

**HORSHAM DISTRICT COUNCIL
CORE STRATEGY REVIEW 2026**

**RESPONSE FROM
PULBOROUGH PARISH COUNCIL
15 OCTOBER 2009**

INDEX

Page 3	Strategic Option 8 and 9 : Introduction
Page 4	Summary Conclusions
Page 5	Detailed Review of Strategic Option 8 and 9
Page 6	Strategic Option 8 : Parish Council Review and General Feedback and Comments
Page 9	Strategic Option 9 : Parish Council Review and General Feedback and Comments

Appendices

- Appendix 1 : Analysis of Questionnaire Feedback
- Appendix 2 : Copies of comments received by Email.

Consultation by Pulborough Parish Council: Horsham Core Strategy - Strategic Options 8 and 9.

Introduction

Pulborough Parish Council obtained as much information as possible in the time frame allowed from the residents of Pulborough. This information has been collected via:

1. a stall at the Farmers Market (26 September)
2. a stall and map outline at the Harvest Fair (26 September)
3. attending a public meeting at the Adversane village hall with Billingshurst (3 October)
4. Participating in the holding of a public meeting at Pulborough village hall. (10 October)

The residents were requested to complete small questionnaires referring to strategic options 8 & 9. The number of responses was 237 which have been tabulated in Appendix 1. As can be seen in the results contained in Appendix 1 there was only one person (who did not live in Pulborough but Storrington) who was not opposed to strategic option 8.

Other residents took HDC forms away which they intend to complete and they undertook to either submit these individually to Horsham or to deliver them to the village hall for collection by the Parish Clerk. The Clerk will forward these to Horsham en bloc.

The Council has received a number of email objections. In some cases these objections have detailed information in them attached to the emails. The objections have been forwarded to HDC and they are incorporated into Appendix 2.

In summary all those consulted, bar one, was opposed to the Adversane plan (Option 8). In all cases under option 9 the plan to build on the West Glebe Field was rejected. Local inhabitants found that the HDC proposal - Potential Strategic Options Pulborough expansion page 33 HDC News dated Autumn 2009) confusing. The swathe of pink on item 9 to the west of the railway line was totally confusing to all members of the public (and Parish Council) for it takes into the plan an area known as The Gallops. Anyone knowing the area would realise that this is an area used solely for the training of race horses. It is outside of the built up area a Greenfield site alongside the edge of the national park. Development to the west of the rail station bounded by the A283 to the south and the north by Coombelands Lane and either a footpath or the edge of the Park/ River Arun to the West is not necessary either now or in the future.

Pulborough Parish Council has considered the public feedback in formulating its response to Horsham District Council.

Summary Conclusions

Option8:

Pulborough Parish Council is **opposed** to Option 8 which is the development of a new settlement at Adversane / North Heath. The opposition is based on the development of a non sustainable green field site, away from the economic centre namely the Gatwick diamond. Without substantial investment the present road system does not lend itself to large scale development. Medical facilities would be stretched to the full if not overloaded. There is very little scope for local employment therefore the use of the car would increase to access the Gatwick area. There would be an important loss of countryside and probably wildlife of various types. There is the impact of said settlement on the environment both in terms of sewage, water supply, water runoff and its impact on local rivers. Finally the belief that the construction of a new rail station at Adversane would address sustainability issues is rejected, as indeed HDC has rejected these arguments in developments at Christ Hospital. A more detailed review of option 8 and assessment can be found in the section Option 8 Adversane North Heath that follows.

Option 9:

The Parish council response to Option 9 is more nuanced. The Parish Council with HDC have identified sites within the village for development at some time in the future namely SA113, SA157 and SA036. The Parish Council would prefer the development of SA036 before SA113/157. An open public space is a requirement in the case of SA036. HDC is aware of the concerns of the Parish Council about these sites and the results of the Village Transport plan. The plan identified issues on pedestrian access, road networks and access that need to be addressed prior to development: The same is also the case for item SA079. Some limited development is needed to sustain the village and this has been **supported** by the Parish Council and recognised by both Councils in partnership.

There remain concerns over the capacity of infrastructure and sewage evacuation as evidenced by two studies undertaken by HDC about main drainage from the Codmore hill area. There is at present, during floods, contaminated water flowing over the water meadows.

The Parish Council **oppose** the development of the West Glebe Field. This is within the conservation zone, and is an important zone for leisure and recreation purposes: This green area within the village, although a small area of land, has an abundance of wildlife. These areas of green within the village are irreplaceable; development of this area contradicts SA objective #2, Education Recreation and Leisure.

The Parish Council **oppose** development further north along the A29, as it reduces the sustainability of these houses in the context of the village. The centre of gravity of the village is in the area of the West Glebe, Lower Street, Glebe Lands and the Railway. Development outside this area reduces the homogeneity of the village leading to opposition to SA112 and the “pink” area to the west of the rail line and A29 contained in the consultation document page 33 Horsham District News.

Detailed Review of Strategic option 8 and 9

Horsham District Council Outline Facts: Pulborough and North Heath

As a general observation based on the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Framework page 45 section 5.4 with appropriate use of planning discretion HDC should be able to achieve its SA objective in many cases. For example:

- under Housing HDC seek to “improve the availability of decent, affordable housing” and “provide a range of housing types of various sizes and tenures” and
- under Education, Leisure & Recreation if HDC seek to “increase the provision of community facilities and public open spaces”.

These objectives can be met by laying down appropriate planning conditions when dealing with the relevant planning application.

The issues with the region around Pulborough and South of Billingshurst are:

- Character of the countryside: open and rolling countryside with wood strips. None urban and totally rural perspective and character. Few urban areas in this southern corner of the district and limited urban centres with limited but some successful employment possibilities.
- Logistics road network and rail network. A29 is the major trunk road narrow and heavily used by HGVs. The A 283 is a narrow and fairly heavily used route for HGVs as well and both intersect Pulborough. The A283 is a major east west route and the road layouts in Pulborough (Swan Corner- subject to flooding) and A29 crossing of the railway cause major issues for development. This affects Strategic option 9 and also 8 to a lesser extent. The Pulborough Transport Plan covers this in some detail in reference to Option9. The A 283 A272 and A29 are directly affected by Strategic options 8 and 9 as well as option 7. The A 281 A283 and A272 are narrow roads taking considerable traffic as the A27 East west link is unfinished.
- The rail provision on the Arun Valley line is not good as trains run more slowly than 20 years ago as operations now dictate train division and coupling at Horsham delaying passengers to intermediate stations. The railway line through Pulborough has worsened during the last 8 years. The Parish Council knows that putting in a new railway station is not as simple as inserting a new bus stop on a bus route. To imply in the Horsham Core Strategy document that a new station is a possibility is disingenuous. The creation of another station would make a poor service poorer whilst not addressing issues of parking and greater intermodal transport links at both Billingshurst and Pulborough.

The study predicates probably rightly that the main centre of employment will be the Gatwick area. Employment in the coastal strip and in areas of Chichester District and Arun District are limited in their impact on Pulborough and North Heath. Checks with CD show no major development close to Pulborough so any new development in either case will seek employment either locally or to the Gatwick diamond. As a result any development under option 8 or 9 will generate more traffic on the A29, A272, and A264 as people seek employment north or the area. This in turn will put more pressure further away on the

A264/A24 intersection at Broadbridge Heath and also on the North Horsham bypass and routes to Crawley/Gatwick. There would need to be substantial work on the road net in the area which is accentuated by several degrees by Option8.

- Schools: Schools places for secondary pupils are barely adequate for present levels of development and the recent turning down on DC09/0488 is a case in point. The option proposed does little to address the schooling issues.
- Water and Drainage: The Parish Council has large concerns regarding foul and surface water drainage. The surface water drainage system is now overloaded made much worse after the houses in Billingshurst were built after 1996. The rainfall over the past 12/13 years has not been greater annually, but the amount of land under brick and concrete north of Pulborough has meant that the run-off into the water meadows has deepened greatly and arrived faster. The depth at the northern edge of the 'Brooks' water meadow has increased from 2 feet to 8 feet in that time and gardens which were previously never under water are now frequently flooded. This increases the risks to flooding of the A29 at Swan Corner and possibly.
- Foul water drainage is already inadequate – why otherwise is there a floating mass of toilet paper and other detritus in the water meadows after heavy rains? The remains of foul detritus are still visible (early October 2009) in the meadow on the south side of the A283 opposite to the Pulborough Garden Centre. A public footpath runs through this meadow.
- Jobs: Local employment is limited and most of the towns in the south of the region have some employment but not enough and therefore a large number of workers are forced to commute out of the villages heading North.
- Medical Provision: Whilst Pulborough has medical facilities nowhere in the consultation document has the issues of hospitals and medical facilities been addressed. Clearly in the case of option 8 this is a serious oversight, whilst on a more general level the lack of provision of acute care and day surgery etc facilities for this region encompassing parts of HDC, CD and Arun DC remains an important issue.

Parish Council Review of the Core Strategy and general feedback and comments:

The following two sections look at each option in more detail and structured to reflect the SA framework tables on page 44-48 section 5.4.

Strategic Option8:

1 HOUSING

- a) What is the waiting list for accommodation at all levels and what is needed to sustain the community rather than grow it? To build extra housing here to serve people working in the Gatwick triangle creates extra strain on transport links which could be avoided if houses were located nearer to where the jobs are.

2 EDUCATION LEISURE RECREATION

- a) Local schools and nursery facilities such as those at Brinsbury are full and could not cope with a large influx of new children.

- b) There appears to be no schooling provision whereas both the junior school and senior schools are full or nearly full. Under strategic option 8 the provision of new junior and senior education facilities is an absolute necessity. As the development at North Heath/Adversane will result in more residences than there are currently in Pulborough and West Chiltington combined this would necessitate a huge investment in infrastructure to more than double existing school sizes, playing fields, changing rooms etc. Brand new facilities would be needed

3 HUMAN HEALTH

- a) Pulborough Medical Group is already stretched to look after existing population. Critical care and hospital provision is an issue in the area of North Heath and Pulborough: the area is as far from the main casualty hospitals as possible anywhere in West Sussex. As road network is poor and congested access times to A&E is slow. The Pulborough practice is not in a position to cover a new settlement under option 8.

4 COMMUNITY SAFETY & CRIME

- a) Large tracts of new housing, unless there is substantial provision of youth facilities, breed anti social behaviour.
- b) Police cover is poor even considering the use of PCSOs across Horsham District – which luckily remains a low crime area. More traffic officers will be necessary as well as beat offices in both cases.

5 EQUALITIES AND SOCIAL INCLUSION

- a) Whilst the provision of a significant portion of affordable might be included under governmental diktats, is there a need for it in a new settlement? Local needs should be defined and met without “importing” people in need from Crawley or further afield.

6 SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES

- a) As planning decisions and appeals have shown (vide Christ Hospital) just because a settlement has a station that this does not make it sustainable. Clearly this option will require substantial development costs and is open to question as to cost efficiency. Also the disruption to line users will be a major problem as well as the length of time necessary to put in a new station.

7 BIODIVERSITY

- a) The North Heath/Adversane potential site is a large tract of unspoilt farmland. While a study would be needed to identify the specifics it is self evident that development there will rather than develop new habitats, eradicate a huge amount of flora and fauna. This option leads to a significant destruction of the local biodiversity contrary to items 7a and 7b. Also creation of a new village in fact will lead to a break up and fragmentation of green infrastructure. It is clear there will be a major deleterious impact of building on skylarks and other birds, bats and also small mammals etc.

