also be downloaded from the website. Hard copies are available from the Parish Clerk anita.emery@plumptonpc.co.uk or at the open event (below).

Hard copies of the Plan are available at the Station, the Fountain, Half Moon and Plough, the Church Annexe, the Village Hall and Village Shop.

There is an open event for residents to view the proposals and ask questions of the Steering Group on Sunday 16 July, 11am to 4pm at the Village Hall.

SPITHURST HUB
The new business centre in the heart of the Sussex countryside near Barcombe

Opening Summer 2017

all the features, design and practicality of the best shared working spaces in London but without the need to commute or fight for parking spaces

Contact Nigel@spithursthub.co.uk or 07739 050816 for information and a tour

Robert Symes
TREE SURGEON
East Chiltington
Tel: Plumpton (01273) 890080
Free Estimates

FLORAL ART
Mobile Florist - Wide Delivery Service
NICHOLA MASSINGALE
Phone: Plumpton (01273) 891301
Mobile: 07970 462337
• Weddings • Funerals • Special Occasions • Contract • Dried

Rupert Thacker
Furniture Restoration Services
Including Furniture repairs, Polishing etc. of Antiques, Contemporary, and Reproduction Furniture
Hitching, E Sussex, TN22 3TQ
Tel : 01825-713111 (Workshop)
Mobile: 07950-035044
Email: sales@rupert-thacker.com
Website: www.rupert-thacker.com

A clean carpet isn't all we guarantee......
• Carpet Cleaning & Repairs, retufting & reweaving
• Upholstery Cleaning
• Rug Cleaning including Wool & Silk
• Curtain Dry Cleaning on-site-at-the-window
• Carpet Moth Treatment Service
• Fire & Flood Clean-Up Service

Now celebrating 24 years of providing 1st class service in Plumpton, Plumpton Green, East Chiltington, Lewes & Brighton.

Call Paul or Liz on 01273 733339
For a free no-obligation quotation
Or email paul@servicemasterbrighton.co.uk
See our website for special offers
www.servicemasterbrighton.co.uk

The Hairdressers
Sarah And Mandy
South Road Wivelsfield Green
01444 471224

Parish magazine July 2017
The Parish Council would like to thank all residents who responded to the Draft Neighbourhood Plan. In raw numbers, there were more positive responses than negative and, as might be expected, the replies expressed conflicting views on some elements of the plan. A lot of questions and concerns are already addressed in the supporting documents, particularly the Strategic Environment Assessment and Site Assessment reports, although it is understandable that not everyone has the time to wade through these.

First, it is worth restating that a neighbourhood plan can only guide the planning process. It does not carry some weight, but cannot override national planning policy, or local (Lewes District Council and East Sussex County Council) strategic and planning policies.

Here, we’ll try to answer some of the most common themes and concerns that came out of the consultation process.

1. Why can’t we put a cap on the numbers of houses?
   Unfortunately, a neighbourhood plan cannot dictate a maximum number of houses that can be built.

2. Why has the plan exceeded the 50 demanded by Lewes District Council?
   To avoid this, LDC asks that they may still have a shortfall in the total number of houses they are expected by the government to build in the planning period. Therefore, LDC requires parishes preparing a neighbourhood plan to allocate housing above their minimum to ensure that the minimum requirement is fulfilled and protect us, if additional housing is needed, from speculative development outside the plan.

3. The sewage infrastructure is inadequate to cope with the extra housing.
   Planning laws require that no development can be granted planning permission without the necessary infrastructure capacity in place. We are continuing to raise these concerns with Southern Water.

4. Why is there no policy for the school?
   A neighbourhood plan does not have any powers over provision of school facilities. This is the remit of East Sussex County Council and the education authorities.

5. The plan would mean removal of the Brighton Garage, yet it claims to support local businesses.
   Some time ago the landowner of the site was granted planning permission for the demolition of the garage building and the development of two homes to replace it. The plan supports viable businesses. The premises are on a short-term lease, and can be terminated at short notice, so the business is not viable in the long term. Residents have also expressed concern that it causes congestion on Station Road, as it has no parking and cars waiting to be serviced are parked along Station Road.