- 8 LANDSCAPE
- a) Development of a new developed site in the middle of rolling green fields will do nothing to enhance the skyline and enhance the local landscape (8a). This option will only serve to destroy local landscape and character, not conserve it.
- 9 ARCHAEOLOGY CULTURAL HERITAGE
- a) Clearly this development is also not remotely likely to “conserve and enhance the quality and distinctiveness of the historical and cultural environment” of our village as they serve only to fundamentally change the nature of the area.
- 10 ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY
- a) This development can only adversely affect the environment. Clearly the existing road networks namely the A29, A272, A281 and 283 are barely adequate to cope with more users of the roads. When taken together should options 7 and 8 be implemented then the impact on the A272, A29, and further afield A24, A264 or A281 will necessitate more work on the network with new bypasses in the case of Option 7. The present issues with the A281 and A24 interchange will not be helped by the two developments options 7 and 8.
- b) This option will not enhance ground water quality or indeed waterways. It is likely that hard surface runoff will be contaminated by oil and petrol and other contaminants. In addition these volumes will end up in the Arun and increase the likelihood of flooding in the area of Swan corner.
- 11 WATER EFFICIENCY
- a) With no available source of extra water and with existing supplies under strain in this area building all these additional homes can only increase demand perhaps by as much as a multiple of 3 or 4. Even rain recovery systems in the new houses (which are expensive) would not ease this issue. This is contrary to article 11 as posed.
- 12 FLOOD RISK
- a) Increased hard surfaces unless accompanied by rain water catchments and recovery facilities to reduce run off will add strain to watercourses and increase flooding in Pulborough.
- b) Some areas of this option already retain water and building will increase issues of flooding, overwhelming the capability of some of the local watercourses to cope.
- 13 ENERGY EFFICIENCY
- a) This is an issue of government guidelines, building regulations, and specifications as laid out at district and county council level.
- 14 SUSTAINABLE DESIGN CONSTRUCTION
- a) See 13
- 15 REUSE OF LAND AND BUILDINGS
- a) There is no re-use of brown field sites for this option.

- 16 WASTE
- a) This option does nothing for waste minimisation etc.
- 17 TRANSPORT
- a) New employment is more likely to be in towns like Horsham, Crawley, Guildford or the coastal towns. Putting homes where proposed for people working in the Gatwick diamond can only increase car use. It would seem to achieve the diametric opposite of the SA Objective. Despite buses and trains it is more than likely that people will use cars to get to work and shop as in the case of Gatwick jobs these tend to be 24 hour shift patterns. The existing road network locally A272 A29 and further field A24, A281 and A264 will see more pressure. A new rail station will degrade services to London and probably not be used by a sizeable proportion of people taking up employment in the Gatwick diamond due to inconvenient and non existent services at times they need them, Transport problems are materially mitigated by putting the homes as close as possible to the jobs.
- 18 ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT
- a) Assuming no provision of local facilities this development might improve the use of local shops in Pulborough but would increase road traffic substantially.
- 19 SKILLS TRAINING
- a) The employment land review draft final report shows in its assumptions a clear bias to a view that self employment will increase substantially. WE do not see how a new settlement could provide the amount of jobs needed, leading to a more traditional pattern of employment. This we assume will lead to job take up outside of the Pulborough North Heath area. Local infrastructure is probably inadequate to provide new employment “poles” also pointing towards people moving to employment centres away from the local area.

Strategic option 9:

Most of the development, where identified at this time in the village, lies outside any built-up area as defined by the Horsham District Local Development Framework. This framework poses a strong presumption against additional residential development and so far there are no overriding reasons to justify a departure from development plan policies. These proposals so far therefore would conflict with policies CP1, CP3, CP5, CP13 & CP15 of the Core Strategy, policies DC1 & DC9 of the General Development Control Policies Document and also the guidance contained within the Facilitating Appropriate Development Supplementary Planning Document of the Horsham District Local Development Framework.

In more detail we can see for option 9:

1. HOUSING
- a) Local housing needs should be met by existing housing stocks. Are there significant numbers of families on waiting lists or in temporary accommodation? There are already insufficient jobs in the village for people living here. To build extra housing here to serve people working in the

Gatwick triangle creates extra strain on transport links which could be avoided if houses were located nearer to where the jobs are.

2. EDUCATION, LEISURE & RECREATION

- a) The development of the west Glebe field would reduce the amount of leisure and recreation facilities in the village.
- b) Local schools and nursery facilities such as those at Brinsbury are full and could not cope with a large influx of new children.
- c) Option 7 will reduce places available for secondary school pupils –so where would the new school children go?

3. HUMAN HEALTH

- a) Pulborough Medical Group is already stretched to look after existing population. There is no parking for either staff or patients at Tesco so new houses in Pulborough would add to the problem.
- b) Critical care and hospital provision is an issue in the area of Pulborough area: the area is about the greatest distance from the main casualty hospitals anywhere in West Sussex. As the road network is poor and congested access times to A&E is slow.

4. COMMUNITY SAFETY AND CRIME

- a) The small number of police and community police covering our area is already an issue. They are certainly stretched.

5. EQUALITIES & SOCIAL INCLUSION

- a) Pulborough is a village in a rural area. Is there a local waiting list necessitating affordable housing? Appropriate use of HDC planning policies should supply the small starter homes and mixed ownership accommodation without a need for more social housing. Social housing implies less money for 106 funds and infrastructure provision.

6. SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES

- a) Pulborough is currently a small community where we feel sure most residents (even if some work outside the area) feel they belong. We are still a rural community of people who like living in the countryside.
- b) Whilst Pulborough is more or less sustainable, new development in the village leads to greater burdens on the A29 and other roads as people commute out of the village for employment.
- c) Whilst some development is necessary and this has been agreed after some public consultation leading to SA036 and SA113/157 being reluctantly accepted by PPC. However infrastructure issues as outlined by the Village Transport plan and other issues necessitate investment PRIOR to development of these and also road network issues will delay SA079.
- d) The appearance of SA112 is unwelcome as it is extending Pulborough northwards up the A29 which is contrary to the wishes of Pulborough inhabitants and the Parish Council. The Council's view is that SA036, SA113 and SA157 provide enough new accommodation for Pulborough to maintain its community sustainably.
- e) The "pink" area in the Horsham magazine also needs to be rejected.

7. **BIODIVERSITY**
 - a) Part of this proposal can only severely damage biodiversity in our village. The West Glebe field is an oasis of green in the village. How this objective of creating bio diversity can be met by destroying this is unclear to us.

8. **LANDSCAPE**
 - a) The proposal item SA112 and SA087 will only reduce the quality of the landscape and its condition. In the case of item SA112 open rolling green countryside and fields and gardens will be replaced by buildings in an unsustainable area with no employment. The same applies to the West Glebe field.

9. **ARCHAEOLOGY AND CULTURAL HERITAGE**
 - a) The West Glebe Field is an area where significant archaeological history is likely to exist. We have no idea what other history may be hidden under these sites but bearing in mind the proximity to Stane Street the potential for these to exist is high. Hence there is risk for Archaeological history to be lost. Clearly these developments are also not remotely likely to “conserve and enhance the quality and distinctiveness of the historical and cultural environment” of our village as they serve only to fundamentally change the nature of the area.

10. **ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY**
 - a) These developments can only adversely affect the environment. The roads will not cope with the additional traffic load leading to extra noise, exhaust pollution and hence poorer air quality. Transport issues here remain as outlined by the village transport plan and until they can be addressed development should be minimised.

11. **WATER EFFICIENCY**
 - b) New houses need more water and this leads to more sewage.

12. **FLOOD RISK**
 - a) Limited new developments in the village will slightly increase the risk of flooding etc due to water runoff etc

13. **ENERGY EFFICIENCY**
 - a) This is an issue of government guidelines, building regulations, and specifications as laid out at district and county council level.

14. **SUSTAINABLE DESIGN & CONSTRUCTION**
 - a) As with (13) meeting this objective is not affected by which site is chosen.

15. **REUSE OF LAND & BUILDINGS**
 - a) Obviously using either of these options will totally fail to meet the objective of reusing previously developed land. Under option SA113 and SA157 there is a fine sandstone farm building that could be re-used but so far plans for this area make no attempt to do so.

16. WASTE
 - a) Yet again meeting this objective is not affected by which development option is chosen.

17. TRANSPORT
 - a) Putting homes where proposed for people working in the Gatwick triangle can only increase car use. It would seem to achieve the diametric opposite of the SA Objective. Most of the residents will need to drive to work. The existing road network locally A272 A29 and further field A24, A281 and A264 will see more pressure. Public Transport is not a viable alternative as running this with sufficient frequency (either trains or buses) would require huge subsidy.

18. ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT-
 - a) Limited new housing in Pulborough should provide for local needs and provision.

19. SKILLS AND TRAINING
 - a) It must be the case that the vast majority of people living in these proposed developments will not be able to find work close by.

APPENDIX 1

PULBOROUGH PARISH COUNCIL RESPONSE TO HORSHAM DISTRICT CORE STRATEGY REVIEW 2026

POSTCODE	OPTION 8	OPTION 9	Road Name	Polling District	No of Responses
RH20 4AB	YES	NO	n/a	Storrington	1
RH20 1BX	NO	NO	Toat Lane	North Heath	1
RH20 1DN	NO	NO	Stane Street	North Heath	2
RH20 2HR	NO	NO	Stallhouse Lane	North Heath	4
RH20 2HW	NO	NO	Gay Street Lane	North Heath	4
RH20 2HD	NO	NO	Nutbourne Road	Nutbourne	1
RH20 2HE	NO	NO	The Street	Nutbourne	3
RH20 2HS	NO	NO	Nutbourne Lane	Nutbourne	1
RH20 1AE	NO	NO	Church Place	Pulborough	2
RH20 1AF	NO	NO	Church Place	Pulborough	2
RH20 1AG	NO	NO	Coombelands	Pulborough	2
RH20 1AJ	NO	NO	Cobbetts Mews	Pulborough	1
RH20 1AL	NO	NO	Station Road	Pulborough	1
RH20 1AN	NO	NO	Chestnut Walk	Pulborough	1
RH20 1AS	NO	NO	London Road	Pulborough	1
RH20 1AZ	NO	NO	Lyntons	Pulborough	1
RH20 1BB	NO	NO	Stane Street	Pulborough	4
RH20 1DR	NO	NO	Stopham Road	Pulborough	2
RH20 1DT	NO	NO	London Road	Pulborough	2
RH20 1DU	NO	NO	Spiro Close	Pulborough	3
RH20 1FJ	NO	NO	Riverside	Pulborough	3
RH20 1RG	NO	NO	Station Road	Pulborough	1
RH20 2AA	NO	NO	Lower Street	Pulborough	1
RH20 2AD	NO	NO	Rectory Lane	Pulborough	4
RH20 2AE	NO	NO	Rectory Lane	Pulborough	2
RH20 2AF	NO	NO	Old Rectory Lane	Pulborough	2
RH20 2AJ	NO	NO	Rectory Close	Pulborough	5
RH20 2AR	NO	NO	The Spinney	Pulborough	1
RH20 2AT	NO	NO	Spinney North	Pulborough	1
RH20 2BF	NO	NO	Swan View	Pulborough	2
RH20 2BH	NO	NO	Lower Street	Pulborough	2
RH20 2BL	NO	NO	Lower Street	Pulborough	2
RH20 2BN	NO	NO	Lower Street	Pulborough	2
RH20 2BX	NO	NO	Lower Street	Pulborough	1
RH20 2BZ	NO	NO	Glebelands	Pulborough	2
RH20 2DE	NO	NO	Moat Lane	Pulborough	1
RH20 2DF	NO	NO	Moat Lane	Pulborough	2

POSTCODE	OPTION 8	OPTION 9	Road Name	Polling District	No of Responses
RH20 2DH	NO	NO	Southside	Pulborough	2
RH20 2DJ	NO	NO	The Moat	Pulborough	1
RH20 2DL	NO	NO	Little Dippers	Pulborough	1
RH20 2DQ	NO	NO	Downlands	Pulborough	2
RH20 2DU	NO	NO	Broomers Hill	Pulborough	2
RH20 2ED	NO	NO	Batts Lane	Pulborough	1
RH20 2GP	NO	NO	Wildbrooks Close Carpenters	Pulborough	1
RH20 2HQ	NO	NO	Meadow	Pulborough	1
RH20 2HZ	NO	NO	Broomers Hill	Pulborough	2
RH20 2JD	NO	NO	New Place Road	Pulborough	1
RH20 2JE	NO	NO	Collingwood	Pulborough	2
RH20 2JF	NO	NO	Nutcroft	Pulborough	2
RH20 2JH	NO	NO	Glebelands	Pulborough	6
RH20 2JJ	NO	NO	Glebelands	Pulborough	2
BN11 5SN	NO	NO	n/a	n/a	1
BN18 9AB	NO	NO	n/a	n/a	1
BN44 3PL	NO	NO	n/a	n/a	1
GU28 0SA	NO	NO	n/a	n/a	1
GU28 0SA	NO	NO	n/a	n/a	1
RG20 1AJ	NO	NO	n/a	n/a	1
RH12 1AE	NO	NO	n/a	n/a	2
RH14 0DL	NO	NO	n/a	n/a	1
RH20 1LF	NO	NO	n/a	n/a	2
RH20 1LJ	NO	NO	n/a	n/a	2
RH20 1LP	NO	NO	n/a	n/a	2
RH20 1LW	NO	NO	n/a	n/a	2
RH20 2BO	NO	NO	n/a	n/a	1
RH20 2DG	NO	NO	n/a	n/a	1
RH20 2EQ	NO	NO	n/a	n/a	1
RH20 2HL	NO	NO	n/a	n/a	1
RH20 2JW	NO	NO	n/a	n/a	1
RH20 2QB	NO	NO	n/a	n/a	1
RH20 2RL	NO	NO	n/a	n/a	1
RH20 2RU	NO	NO	n/a	n/a	1
RH20 3UN	NO	NO	n/a	n/a	1
RH20 9JD	NO	NO	n/a	n/a	1
n/a	NO	NO	n/a	n/a	71
Total					197

**HORSHAM DISTRICT COUNCIL
CORE STRATEGY REVIEW 2026**

RESPONSE FROM PULBOROUGH PARISH COUNCIL

APPENDIX 2

I want to voice my extremely strong objection to the idea of building 4,000 homes in North Heath/Adversane. This is crazy!! Beautiful countryside will be destroyed forever; 10,000 more cars will be on our local roads; the environment will be polluted by the extra vehicles; the road network will grind to a halt; the local infrastructure cannot support this additional housing, plus the fact that a new train station and extra shops and pubs is an unbelievably stupid idea!!

This will link Adversane and North Heath together which I had believed was a no, no in terms of council planning regulations. Plus the fact that Pulborough and Billingshurst will very nearly start to merge.

Please can you tell me who had this stupid idea and what planet they reside on because local knowledge, caring for the local community, local environment and local people does not seem to have figured in this decision!!!

Corinne Steer

As my elected Clerk of the Pulborough Council, I urge you to support my plea and vote against the proposed devastation of North Heath Adversane Option 8 on many grounds but primarily the disappearance of agricultural land, environmental impact on wild life, lack of infrastructure, no hospital facilities and a lack of employment. An increase of 4,000 houses giving an extra 10,000 people will lead to the demise of Pulborough as a village and overload us with traffic and people. The list could go on as there is nothing correct about this proposed plan.

If this is permitted we will all lose an area of natural beauty and tranquillity forever.

John Mitchell

It is with much distress that I learn of the plans for a possible development comprising 4000 homes at North Heath. (Horsham District News P32 option 8.)

It would appear that the proposed development will probably result in the destruction of some 450 – 500 hectares of green field area, rather more than indicated in the article.

There are a number of reasons why such a proposed project should not be considered in this area.

- ◆ 4000 homes at an average of 2.5 persons = 10,000 people to be accommodated – How will the current infrastructure support such population growth? Will massive expansion be needed?

- ◆ Railway station to be built at Adversane – the car parking requirement alone would need to be double that of Pulborough or Billingshurst. How does 3 stations in 3 miles work, obviously one of the original stations would have to close, otherwise journeys to London would be lengthened, causing inconvenience to existing commuters and timetabling problems for rail companies..
- ◆ Water supply & Sewerage – where would the processing stations for this be sited? In more green field areas?
- ◆ Waste disposal – is the Billingshurst waste plant big enough for another small town's waste?
- ◆ Road infrastructure – Bringing traffic to and from the A29 would necessitate new roundabouts/traffic lights systems, which would require even more land consumption, CPO's etc.
- ◆ Timing – How will the release of new house tranches coincide with infrastructure improvements? Delays here would disrupt building programs.
- ◆ Listed Buildings – How does the preservation of these buildings fit with the building of new housing?
- ◆ Compulsory Purchase – where do the funds come from to CPO vast numbers of relatively expensive properties? – even higher Council Taxes?
- ◆ Wildlife destruction – I know this is a bit hackneyed, but the fact remains that there are rare species in this area and they would be destroyed upsetting the ecology balance.
- ◆ Urban sprawl – The existing placement of villages/hamlets along the A29 is sufficiently separated to prevent ribbon development joining up to form sprawl. The building of a large conurbation midway between two villages will encourage coalescence, and sprawl will result.
- ◆ Social problems – 10,000 people will create extra strain on policing and fire services, where is the funding for this coming from? Higher Council Taxes presumably.
- ◆ Emergency Services – The proposed development appears to be midway from any hospital and therefore the furthest away from any hospital, with this number of residents, another hospital would be required locally.
- ◆ Schools – Excessive strain on local schools, would there have to be more schools built?

Finally, I am sure there are many other constraints on such a project, however on a personal note, I and most of my neighbours moved to North Heath from urban conurbations to get away from the problems that they generate. We live in an area which is relatively tranquil – well, away from the A29 it is, and we pay a premium for this lifestyle, both in monetary terms and in minor inconveniences such as reliance on the car. However this is the lifestyle we enjoy and it seems unjust that we could possibly lose our environment on the dictation of a faceless Deputy Prime Minister's Office, which is now redundant anyway. Please accept this communication as my strong objection to the possible proposed development.

Chris Merry

I would like to state that I am appalled at the idea of developing 4000 homes in the Adversane/North Heath, Gay Street area of Pulborough. I have lived here at, Cannons, Gay Street, RH20 2HL for nearly 15 years and I dearly love the fact that it is clearly an area of natural beauty and home to many species of wildlife. Please reconsider this decision as the development would clearly change the whole area and effect it environmentally and also affect many people's lives. It doesn't really make sense and the upheaval of putting in place services in an area which is plainly rural is ludicrous. All the residents love living here so please don't spoil it.

Elena Hester

I am dismayed to hear of the proposal to build 4000 houses between Adversane and Pulborough, this is prime Green belt land of great natural beauty and would be a devastating loss to all not to mention the wild life. My understanding of green belt is that they were introduced in order to prevent such developments taking place! It is also of great concern as to where this large number of houses would get their water from and where their wastewater would go. It would also put an unacceptable strain on the greater infrastructure 4000 houses must equate to at least 8000 more cars on the already overcrowded roads not to mention other local services such as schools medical centres etc. On investigation I then learnt of the other developments proposed in Faygate, Warnham, Southwater, Billingshurst and Broadbridge Heath. The overall impact of these developments are unacceptable on every level and must be resisted in the strongest possible manner. The South east is full, central government must find other ways, like for instance closing our borders and encouraging people to chose to settle in less densely populated areas

Paul Quickenden

I am surprised and dismayed that the above development is even being considered, with around 4,000 new homes for roughly 12,000 residents. This greenbelt / farmland is too valuable to lose and the environmental impact will be devastating. The necessary infrastructure will be overwhelming to the local villages of Pulborough and Billingshurst. Employment for the new residents will be impossible as there is no manufacturing or commercial business of any size, anywhere near. There are many more points I could and wish to raise and hopefully, consultation meetings will be held for all of us local residents to give our points of view.

Mr.& Mrs. B.Hills

With regard to the proposal to build 4000 new homes north of Pulborough I have the following comments to make.

This area adjoins one of the oldest Neolithic sites recently excavated by archaeologists last Summer at Beedings Castle and therefore is one of the most anciently inhabited part of the Sussex countryside, if not in the U.K. It is also adjacent to the Roman remains at Borough Farm and one of the most ancient of roads, Stane Street. Surely covering this area in concrete cannot be a step forward in civilisation.

The views across the Weald north from Nutbourne are some of the most beautiful and unspoilt in the country with 360 degrees of vista over Sussex and Kent from Beedings Castle. The very thought of housing in the proposed area would be completely detrimental to walkers and lovers of this part of the countryside, which is rich in footpaths and bridleways open to the public. As a regular walker of the fields proposed for what can only be described as a mental aberration the tranquillity of the area is an increasingly rare commodity - it would be a travesty to lose it.

Nutbourne Lane and Gay Street Lane are rural communities - the routes they take are ancient, narrow and often impassable in places by two cars. The village of Nutbourne would be under threat from traffic trying to avoid the bottleneck of what is already a problem at the junction of the A29 in Pulborough with the A283. Nutbourne is tranquil and picturesque - it has no room for pavements along its 'street', our village life and community would be completely threatened with such a conurbation on its doorstep. The right hand bend at Raglands Castle would quickly become an accident blackspot.

This is an ancient community largely made up of tenant farms historically owned by the Abergavenny and Leconfield Estates which are now in private ownership. The smallholdings, their dewponds, hedgerows and fieldscapes are linked by a series of ancient footpaths and drovers roads all of which would be disappeared under tarmac.

Many of us live and work from home - this is not a commuter belt of white collar workers - what exactly are 12,000 new residents going to find to do within our community - we are short of paid employment as things stand at present.

I am a volunteer assistant teacher at Pulborough Primary School. Classes are already full. The surgery at Pulborough Health Centre is already busy - I know I am also a volunteer driver for the Community Services.

In our part of Nutbourne we have just worked hard to dredge our Millpond and bring back the wildlife that had disappeared through neglect. We have frequent sightings now of kingfisher, tufted and mandarin ducks, a hen harrier, cormorants, geese, swans and an abundance of badgers and owls. A neighbouring sizeable town would have nothing less than a detrimental effect on our local wildlife and the street lighting a neighbouring town would bring would change our night sky significantly.

When I first heard about this proposal my first thought was that it was an April Fool. It is difficult to imagine a less suitable area for development than this proposal - a green field site in an area adjacent to an area of outstanding natural beauty. I can understand what our community has to offer others but this proposal offers us nothing that we don't already have, our countryside, our villages just the way they are. It is not broken so it does not need fixing.

Rowena Phillips

Strategic Site Option 8 Adversane/NorthHeath

I believe it to be unsustainable and I have outlined my reasons below.

Firstly I would like to say that I fully accept that Horsham District Council has an obligation to provide homes to its growing population. I believe that Adversane/North Heath could sustain a modest increase in housing – in the hundreds perhaps, but creating a new town from scratch in unspoilt and tranquil countryside is going to create huge planning, political, environmental and economic issues. I ask the Council to reconsider this proposal and instead to focus on strengthening existing communities in the area, rather than creating such a large new community so far from any established infrastructure.

The creation of such a large community here could lead to the further decline of Pulborough and Billingshurst as rural hub communities as it draws shoppers away from them and into the new area. This would damage community cohesion and contradict the stated goal of strengthening rural communities as hubs.

I am told that that some local land owners may decide to ask their solicitors to search the Land Registry for historical covenants which may prevent development and this will greatly increase the cost and complexity of any development plans in the future. These risks and liabilities will need to be insured to protect the developer's investments, and this will detract from the economic viability of the project and lengthen the already very long lead time.

Local footpaths and bridleways are well used here and there will be considerable disruption to these if the plans go ahead. There are plans afoot currently for some local residents to apply for even more public rights of way, and this will add further complexity to building on this site.

Once local residents have employed the services of an ecologist we will be able to categorically prove the existence of many rare and protected species of plant and animal. Currently, it is local knowledge that this is the case, and it is not surprising given the pristine and wild nature of the area in question. Relocating species or building around them will further add to the costs of this development and greatly reduce its viability.

In all of our attempts to slow down climate change, protection of country side, with its trees, soil and plants is a critical asset. The removal of hundreds of hectares of such country side will exacerbate Horsham District Council's problems in this regard. Furthermore, the risk of flooding from the increased water run off must be considerable. A community of this size will require roads to be built, widened, pavements to be added to current country lanes which are ancient and narrow. The A29 is extremely narrow at Church Hill and will require widening. All of this will add considerably to the cost of the project and to the destruction of countryside. If it is not done then chaos will ensue as thousands of new residents pile into the delicate and fragile road network. Has this been fully investigated with the Highways Agency?