6. The access to Riddens Lane onto Station Road is not safe to accommodate additional traffic.
   The Parish Council acknowledges concerns about this junction but the overriding authority here is East Sussex Highways, who have already given their approval to the proposed development. Therefore, we cannot prevent development on these grounds.

7. Why is the Glebe included when it may not be available for five years?
   This site may not be available for several years, but it will become available within the planning period (to 2038) and therefore it meets the criteria for availability. We do not expect all the sites to be developed at once.

8. Why is the Nolands site excluded?
   The Nolands site was assessed with the other sites in the revised development plan. The Parish Council decided that the density of housing proposed for the site was unacceptable (45, according to the appraisal given around the village), and that the 40 houses are not within the Glebe and Oakfield sites are at a more acceptable density that is in keeping with the rural nature of our village. The developers of these sites have agreed to a density far lower than permitted by planning law, allowing much greater accommodation of wildlife habitats and landscape features. Furthermore these sites will not be developed at the same time, unlike Nolands.

9. The racecourse site would give a precedent to further possible development on the site.
   We recognise residents’ concerns about this site. We also recognise the importance of supporting the survival of the racecourse. Unless the access problem is resolved, this site cannot go forward as the plan cannot recommend a site that is not deliverable.

Plumpton Parish Council

7. How can the Rectory and Church environs be protected?
   The plan already includes a policy to protect the Rectory. The Parish Council is in discussion with developers to ensure any development proposals respect the environs of the Rectory and Church, which are an important historical feature in the village.

8. The three sites together, at Wells Close, the Glebe and Oakfield, exceed the residents’ expressed wishes to have distinct, smaller developments.
   Only two sites have a common boundary (the Glebe and Oakfield), and the Plan policies include the requirement that the developments should be separated by landscape buffers. The three sites will not be developed at the same time.

9. The racecourse site would give a precedent to further possible development on the site.
   We recognise residents’ concerns about this site. We also recognise the importance of supporting the survival of the racecourse. Unless the access problem is resolved, this site cannot go forward as the plan cannot recommend a site that is not deliverable.

Plumpton Parish Council
cont. from page 2
4. Why is there no policy for the school?
   A neighbourhood plan does not have any powers over provision of school
   facilities. This is the remit of East Sussex County Council and the education
   authorities.

5. The plan would mean removal of the Brighton Garage, yet it claims to support local
   businesses.
   Some time ago the landowner of the site was granted planning permission for the
   demolition of the garage building and the development of two homes to replace
   it. The plan supports viable businesses. The premises are on a short-term lease, and
   can be terminated at short notice, so the business is not viable in the long term.
   Residents have also expressed concern that it causes congestion, as it has no
   parking and cars waiting to be serviced are parked along Station Road.

6. The access to Riddens Lane onto Station Road is not safe to accommodate additional
   traffic.
   The Parish Council acknowledges concerns about this junction but the
   overriding authority here is East Sussex Highways, who have already given their
   approval to the proposed development. Therefore, we cannot prevent
   development on these grounds.

7. Why is the Glebe included when it may not be available for five years?
   This site may not be available for several years, but it will become available within
   the planning period (to 2030) and therefore it meets the criteria for availability.
   We do not expect all the sites to be developed at once.

8. Why is the Nolands site excluded?
   The Nolands site was assessed with the other sites in the revised development
   plan. The Parish Council decided that the density of housing proposed for the site
   was unacceptable (45, according to the leaflet delivered around the village),
   and that the 40 houses spread across the Glebe and Oakfield sites are at a more
   acceptable density that is in keeping with the rural nature of our village. The
   developers of these sites have agreed to a density far lower than is permitted by
   planning law, allowing much greater accommodation of wildlife habitats and
   landscape features. Furthermore, these sites will not be developed at the same
   time, unlike Nolands.

9. How can the Rectory and Church environs be protected?
   The plan already includes a policy to protect the Rectory. The Parish Council is in
   discussion with developers to ensure development proposals respect the
   environs of the Rectory and Church, as important historical features.