If a railway station is built at Adversane it will be hugely expensive. It will mean that Pulborough, Adversane and Billingshurst stations will be within 4 miles of each other. For all three stations to remain open, it may be necessary for train services not to stop at all of them at busy times. This would cause traffic congestion as people are forced to drive further to a station. If no station is built at Adversane then thousands of new

residents will need to drive to find employment in Horsham, Crawley or Brighton or drive to Pulborough or Billingshurst train station. The resulting traffic congestion and pollution from the increased motor car usage is unsustainable. Furthermore an expensive new railway crossing will need to be constructed to allow access onto the A29.

The nearest major NHS hospital is 19 miles from Adversane. This is unacceptable for 10/12,000 new residents.

To find employment, residents will be forced to leave the area every day. The major centres of employment are Crawley, Horsham, Brighton and London. This means that every day the new population will drive to work (or drive to a train station) miles away and come home at night – creating a dormitory town, rather than a sustainable and vibrant rural community.

There is insufficient secondary education for a community of this size. The consultation document refers to Brinsbury College of Rural Excellence as an education and employment opportunity. It is not appropriate to destroy the countryside around a rural excellence college. If we are to be taken seriously in the aims of the college then we must nurture Brinsbury and ensure that it is renowned for rural excellence and provides a model for rural sustainability. It is surrounded by farmland and countryside and this is wholly appropriate for it's purpose.

I would also ask that you confirm that the information in the consultation document regarding the size of the development area (155 Hectares) is correct as I believe it could be much bigger once infrastructure development is taken into account. There could be a danger that local people may feel misled during the consultation period, which could lead to delays at a later stage.

I do appreciate that Horsham District Council needs to meet its national and South East obligations for new housing; however I ask that you reconsider this unsustainable option. It is far more efficient to expand existing communities in a measured and sustainable manner rather than adversely affect this tranquil part of the district in order to build new a new community.

Andrew Swaffield

I must strongly object to this proposed development. I have been a resident of Pulborough for over 30 years. In that time I have seen many changes to the village some good and some not so good. This development would be a blot on the landscape ruining the lovely countryside. There are not enough Schools Local Jobs and other essentials in the area. This in my view would be a disaster and a total waist of money. Pulborough, Adversane, and Billingshurst are Sussex villages I am sure that the vast majority of local people don't want our villages connected up to form one big town.

There is a lot more I could put in this e'mail, but you will get other views from other people.

Paul Garland

I would very much like to be involved in any way I can to stop this disgusting development project. Nobody with even half a brain cell couldn't possibly think that this will be of any benefit to anybody. Who put this together? Apart from stating the complete obvious regarding the environmental impact, we simply cannot sustain locally a project of this size. Who will employ these people? Who will police these people when they move to a totally rural area and there is no work and not enough facilities for their leisure time, boredom will set in and the crime rate will go up. They will be frustrated and our quiet country life style that we have chosen and cherish will be ruined.

Helen Simmonds

I write with reference to the Adversane/North Heath option.

My objections are among the obvious ones.

Firstly, given that the site is in a green belt area there are clear implications for a major impact on the environment. An alarming possibility would be an incursion into a rural area which arguably would lead, in due course, to ribbon development between Adversane/North Heath and Billingshurst. In this regard, a major asset of West Sussex is its landscape. Any erosion of this in the proximity of the newly designated national park could surely be detrimental, not least to visitor numbers.

Secondly, traffic density would inevitably be affected. On a seasonal point, the A29 already takes a very high volume of traffic during the summer months and traffic flow and capacity would surely be affected by the development of a new settlement at Adversane/North Heath.

I am fully aware of the need for new housing and the pressures on local authorities to make the appropriate provision and of the opportunities and constraints so helpfully laid out in the Autumn edition of the Horsham District News. However, given the particular and distinctive location of the site I fervently hope that Adversane/North Heath will be spared for the enjoyment of future generations, local people and visitors alike.

Alan Chadwick

Horsham District Potential Strategic Site Option 8 Adversane/North Heath

We wish to register our strong opposition to the above proposal.

The proposed site is part of West Sussex's rural heritage; a mixture of pasture and arable, hedgerows and ancient woodland. Once this asset is lost it cannot be reinstated. The proposed development will have a significant and negative impact

overall on both the immediate and surrounding environments, hamlets, villages and towns, and undoubtedly would result in loss of habitat and green field sites. Impacts must also consider noise and light pollution in addition to waste removal. Surely it is far better to make use of existing brown field sites or areas in need of urban regeneration such as redundant industrial estates and warehouse areas on the periphery of towns where the infrastructure would already be in place.

The proposal makes reference to the inevitable increase in traffic. While some of the problems could be alleviated by an improved new network of roads, nothing will alleviate the bottleneck that already regularly occurs on Church Hill and at Swan Corner, Pulborough. It is already very dangerous for cars turning out onto the A29 from the minor roads along it and any increase in the number of cars would further exacerbate the problem and be worse still in the summer months. A large increase in population would require more lorry traffic to provide food to supermarkets and local shops. Such would escalate the need for a Pulborough by-pass and a new river crossing; surely these would have dire impacts on the environment and be quite unaffordable?

No mention has been made regarding the potential flooding risk to the low lying areas of Pulborough which would result from the increase in water run-off caused by such a development.

Issues such as schools, health, emergency services and leisure facilities have been touched upon but given low priority, whereas they are essential to the success of any such scheme and should be at the forefront of any proposal. The estimated increases in capacity of these facilities outlined could only provide a fraction of that needed to meet the requirements of the proposal.

The issue of employment has been given scant regard. 4,000 homes could easily mean over 4,000 – 6,000 workers and over 4,000 – 6,000 commuters. The area certainly cannot provide employment for such numbers of people. The Brinsbury enlargement that is referred to certainly could not.

All the projections included in the proposal appear to ignore that there are and will be other developments in the area, thereby compounding the problems.

It is our firm belief that this is not a viable option. The proposal has already been rejected once. It should be rejected again at the earliest possible opportunity to avoid distress to those residents in the immediate vicinity and surrounding areas of the proposal and to reduce the cost of any further studies.

Dr. G.E. Westlake & Mrs. J. M. Westlake

With reference to the proposed planning at North Heath, Pulborough I write to voice my most strongest objection.

The environmental damage, in my opinion, will be catastrophic. Having lived in Gay Street all my life I cannot believe that there are plans afoot to destroy such an area of outstanding beauty.

I am sure that should more housing be a necessity then there are more urban areas that would be more suitable, ie Crawley, where there is already a high density of population.

I also feel that this will lead to the ruin of the beautiful village of Pulborough, along with the wildlife within it. The Steepwood Deer farm at Adversane, would be a major casualty.

Lisa Blaber

Awful. That is what I think about the proposed development near North Heath. This is a very beautiful rural part of West Sussex, with so much wildlife, that is already under threat due to over-population.

We cannot allow a development of this size in an area of such natural beauty. The roads are already too busy. The supermarket car parks are always full as it is. The doctor's surgery overloaded with too many patients, with nowhere to park, other than the already full Tesco's car park.

Wildlife is being threatened by too many people, and too much traffic in this lovely part of Sussex.

I say NO NO NO to this development. Everyone I talk to in this area feels the same way. It MUST NOT be allowed.

Please help to keep this area special. Keep the developments near the big towns, and keep them away from areas of stunning natural beauty.

Jacqueline Dacey.

Adversane/North Heath New Town

How is it that Planning Authorities nearly always manage to get permission to build in areas that are listed as green field sites?

The idea of building such a massive site in this area is just plain ludicrous, it will completely ruin the peaceful nature of this wonderful area and the needless destruction of a green field area. When there are many brown field and urban areas which could be developed.

I am particularly interested in wild life, this development would have a huge environmental impact on this whole area and in time the remainder of the land between Pulborough and Billingshurst will be as one.

What about the infrastructure that will be demanded to carry this out, Particularly Water, Electricity and Health, both clinics in Billingshurst and Pulborough are already at full capacity.

One further point; the A29 through Pulborough is already causing many problems with heavy traffic particularly at weekends, we have already complained about this on many occasions, the burden of a further 10.000 plus vehicles is beyond belief.

Patrick & Jennifer Laker

We were not pleased to read that you have put forward proposals for 4000 homes between Adversane & North Heath.

To build on open Green Fields and hedge rows is taking away even more of the rural life and wild life.

WATER WHERE IS IT ALL GOING TO COME FROM.

730 MILLION GALS PER YEAR is the very minimum which will be required to serve 4000 homes with 2 people minimum per home,
Plus garden watering MINIMUM OF 400 MILLION GALS THIS OF COURSE NOT ALLOWING FOR PEOPLE WATERING LAWNS.

THE SAME AMOUNT AS ABOVE WOULD BE A MINIMUM REQUIRED TO BUILD THESE HOMES.

In the last 3 years we had a hose pipe ban for 2 Years plus very poor pressure.

WHERE ARE AN ESTIMATED 6,000 JOB OPPERTUNITYS COMING FROM FOR ALL THESE PEOPLE.

The A29 road along the North Heath Straight is supposed to be only 60 MPH.

THE SPEED OF MANY VEHICLES 4 & 2 WHEELED FAR EXCEEDS THIS, with the increase of many more hundred vehicles will make this road an even greater DEATH TRAP than it is all ready especially when trying to enter this road from driveways.

Obviously the new homes will be serviced with THEIR OWN WATER SUPPLY,MAIN DRAINAGE,MAINS GAS,STREET LIGHTING ALL PROBALLY AT NO EXTRA COST TO COUNCIL TAX. WE HAVE NONE OF THE ABOVE. WE HAVE LIVED AT NORTH HEATH FOR 27 YEARS.

No doubt should this massive housing development be given the green light all the above services will also be available to us and others.

J & J JUPP

Proposed Adversane 'New Town' development

We have just learned about this astounding proposal which, if we understand correctly, would result in the creation of a suburban-type development of some 4,000 houses or more in a large designated green field area.

We will certainly do all we can to oppose this plan, on the following grounds:-

- ◆ Many more appropriate sites exist in West Sussex where, for instance, existing villages or towns could be extended, making the centres more viable.
- ◆ We already experience water supply problems in this area, not to mention overloaded GP surgeries, schools and services generally.
- ◆ The A29 is at present a seriously busy link between Bilingshurst and Pulborough. The thought of thousands more cars adding to the mayhem is really alarming.

There are numerous other reasons why this plan cannot be allowed to proceed further and we hope you will be in agreement with us and put your weight into forcibly opposing the proposal.

Kevin and Jill Bell.

I have lived in Gay Street for over 25 years and have been reading your proposals for developing the above area with utter dismay and wish to make my feelings known. My first reaction was why would you wish to destroy a greenfield site of such beauty and tranquillity, that supports a myriad of wildlife, rather than use brownfield or urban areas? If this proposal goes ahead, where will it end? What other surrounding countryside will be destroyed in the years to come? Pulborough has successfully managed to remain a village of such character, despite the recent growth of the surrounding towns, but this would no longer be possible.

The roads are congested as it is, especially during the times of rush-hour. Trying to turn on to the A29 from Gay Street in the mornings is getting more and more hazardous. How much more traffic would be generated by a development of such magnitude? Our roads just could not support it.

Also, how can the current infrastructure possibly support such a development? Indeed, the water pressure where I live is so bad that we have had to have a pump installed (at our expense) just to get water into the tank in the house. How many other households would end up having to do the same?

Apart from the environmental impact, as a local resident I could not bear to see such an area of beauty be totally destroyed. Please, please think again about this proposal.

Sarah Harrison

My family and I live in Toat Lane, Pulborough and have been made aware of the above, much to our incredulation.

Firstly, I would like to point out the poor consultation and awareness process instigated by the Council. I have just spent 20 minutes trying to find specific information on the HDC website - to no avail - (I understand it is there but such an important issue as this, due to effect thousands of local people, should take precedent over Cinderella pantomime tickets...) and have had no posted documentation - is there

a

reason

behind

this?

Secondly, I detail my points below :-

- ◆ Village life - The A29 and all surrounding areas are extremely busy and due to past planning policies the heart of Pulborough has been torn out - this proposal will finally reclassify it as a Town with no personality. Hospitals at present struggle to cope and as St Richard's, Chichester is due to be down-graded where will all these extra people be treated?
- ◆ Railways - already 15 minutes slower than 30 years ago to London from Pulborough and supposedly engineering has improved. An extra station will add longer journey times.
- ◆ Environmental - we are constantly hearing about the need to preserve the environment, species and reduction of CO2 - this area must be 95% agriculture therefore I question HDC's reasoning.
- ◆ General pressure of living - this area is already over-crowded and quiet enjoyment is becoming increasingly difficult.
- ◆ Relocation of proposed new housing - I would expect, especially after this recession, there to be increased brown field and urban sites ripe for redevelopment, if correct incentives carefully thought through, were to be offered and I would urge HDC to journey down this route.

In short we are very much AGAINST this proposal and look to our elected Councillors and MP to act for their constituents and also oppose it.

Mr J. Whitmore

I am writing to express my strong objections to the Government's plans to build 4,000 new homes on land at Adversane/North Heath for the following reasons:

- ◆ The land in question is a purely green field site and its development would have a huge detrimental affect on the environment. At the moment it is home to rare nightingales, owls and many other creatures, not to mention ancient trees all of which would disappear under acres of concrete.
- ◆ Building a new town in the heart of the countryside will only encourage more urban expansion in the future and an increase in urban sprawl.
- ◆ Building a new train station at Adversane would not improve the service - the route to London is already over subscribed with standing room only for a lot of commuters. Also a large parking area would be needed to accommodate all the cars again increasing urban sprawl and increasing the carbon footprint of the local area.
- ◆ Insufficient school and medical facilities. The town would be almost further than anywhere else in Sussex from a hospital.
- ◆ In dry summers we are already short of water in the area. What would happen if another 12,000 people needed water. I dread to think.
- ◆ I understand that parts of the site already suffer from flooding. How much worse it would be if 4,000 new homes were built.

- ◆ Massive improvements to roads and the existing infrastructure would need to be made to accommodate this new town causing chaos for the present residents of the area and increasing the carbon footprint of the local area.

At the moment Pulborough is a lovely place in which to live. Unfortunately, things would be very different if this development were to be built. Inevitably such a large urban development so close would gradually overwhelm our village and Pulborough as we know it would cease to exist.

I urge you to vote against this proposed development and save this rural and beautiful corner of Sussex for future generations to enjoy.

Rowena Snell

STOP ADVERSANE/NORTH HEATH NEW TOWN

Dear Planning Dept Please consider impact with 4000 extra homes. There are empty properties in this area now why do we need more. Where are all the People coming from ?? Maybe from Overseas ????. Where are all the jobs for all these extra people ??

Many Types of Wild Life Occupy the Proposed Area including The Graceful Buzzards

most of this would be destroyed and irreversible.

Power Cuts were forecasted last winter as the Electric Companies would not be able to meet Demand,

How are they going to cope with an extra 4000 Homes ??.

Water Companies are unable to meet Demand Now in Dry Conditions, How will they manage to supply another 4000 Homes ???

With the Proposed Area covered with Roofs and Tarmac there will be very little natural drainage,

Flooding can be expected as this Proposed area is generally flat.

J Jupp

I appreciate the demands by the Government to meet development requirements, there is an ever increasing population, particularly with a greater percentage in retirement. There are many people both locally and those not directly affected who are amazed at the prospect of such a large development.

- ◆ This project will take well over ten years to complete. We are in an environment and will continue to be so, where both socially, financially and in many other aspects, life continues to change dramatically. It will be impossible to embark on such a long term plan without any certainty that it will be an effective solution before or at its completion.
- ◆ Recently a report stated that in the UK over 500,000 homes have been on the market for over six months and more than 370,000 have been for sale for over a year. In total about £86.5 billion of property remains unsold. Conditions may improve, but inevitably similar situations will return. Locally there are examples of developments which have many unsold properties.
- ◆ This area offers low employment opportunities, with many people travelling to London and other areas for work. Prospective buyers would take a negative view at the potential travelling costs, low wages and other family considerations. To suggest that Brinsbury offers employment opportunities is misleading, how many currently work at this site, are there many current vacancies. I believe that Chichester College have recently shelved/ deferred plans for considerable expansion.
- ◆ To suggest that new services would be provided is again without foundation. Locally Billingshurst has virtually one side of the main street full of unoccupied commercial property. Pulborough now has very few shops in the main street. Throughout the country many small business's have disappeared, I cannot see this town attracting a range of local shops and business's, the numbers would not make it viable for long time and no one can forecast trends and demands in ten years time. We continually read about the closure of local Bank branches and Post Offices throughout the country and many traditional shops have already disappeared from towns and villages.
- ◆ There would be a huge increase in the numbers of cars, the A29 is now overloaded particularly in the summer, it was never designed for the amount of current traffic leave alone with thousands more local cars. The other main coastal 'A' roads, eg A24 & A23 are now dual carriageways or Motorway. Other local roads are mainly 'B' roads.
- ◆ I can really see a huge controversy in trying to build another railway station within about two miles of the existing Billingshurst station and three miles from Pulborough. The added journey time for travellers would be increased and with train companies continually under strain to perform, they would resist such a major change.
- ◆ This week there has been a significant article in the County Times by one of the local Pulborough Doctors. This development would mean a large population would have a long journey to the nearest A&E. Most ambulances on call come from Worthing which is at least a 30minute journey. I agree fully with Dr Fooks' comments.
- ◆ I have lived in this area for 30 years and have regularly run and walked the local countryside. It is an area of great beauty with a huge amount of wildlife. There are many bridleways and footpaths which provide ideal opportunity for families to enjoy and hopefully provide exercise for people and education for children.
- ◆ Much of the planned area is low-lying and often floods in the winter months, to impose such a huge number of properties would cause considerable strain on the natural water courses. We so often hear about properties built on unsuitable land where they suffer much flooding and then owners find it difficult to get suitable insurance.

- ◆ There is every prospect of a new Government in the near future, doubtless they will approach the needs of the future in many different ways.

Myself and my wife completely object to this proposed development and support the many comments made by other people against this project.

Michael Lang

The Government's proposal to build 4000 homes entirely on Green Belt land is outrageous. Whilst I recognise the need to have additional homes in the South-East the proposed site at Adversane is totally unsuitable for this size of development. The present A29 is not suitable for the increase in traffic that this 'new town' will create. There is a lack of service facilities in the area, in particular with regard to the provision of water as evidenced in recent years by the extensive ban on hose pipes.

The area is presently badly served by the lack of hospitals in the vicinity (Chichester, East Surrey, Worthing all 45 minutes away by car) .

One can only hope that sense will prevail and that future development will be confined to urban site extensions or at worst brown field sites

John Bowker

Adversane / North Heath New Town Proposal

I am writing to register my opposition to the proposed development of a new town at Adversane/North Heath.

Whilst I could itemise a list of objections relating to lack of infrastructure and the negative effects on local villages, the destruction of a green field site when brown field and urban alternatives exist is indefensible. Once lost this countryside will never be returned to agricultural use, and this development will undoubtedly lead to additional urban sprawl in ensuing years. We are living in a time when the ability of this country to feed itself will become increasingly important, as world resources dwindle: Concreting over productive countryside is a step in the wrong direction.

I would therefore ask that my objection be noted when considering this matter.

C R Swain

I wish to make the strongest possible objection to the proposed Adversane/ North Heath New Town

- ◆ This is ecological/ environmental vandalism, and wilful destruction of the “Garden Of England”, to replace it with a “concrete jungle”. Not only is the local infrastructure unable to support this expansion, but we seen the result of what could happen in Pulborough in other parts of the country in 2007 with major floods. We are replacing the grass and trees that used to soak up all the rainwater, with concrete. The water that would have been soaked into the ground or grown larger trees or enriched the meadows, runs off the concrete into the rivers that then “FLOOD”. The river in Pulborough already floods every year over square miles of the Sussex Downs. It is obvious that removal from 155 hectares of countryside, with all their grass and trees ABOVE Pulborough, is going to have a major impact on the height of the rivers, putting all the houses on the river side at Pulborough, and HARDHAM at risk.

- ◆ Roads Infrastructure - The access to Horsham from Five Oaks on around 08:00 am each morning, is dreadful, resulting in a 15 min queue from the hump backed bridge on the Five Oaks side, to the Broadbridge Heath roundabout after the Toll House Toyota Garage (Approximately ½ mile). Another 4000 houses (with one to two cars per house) will result in between 4000- 8000 extra cars using this access road, which will potentially mean traffic jams each morning back to before Five Oaks, and possibly to Billingshurst. The access road to Horsham from the Southwater roundabout is similarly congested, and would probably have traffic jams back to before the A24 roundabout and onto the dual carriageway. To anyone who uses the roads to Horsham area regularly, it is immediately apparent that the A24 & A29 could basically not support another 4000-8000 cars over this area. The traffic jams would be horrendous, destroy everyone’s quality of life, and raise the carbon footprint of the area by a significant percentage. The area is simply not able to support this housing explosion. The Quality of Life of everyone currently living in the area will be completely devastated and destroyed.

- ◆ Breakdown of Quality of Life and values - the villages of Billingshurst, Pulborough, Adversane will just merge into a sprawling mass of housing, totally destroying village and community life, which has existed for hundreds of years. Every study into the breakdown in society values and standards in Great Britain, identifies the BREAKDOWN OF COMMUNITIES as a major factor. This creation of an URBANE SPRAWL, will do just that, and destroy the communities of Adversane, Billingshurst, and Pulborough. This will create another PROBLEM AREA that we would all have to SUFFER. The model for what will happen here is evident all over this country. Villages with their own identity just merge into one another, and as with the creation of “New Towns”, result in mile upon mile of faceless housing estates. The ever-expanding mass of concrete has no identity or communities, and propagates all the social problems we hear about daily in the News Programmes. Yet, now it is proposed we bring them to the Horsham Area. It cannot be allowed to happen in “The Garden Of England”. Years ago a New Town was created at Crawley, (30 miles away), why should there be another.

- ◆ Environmental Footprint - Everyone is worried currently about our ENVIRONMENTAL FOOTPRINT. Trees and Grass absorb carbon Dioxide to make Chlorophyll (Green and leaf greening). Taking up 155 hectares of green fields and resident trees will INCREASE THE CARBON DIOXIDE footprint.

One simply cannot keep removing nature's means of absorbing carbon dioxide from the atmosphere, at an ever-increasing rate, and then wonder why carbon dioxide is increasing. Conferences all over the world are postulating what we should do to reduce CO₂ levels. Horsham Council's contribution to this global problem should be that they will not tear up 155 hectares of green fields & trees, and make the situation worse. Logically, the 4000 houses should be built on an existing "brown field site", which will not destroy nature's means of CO₂ removal.

- ◆ The Electricity supply in Pulborough is not currently adequate with lights regularly "dimming" at peak periods, and potentially damaging electrical appliances and computers. With a further drain on the Area Grid of the new town, even with increased sub-stations, can only make this worse!!
- ◆ Building 4000 new homes where there is an expanding thriving economy is one thing, but where is the employment for these people and their families. Since there are often two to three wage earners in a family, where are the new 12,000 jobs to sustain these people? Manufacturing around West Sussex has significantly reduced over the past twenty years, so who is going to employ them, or are they just going to have to sign on at the Job Centre, and swell the unemployment benefits bill.
- ◆ The lower buildings on our estate already have flooding every winter, and the height has been steadily creeping up over the past few years, without the addition of 40000 houses. The council have to send "gulpers" (Drain suction vehicles) in to get rid of the water. If another 4000 houses were built North of Pulborough the impact could be catastrophic.
- ◆ This proposal is an irreversible change that will totally destroy a cornerstone of England's heritage, and some of its most beautiful countryside forever. In a hundred years time, we want our grand-children's children, to be able to look out onto this beautiful countryside, and not a sprawling mass of concrete. We want them to thank us for protecting, not destroying their environment and their "Quality Of Life". This proposal is not progress, it is destruction, and once it starts, it will not stop, but continue to expand. If this goes ahead, future generations will brand this generation Environmental Vandals for destroying this part of England, their England. I hope you will take note of these major concerns, for a beautiful part of England that will be irreversibly changed, for the worse forever.

You cannot allow this to go ahead.

Colin Wade B.Sc. M.Sc.

As residents of Nutbourne and former residents of Adversane, my husband and I are firmly opposed to the proposal of 4000 homes in Adversane.

We oppose this proposal based on the following points:-

- ◆ 4000 new homes in Adversane/North Heath could put the public's health at risk and put a significant demand on resources in this area as this site is as far as possible from each of the main acute hospital trusts, ambulance services struggle with the long journeys to and from hospitals and there are no plans to build a new A&E hospital that could easily access this area. (NB this point has been purported by the Pulborough Medical Group);
- ◆ Unnecessary urbanisation of these green fields rather than exploiting available brown field/urban sites;
- ◆ Huge, irresponsible environmental impact on habitat for wildlife and resident enjoyment of the natural beauty of Sussex;
- ◆ Unsustainable pressure on local infrastructure (water supply/drainage);
- ◆ Initiates an urban foothold in the heart of the countryside which will only lead to more growth/urban sprawl;
- ◆ Untenable pressure on local schools, lack of jobs and A29 not designed increased traffic of this magnitude;
- ◆ Further demise of Pulborough as a village.

Tim and Diane Smith

We have reviewed the proposed plan for a new town at Adversane/North Heath and as residents of West Chiltington we object to the proposal for the following reasons;

- ◆ The plan is irresponsible and demonstrates the needless destruction of a green field site, which is disproportionate, unnecessary and not justifiable
- ◆ The traffic pressures created by an additional 8000+ cars/vehicles will overload the villages of West Chiltington, Thakeham, Pulborough, Storrington, Adversane and Billingshurst as well as the heavily congested & busy A29 road to London/Bognor Regis.
- ◆ The density of properties which is proposed (10 homes per acre) is too heavy as there are no proposed infrastructure developments and this will impact the existing problems that we have already with water supply, reservoirs and drainage etc .You will remember that this area has suffered several droughts and water pipe bans in recent years
- ◆ The plan initiates a town foothold in the heart of the Weald countryside which will lead to more urban sprawl.
- ◆ Adversane & Billingshurst will become dormitory towns as there are little prospect of employment opportunities locally. New inhabitants will have to commute to Horsham, Crawley or London, thus causing increased traffic congestion and CO2 pollution in a rural area
- ◆ A major problem is the lack of a nearby local NHS hospital and A&E department - the nearest is Worthing or Chichester (45 minutes away) In my village we have had to create a local initiative to reduce the risk of heart attacks (Crest) because of the time that it will take ambulances to get to an emergency such as a heart attack
- ◆ The proposal will destroy the present rural and tranquil character of the area and the surrounding villages and towns will be adversely affected
- ◆

We strongly believe that the proposal should be rejected

David & Julie Daley

Re ; proposed new town at Adversane/North Heath. 7th October 2009

I have been made aware of the above proposal, and thank you for the opportunity to express my views. The proposal appears to contradict many issues currently being extolled and deemed important by the government.

- ◆ Our rivers are under threat with the increasing amount of water extraction , and we are subjected to hose pipe bans in the summer. Another 4000 homes being supplied from the current resources will only increase the strain on the existing supply, to the detriment of the area as a whole.
- ◆ Natural farm land covered by roads and buildings reduces the ability for rainfall to be absorbed for the benefit of the water table and increases the risk of flash flooding.
- ◆ For the past recent years , policy has been giving grants to maintaining the countryside for the benefit of wildlife , and human enjoyment. These benefits take time to develop....why should they be destroyed now?. We have nesting Buzzards , barn owls and herons (the later is a protected species) , we have glow worms and meadow butterflies on the increase and we have rare lichens in parts of the woodland.
- ◆ Leading on from above I would have thought that the ability for land to grow food is increasingly important and currently badly undervalued .
- ◆ The proposed area as it exists benefits a far larger area than the shown boundary in terms of wildlife, a break between the villages and amenity value. The adverse affects of the proposed development will also influence an area larger than its boundary in terms of increased traffic, noise and light pollution, and increased pressure on all local services.
- ◆ Looking at every precedent , the initial development will at some stage increase in size , as will the adverse detriments to the area as a whole.
- ◆ Any increase in the areas population should be accommodated in the existing
- ◆ villages , with a view to improving the village amenities at the same time.

As you can see from the above comments , I am strongly against the proposed development on the grounds of the destruction of the natural habitat and historical evolution , that gives us existing villages interspersed with farmland , that is a feature of our county

Peter Russell

I wish to register my opposition to the suggested development of the land around Adversane/North Heath West Sussex for the following reasons:

- ◆ A lack of adequate infrastructure to sustain safely a development of this magnitude by way of roads, schools, hospitals, community centres, sewerage works, refuse management facilities etc.

- ◆ The excessive environmental impact that a scheme of this size would have on the local area i.e. pollution during construction and the subsequent increased pollution levels from the proposed 4000 new homes and associated motor vehicles. Also the decimation of existing wildlife resulting in the destruction of their natural habitat.
- ◆ Areas within the proposed development are prone to flooding.
- ◆ I would welcome alternative 'brown field' sites and existing vacant residential and commercial sites being considered rather than the needless destruction of a beautiful rural location.
- ◆ I question if there are enough jobs available to satisfy the demand of an additional 4000 households in the area.

Michael Sparks

My family have lived in this area for >300 years and WE OBJECT to the further suburbanisation of rural Sussex that will spoil forever our region by building needlessly on greenfield sites in the heart of a rural area. We must preserve the countryside and rural way of life and not let it be spoilt. In any event it is vital Britain retains its agricultural potential for food production.

The following comments form the basis of our opinion:-

- ◆ CLIMATE CHANGE with a substantially lower carbon footprint/usage is the key to reducing the risk of ending human civilisation as we know it. This recovery needs a complete restructuring of society and we must, produce a less environmentally damaging way of life. We must get back to basics and all human activity must be sustainable. FURTHER DESTRUCTION OF OUR GREEN LAND IS NOT SUSTAINABLE IN THE LONG TERM.
- ◆ TRAVEL. This should be a luxury not a necessity and the daily travel miles to get to and from work, schools etc must be reduced similar to what it was before 1950 when world oil consumption was <10MBD (million barrels/day) as opposed to now when it is approaching 100MBD. We must develop a way of life where people are happy where they are enjoying their immediate locality. A NEW COMMUNITY AT ADVERSANE/NORTH HEATH WOULD EXACERBATE THIS PROBLEM AS IT IS FAR FROM SHOPS, HOSPITALS AND MOST MAJOR FACILITIES.
- ◆ THE PLANNED HOUSING is not for people working locally but to establish a new community and for commuters. The railways cannot cope with such a large influx of commuters along the line as it would become slow and inefficient. The roads we all enjoy as they are would become jammed inefficient and inadequate. THE ENVIRONMENTAL & FINANCIAL COST OF DUALLING THE A29 & B3133 TO ADDRESS THIS ISSUE WOULD BE PROHIBITATIVE.
- ◆ NEW HOUSING. Our view is that the housing we should build to overcome the current crisis, if there is one, should be in the form of futuristic very large skyscrapers linked by walkways at many levels. These could be all encompassing complete communities with very high quality leisure facilities, shops, health centres, libraries clubs etc. These should be built in and around the periphery of London and our other large cities on brown sites of which there are many. For a short period in our younger days we have enjoyed living in similar N.American

high rise/skyscraper complexes with easy access to the wildwood. It suits many people at stages of their life and could, and should be, only of very high quality. IN SHORT WE SHOULD GO UPWARD AND NOT OUTWARD.

- ◆ HOUSING STANDARDS. Wherever new houses are built these should all have “state of the art “ environmental systems such as 100% rainwater capture, solar power, ground source heat and heat recovery systems etc., so that they are not totally dependant on oil, gas and electricity. In particular they should have by mandate underground garaging to reduce the loss of green land.
- ◆ FOOD & AGRICULTURE. Churchill said after WWII "we must never again rely on imported food" but we have ignored this and the next major war will likely be about food and food miles is a major part of CO2 production. Kenya should grow food for Africa not roses to be flown to England. We must get British farming going again, pay our farmers well and not let it be ruined by cheap food from overseas sources to sustain an overpopulation problem. WE MUST THEREFOR RETAIN ALL AGRICULTURAL LAND TO PRODUCE LOCAL FOOD FOR THE ALREADY HEAVILY POPULATED SOUTHEAST REGION.

The basic needs of humans is to have:-

- food, water & clean air,
- shelter & warmth,
- rest and recuperation.

WE SIMPLY DO NOT NEED TO DESTROY THE BEST OF WHAT WE HAVE, OUR LANDSCAPE, FARMING AND WILDLIFE, TO PROVIDE THIS.

Frank & Erica Riddle

POTENTIAL STRATEGIC SITE OPTION 8: ADVERSANE / NORTH HEATH

Perceived Advantages

1. Starting with a blank sheet of paper
2. Concentrating all development in one location

Perceived Disadvantages (in no particular order)

1. Additional infrastructure needed for
 - ◆ water supply
 - ◆ gas supply
 - ◆ electricity supply
 - ◆ sewerage
 - ◆ telecommunications
2. Road system improvements needed
3. Reliance on maintenance of rail system
4. Effect on surrounding settlements, particularly Pulborough and Billingshurst
5. Need for emergency services to be re-organised –
 - ◆ fire
 - ◆ ambulance

- ◆ hospital
 - ◆ police
6. Need for community infrastructure;
 - ◆ “village” hall
 - ◆ recreation facilities
 - ◆ religious facilities
 - ◆ shops
 - ◆ schools
 7. Destruction of farm land
 8. Employment location
 9. Isolation

Detailed Consideration of Advantages and Disadvantages

Advantages

1 Starting with a blank sheet of paper

Clearly, from the planners angle this has a great advantage since there are few constraints on how the development should proceed and there is little or no existing infrastructure to be accommodated. In consequence there is likely to be some cost saving in the design and procurement stage of the basic development.

However, these savings will be greatly diminished due to the need to develop the entire associated infrastructure which will be needed to support the development, e.g. utilities, roads, emergency services, etc.

Thus it is concluded that this advantage is really one to be enjoyed by the planners and designers rather than the whole community (existing and future) who will have to finance and provide the necessary supporting facilities.

2 Concentrating all development in one location

This is an advantage or a disadvantage dependant upon the point of view of the observer. Clearly any disturbance and general inconvenience is confined to a prescribed location and any problems arising from the development are concentrated in one place. On the other hand such concentration can cause a problem by the sheer magnitude and the fact that it is concentrated and thus problems may fester and grow as a result.

If it is decided to concentrate the development in one location great care and attention needs to be given to the accompanying infrastructure to provide suitable recreation facilities and activities for the population. A common complaint of young persons today is that “there is nothing for us to do”, this despite all the clubs, activities and opportunities which are provided. It will be essential not to finish up with a ghetto situation but this needs planning and proper provision, not just an expectation that it will happen.

Similarly, concentrating development in one area may give rise to problems regarding employment. Unless there is an accompanying commercial development< which is apparently not proposed for the Adversane/North Heath site all workers will have to leave the area to go to work or they will have to work at home. Although the idea of “working at home” is the current “in idea” it must be appreciated that this only applies to particular types of occupation and even then is not always possible. So any substantial size of development will inevitably generate a significant commuting population.

Disadvantages

1 Additional infrastructure

To provide the necessary utility services there will need to be improvements and increased capacity. The utilities are;

- ◆ water supply
- ◆ gas supply
- ◆ electricity supply
- ◆ sewerage
- ◆ telecommunications

None of the utility companies have sufficient installed capacity for a development of the proposed size.

Consequently each company will have to install additional equipment or otherwise increase capacity which will in turn create additional planning applications in other areas away from the immediate site and general disruption during installation. Installation will include pipes and ducts which will cause major disruption to road traffic.

Southern Water may encounter particular difficulties in obtaining sufficient supplies from the Rother and underground sources. Already in times of reduced river flow water supplied in the area is contaminated and near undrinkable due to chemical content. Similarly there will be a need for greatly increased sewage treatment facilities.

2 Road system improvements

The current roads in the area are all 2-way and are not designed to accept the increased traffic which a development of this nature will generate from within, let alone any generated from external sources as a result of the development. (e.g. commuters from elsewhere driving to take advantage of the new rail station or to use other facilities within the development).

Development on this scale could introduce an extra 8,000 or more cars onto roads which are already heavily trafficked. In addition there will be increased heavy goods vehicles traffic.

Increased North South traffic will exacerbate the problems in Pulborough at Church Hill and Swan Corner and there is no properly viable East-West route without first going to either Billingshurst or Pulborough.

If it is anticipated that a large proportion of the inhabitants will be employed in the Crawley/Gatwick area there will obviously be added congestion on the roads North of Billingshurst and towards Horsham. Alternatively reliance will be placed on an already overstretched rail service as discussed below.

Other than links to Horsham, there are no direct public transport links to centres of entertainment or similar activities, such as Brighton

3 Reliance on maintenance of rail system.

It appears that much of the proposal is based on the provision and maintenance of a viable service on the Arun Valley line and the provision of a new station at Adversane. It is to be noted that the service on the Arun Valley line has steadily deteriorated during the last 30 years and that it is highly reliant upon slotting into the very heavily congested Brighton Line at Three Bridges.

It has to be queried whether the rail authorities will be willing to commit to the considerable expense which a proper provision for a development of this scale will demand. Furthermore, what guarantees will be obtained that the line will be kept open in the future?

It is also queried what guarantees or alternative arrangements are envisaged for Pulborough and Billingshurst stations? Is it really feasible that there would be 3 stations in a distance of 9 miles each providing a full service to and from London?

Finally there is the question of capacity. In the rush hour there is already a shortage of capacity on the London services, particularly north of Horsham. It appears that it is anticipated that many of the additional inhabitants will be employed in the Crawley/Gatwick area. If only a percentage of the new inhabitants have a need to travel beyond Horsham that overcrowding will become an even greater problem.

4 Effect on surrounding settlements, particularly Pulborough and Billingshurst.

The development of a new settlement larger than Pulborough and only some 3 miles from Billingshurst will have an inevitable effect on those two existing settlements and the traders in them who are all struggling to exist. The present retail trade situation is demonstrated by the number of vacant retail premises in both villages.

Horsham District Council has already allowed 2 supermarkets to trade in Pulborough and one in Billingshurst. It is questioned what nature and size of shopping facility is to be provided if this development is to proceed and if it is not to kill the existing centres?

5 Emergency services.

- ◆ fire
- ◆ ambulance
- ◆ hospital
- ◆ police

There will be a need for additional facilities for all the emergency services. In particular it is of concern that the area chosen for this development is already one of the remotest in the county regarding A & E hospital facilities.

It is inevitable that there will be a need for additional facilities for these services each of which will in turn raise planning issues.

6 Community infrastructure;

- ◆ “village” hall
- ◆ recreation facilities
- ◆ religious facilities
- ◆ shops
- ◆ schools

Again individual planning issues will be raised in connection with each of these elements of infrastructure. Particular attention will need to be given to educational facilities and it will undoubtedly be necessary to provide facilities for pre-school and primary school children within the development. Facilities for this age group are already overloaded in both Pulborough and Billingshurst. Provision for secondary education will also be needed and it will be necessary to assess the capacity of the Weald School to absorb the increased numbers.

The need for recreational facilities for young people has been mentioned above. Anti-social behaviour is currently a problem in both Pulborough and Billingshurst and the introduction of a whole new assembly of bored young persons in such close proximity to the two current centres must be a cause for concern.

7 Destruction of farm land

Although the land in question is not top grade it nevertheless has significant agricultural potential. If built upon that potential will be lost for ever. It has to be recognised that present agricultural policies do not place a high monetary value on such land. However, current forecasts are that the world population is increasing at an alarming rate and therefore the demand and competition for basic food supplies will also increase. At a time when large areas of the world are suffering drought or flooding with the inevitable destruction of food producing potential and when this country is reported to be importing some 40% of its food it must be questionable whether destruction of good land is the right solution and whether the damage this will cause to our food production potential is the right legacy for our descendants.

The environmental impact of a development of this size in an undeveloped rural area will be immense. In particular wildlife including nightingales, badgers, foxes, deer, owls etc. will all be displaced.

In view of the fact that the area is presently undeveloped an environmental study should be commissioned urgently to establish whether there are any protected flora or fauna for which special provision will have to be made.

8 Employment location

There is no particular centre of local employment. Thus apart from the few who will be employed within the community, in the schools, local shops, etc. and those who might be able to work at home, all employment will be away from the development.

This will have several effects. These include turning the development into a dormitory town and resulting in everyone in employment having to drive or use the train to get to work with the resultant significant increase in the carbon output.

9 Isolation

It is not clear where all the people are to come from to occupy the development. Presumably the intention will be to provide a mix of private and low cost housing. However, currently it is proving difficult to sell private development housing in this area of West Sussex. This is likely to inhibit any developer taking on the challenge which this development offers. Low cost housing implies a certain lack of financial resources of the residents which poses questions of how they are to get to and from employment and other centres.

If this development is embarked upon there will be no turning back if there is a reduced demand for housing. The land will have been contaminated, the services, road, rail and other infrastructure requirements will have been procured, the schools and recreational facilities prepared and all for what? The numbers used in the report are projections and the time period is so long that they can only be conjecture with no certainty that they will actually materialise. Under these circumstances it would be seem to be sheer folly to embark on a major development when there are a number of brown field and smaller localities identified in the report. These areas will be closer to centres of employment and recreational facilities and will have developed transport links which will be capable of absorbing the relatively limited increase in demand which a small development would cause.

As noted, there are few public transport links to centres of entertainment and what links there are involve a significant journey time. Without the opportunity to enjoy the pleasures of centres such as Guildford or Brighton young persons in particular tend to become a problem. A development of 4,000 homes is insufficient to provide an entertainment infrastructure and the location proposed is too remote to facilitate travel to such venues yet being new build there are likely to be a disproportionate number of younger people.

CONCLUSION

Although there appear to be some advantages with the proposal for 4,000 homes in the Adversane/North Heath area, detailed consideration suggests that these are limited and indeed in some respects are really disadvantages.

It seems that there are many disadvantages to concentrating development in the manner and in the area proposed.

With the number of brown field sites and other sites of less potential environmental harm identified in the Report prepared by the Council's consultants it is felt that the influx of population which is envisaged could be absorbed into existing communities, transport and infrastructure resources with far less disruption and disturbance than will result from a "new town" approach. Furthermore and importantly, such absorption would allow development to proceed at a rate and in a manner commensurate with demand facilities, changing lifestyles and any other factors which may arise in the intervening years.

P. W. Gregory

RE: Potential Strategic Site Number 8

I recently discovered that the Government is proposing to build approximately 4,000 new homes to the north of Pulborough. On hearing the news, I was instantly struck by the lack of thought that seems to have gone into the plan. Being only a fifteen-year-old student and sensitive to the frequent warnings of Global Warming inflicted on our generation, I have naturally come to care about the harm we are doing to the environment. Therefore, for this reason I am particularly opposed to the Adversane/North Heath New Town.

Global Warming is a worldwide and well known idea that is hard to deny as its effects are so apparent. Therefore, why, may I ask, is the Government building a group of houses that will destroy 480 hectares of beautiful, green-belt countryside and contribute to these effects?

In doing this, hundreds of trees will be destroyed, taking with them the oxygen that they produce which is vital in our fight to stopping Global Warming. In addition, the risk of flooding from the increased water run off must be substantial. These new 12,000 residents will bring with them approximately 10,000 new cars, further adding to the rising carbon dioxide levels.

However, what angers me the most is where the energy for this new town will come from. There is no need to guess its supply, however. It is a well-known fact that non-renewable sources will be burnt to accommodate this extra demand, and in doing so releasing more carbon dioxide into the atmosphere and depreciating the precious resources that we have left. Instead of wasting these fossil fuels, we should be using them to discover more sustainable and environmentally-friendly sources of energy. Wouldn't a wind farm be a better use of this land than a town? The land could still be used for farming, the farmers could earn income to add to their already minimal wages, and it would be one way to ensure that the future of the earth is not condemned for later generations.

In addition to this lack of thought, I was struck that the plans are only for housing. If an additional 12,000 inhabitants were to enter this small area the strain on the public facilities would be astronomical. Education for a start would be put under a huge

pressure. At the moment, only a few very small primary schools and one large secondary school exist nearby. These are already very full and could definitely not stand a dramatic increase in pupils. There would also be a lack of jobs for the parents of these children, as well as a lack of medical treatment for the whole family. (The nearest hospital is more than a thirty minute drive away, which in itself is being threatened for closure.) The local amenities, also including the police, dentists and parking, could simply not stand this extra strain, and, despite the new housing, the new inhabitants as well as the existing ones would have worse living conditions due to the difficulty in receiving basic public services.

Although, having said that, will the new housing be of a better quality than the existing ones? Surely not, as to squeeze 4,000 dwellings into 383 acres could only be possible if block accommodation is used. I read in the plans that only Listed Buildings will not be demolished, but surely these will be dwarfed by the high rise dwellings. Valuable land will be lost forever by an urban sprawl which will not acknowledge the character of the area.

This seems even more likely as to put a town in the middle of several villages is to put a foothold in the heart of the countryside. Once it has been proven that growth is possible in this area, it will only lead to further expansion and the abolition of West Chilington, Pulborough and Adversane, merging them together to form one large city, with not a tree or green field in site.

Indeed, if does need to go ahead, why should a green-belt area be sacrificed? Why are these beautiful fields even being considered when there are other brown-belt sites existing near towns, such as Crawley? They already have adequate infrastructures capable of coping with many thousands of new residents. They have larger road systems, more available jobs and a reliable rail and bus route system. These already existing facilities can cope with an increase of 10,000 extra people, and the carbon footprint will not be nearly as large. So where a solution is already present, who would ever even consider adding a huge strain to the already overburdened infrastructure here?

Another point which has been drawn to my attention is the fact that there are plans to build another railway station in this proposed town. This will mean that North Heath, Pulborough and Billingshurst stations will be within 4 miles of each other. For all three stations to remain open, it may be necessary for train services not to stop at all of them at busy times. This would cause traffic congestion as people are forced to drive further to a station, causing overcrowding to an already busy A29, which will not be big enough to accommodate this extra traffic as it is.

This option proposes to destroy a unique area of the county and wipe out the diversity of flora and fauna. Many of the birds in the area are endangered and rare including Barn Owls, Nightingales, Nightjars and Buzzards. A colony of bats also exists, which are a protected species. Repositioning species will add further to the costs of this development, at a time when the Government is already facing an economic downturn.

It is far more efficient to expand existing communities in a measured and sustainable manner rather than negatively affecting this tranquil part of the county in order to build a new community. As far as I can make out, it is simply a way of housing

people and no proper thought or care has gone into ensuring that these new inhabitants will have the proper facilities that they need. I understand that Horsham District Council is in need of new accommodation, but I ask you to please reconsider this option as it is by far the most unsuitable of all the nine sites.

Miss Jemima S. Atkins

With reference to the proposed development at Adversane, I wish to object strongly for the following reasons:-

- ◆ The lack of employment in the area. I myself have been unemployed since December with no future prospect of finding any job at the present time. Therefore this large scale development would mean several thousand more people in the area with little in the way of work places in the locality.
- ◆ These who did not use their car, but chose to use the train would find a very inadequate service. The journey time on the up line now takes longer than it did a few years ago and at some times the trains are overcrowded at times in the rush hour.
- ◆ There will be unsustainable pressure on local water supply and drainage.
- ◆ This development will lead to the demise of Pulborough as a village and it will become another commuter town.

Maurice Poole

Comments on Horsham District Local Framework to 2026
Draft Document September 2009

Introduction

This note sets out objections to the inclusion of strategic site 9; Pulborough expansion and also those aspects of strategic site 8; Adversane/North Heath that are likely to have an adverse impact on residents of Pulborough, with special focus on the historic areas of Pulborough, and the village conservation area.

Strategic Site 9 – Pulborough Expansion

1. West Glebe Field

Flora and Fauna

This area is a green field site and is part of the village conservation area. The Sussex Biodiversity Group has identified over 40 rare and protected species of plant and animal in, or in the immediate vicinity of this area. Horsham District Council has been provided with a list of these species. Some of the flora and fauna in and around this area are of particular interest.

- Lichens. A national expert on British flora, Dr Francis Rose published work showing how lichens are very sensitive indicators of good atmospheric quality. He and his co-workers identified 2 churchyards and surrounding areas in Sussex that had a diverse population of lichens, including some rare species. These were Stopham

and Pulborough (St Mary's churchyard, where some of the species exist on the boundary wall between the churchyard and the West Glebe field. Any development of this area will prove a grave risk to these species, and will certainly not enhance air quality.

- The area around the West Glebe field has been identified as one of the 10 most important in the country for the Stag Beetle, which is increasingly threatened. A report on this by the Sussex expert Colin Pratt was sent to Horsham District Council a few years ago.
- Amphibians and reptiles. Slow worm, grass snake and adder have all been recorded; and the common newt has been recorded in the area. It is also noteworthy that the Sussex Biodiversity Group have a record of the great crested newt existing close to the West Glebe field.

Other key points of wildlife interest are:-

- The West Glebe field is a very short distance (<2 km) from the Pulborough Brooks bird reserve. As such, this is an area that will fall within European Union constraints on developments near such an area. This mandates both a thorough assessment of the impact of any potential development, and also the need to ensure that such developments are done in a manner sympathetic to wildlife.
- Bird life. The West Glebe field is a regularly overflowed by the barn owl, tawny owl, and little owl; and rare species such as the ring ousel has been observed in Church Place. The area to the north side of the West Glebe Field also regularly has nightingales.

Historical Interest

St Mary's Church is built on a roman site, and the extent to which this site extends into the West Glebe field needs through investigation. In medieval times, this part of Pulborough also had a small monastic community (there are signs of this at several locations along Church Place and into Coombelands). The West Glebe field will require thorough investigation to assess this.

Amenity area

The West Glebe field is used extensively by local residents, particularly by those living on the South side of Church Place, and has been used as such at least since the 1950s, at times when there are no horses in the field.

Impact on Industrial Estate to the South of the West Glebe Field, and residents of Lyntons

Access to any new development in the West Glebe field will be from the South, through the existing industrial estate. This will necessitate a new road and significant engineering to ensure that the gradient into the West Glebe field is usable. This will inevitably restrict parking close to the industrial estate, and may hence impact business there. It will tend to make deliveries from lorries to these establishments more difficult, and will increase traffic flow to the A283, which is already very busy during the morning and evening rush hours, and is a location where access to the

railway station is already hazardous due to limited visibility through the railway bridge to the West of the access route.

2. Oddstones

This site has had no fewer than 6 planning applications submitted, and rejected in recent years, the last one in September 2009. If development were viable on this site, an acceptable proposal would have been put forward by now! A key factor on this site is undoubtedly road access, since visibility onto the A29 is not good, and there is already significant traffic accessing the Sainsbury's store, and the new estate on the East of the A29. There needs to be a plan to ensure safe road access without compromising traffic flow on the A29 for this site to be viable.

3. Green field sites West of the railway line between Oddstones and Coombelands

There is a vast swath of pink shading, indicating the potential for development in this region. This is a vital green field site, used by many in the existing community for recreation (such as walking) and borders the new South Downs national park. It will be quite ridiculous to create new developments that effectively deny local people access on foot through existing open countryside to such a site.

It is an important area for wildlife, and again, the Sussex Biodiversity group database shows over 50 rare and protected species in this area. These include a number of orchid species, most British reptiles and Amphibians. In addition to this, the birdlife in the area is stunning, including in particular a strong population of skylarks – which are under considerable threat at the present time. The area is also used during the autumn/winter months by geese and other wildfowl. The proximity of this area to the Pulborough Brooks Nature reserve, and the impact of European legislation on developments close to such a reserve need to be taken fully into account.

Strategic Site 8 – Adversane/North Heath

This area should also be rejected as a development area. It is a key wildlife area with well over 70 rare and protected species in the area. A key species is the Barbastelle bat, which traverses this area on its feeding route, and which will undoubtedly become extinct locally should such a development go ahead.

This site also has very poor transport access to areas where work might exist, mainly to the North. Adding significantly to traffic on the existing A29 will greatly inconvenience all who currently live in the area, and will not be likely to attract new people in – especially if there area areas where there is better access to their place of work. A full assessment of transport issues needs to be done, and draft plans drawn up, before alternative major development sites can be sensibly identified.

General Issues

Water treatment and supply

The water treatment plant for Pulborough lies on the floodplain at Hardham. This plant is subject to flooding regularly, and according to the environment agency the risk of this occurring is increasing. When the river does flood, foul water discharge onto the floodplain (in the new National Park, including Pulborough Brooks bird reserve) occurs. Increased development from options 9 and 8 that feeds this station will make this problem much, much worse. Before any new major development can be sanctioned it is absolutely essential that a new treatment plant is constructed somewhere off the floodplain that has sufficient capacity. Without this, the health of the existing community will be put increasingly at risk.

In addition to the treatment plant, the sewage pipework in Pulborough is already operating beyond its design capacity in many parts of the village. Any new development will have to ensure that they fund the necessary new pipework out of their own resources, and do not seek to further overload the existing system.

There is a further risk here in that more water is being abstracted by Southern Water downstream of the Hardham plant to supply the South Sussex coastal towns. The quality of their water supply will be directly threatened if the treatment issues above are not addressed.

Water supply to Pulborough comes from aquifers to the Northwest of the village. Southern Water have stated that there is capacity for only around 500 new dwellings to be supplied from these sources. More clarity is needed on this. If there is also demand from areas adjacent to Pulborough, does this further restrict the capacity available? If, as the Environment Agency forecasts, we have drier, warmer summer months, how long will the current supply sustain existing dwellings, let alone any major new developments?

School provision

Although there are outline proposals to build a new primary school at Adversane/North Heath, Pulborough primary school is already well over capacity with around 70 children applying for 40 places at the start of the 2010/11 school year. It should also be noted that the sole private school for under 11 year olds in Pulborough, Arundale, has just announced that it will close in a years time. There are no proposals in the new plan to provide any new facility for secondary education – and this is vital if there are plans for new large communities in the area.

Transport Issues

Rail

One of the attractions to outsiders of moving to the Pulborough area is the rail access to Gatwick and London, although this has begun to pall somewhat given the increased journey time and reduction in the number of trains stopping at Pulborough in the last 2 years.

There is a proposal to build a new station to serve the new community planned for Adversane/North Heath, though the consequence of this new station is likely to be a reduction in the number of services stopping at Pulborough, and an infrequent service

from the new station when it is constructed. It is also understood that the construction of a new station will lead to the replacement of rail services by bus services for a period of several years. This will adversely impact on the existing population, and will not encourage incomers throughout this period, thus depressing the local economy further throughout the current recession.

Road

The A29 is already under considerable stress from traffic, and no dual carriageway is available until the A24 access at Horsham. In Pulborough, there are choke points to the South of the village at Swan corner, at the traffic lights and access to Tesco's and the new medical centre, at the railway bridge to the North of the village, at the access to Sainsbury's and the new housing estate, and at the already dangerous staggered crossroads at Adversane. Major road improvement over a very large stretch of the A29 is essential for new communities to be supportable in the area, and need to be in place before such communities are constructed.

General Development Issues in Pulborough

Over the timespans of the last two structure plans for the area, more new dwellings have been constructed in the Pulborough area than were proposed in these plans. There has been major new non-residential development at Sainsbury's, Tesco's, and the new Medical Centre – all done without any significant improvements being made to the supporting infrastructure. This infrastructure now needs addressing urgently before the village can support any new developments. It is now worth reviewing and assessing by how much Pulborough has already overcommitted to developments, and hence coming to a more informed judgement of how much more development Pulborough can support in future.

The draft Local Development Framework correctly identifies that a number of brown field sites have been developed recently in Pulborough. This does not in any way provide a justification for developing green field sites and part of the conservation area, that together form a vital amenity for local residents and are of important environmental and historical interest. What it does point towards is the need to do more work to identify where existing brown field sites lie in the area, and then to encourage any new developments in these locations.

Dr Andy Tilbrook
Chairman, Save Historic Pulborough

I am writing regarding the proposed development plan at Adversane / North Heath. I wish to register my strong objection to the scheme on the following grounds.

- ◆ The development would destroy a beautiful unspoilt area of West Sussex countryside. This would be needless and it surely would make more sense to exploit the brown field sites that exist.

- ◆ The area is largely on clay and is already susceptible to flooding, any development will only increase the risk of widespread flooding
- ◆ The area is badly situated in terms of hospitals, the nearest A&E is too far away.
- ◆ The impact on the environment will be enormous. If 4,000 houses are built there will be around 8,000 new cars on the area's roads. The traffic will be too heavy for A29 not to mention the impact of traffic on the country lanes of West Chiltington, Thakeham and Storrington .
- ◆ The infrastructure to support this development is just not in place, be that water supply, reservoirs and drainage or school capacity.
- ◆ There are few jobs in the area, therefore people will have to travel long distances to work, yet another damaging impactor on the environment.

This is simply a bad idea and should be rejected at the first possible opportunity.

Christopher Smith

I right to lodge a protest in respect of the option to develop 155 hectares of land and to build approx. 4000 homes in the area described as Adversane/North Heath. I totally recognise that there is a shortage of housing across the whole of the south east and that development is going to be needed but not in my option until all opportunities to develop brown field sites, infill and redevelopment within existing urban or semi urban environments have been exhausted. Other options within the Horsham consultative process identify more closely with these objectives but overall insufficient emphasis is made of making better use of land we have designated for housing. Therefore to sacrifice green field site is potentially irresponsible and the option lacks proportionality.

Having looked specifically at this proposal it does seem to me that it has a tremendously detrimental effect on the current infrastructure within the area of proposed development and for many miles around. For example, the road system and specifically the A29 is already heavily used and east/west and north/south movements are already slow and well used. I assume that the additional car movements from such a development can only make the current difficult situation worse. These traffic movements will also adversely create additional pressure on movements through the surrounding villages whose traffic network is best described as rural and not built to withstand massive additional flows.

I have been involved with the NHS for 25 years in East & West Sussex and know well the effect of major developments. Unfortunately the nearest major A&E centres to this new development are in Worthing , Redhill or Brighton. All are accessible for speedy treatment. Our existing primary care is already overburdened and any demands would make existing long waiting times unbearable. We already have difficulty attracting GP's and NHS dentists to West Sussex, and this area specifically, why therefore compound the problems? The support for young people from midwives

and social workers is already stretched as is other family support. This development proposal will only put an additional strain on an already over burdened service.

The plans I have seen in relation to this development make no reference to employment. I accept that West Sussex has a long level of unemployment, specifically because of the "Gatwick factor" but rural employment and indeed rural housing that is accessible and affordable, is in decline. This would mean that those living in rural West Sussex are bound to commute, causing the traffic flows to increase, producing increased pollution and the disruption already referred to.

Overall I suspect this comes to a decision about priorities. Those who want to see the rural nature and mixed economy we currently enjoy, such as myself, protected vs those who believe that housing is best delivered on green field sites with the challenges to nature, the environment, the current infrastructure and habitats that already are well established. I support strongly the status quo preferring to see the option of maximising building within existing community boundaries as the primary areas where new build, etc should be concentrated. We then protect what we have, not only for us today but for future generations.

I should be grateful if my comments and objections could be recorded.

Richard Purchase

I wish to object to the plan for a 4000 homes development adjacent to Adversane/North Heath for the following reasons.

- ◆ The size of this new town is not adequate to be self-sustaining in terms of local employment and services with the result that either it's population will consist of commuters and retirees or considerable enlargement will be necessary.
- ◆ The local infrastructure is not adequate for the size of this development for example transport and access to hospitals.
- ◆ The proposed development would result in the further loss of farm land in the Sussex Weald.
- ◆ The provision of additional homes should be around existing centres of population on brown field sites so as to minimise the impact on the amenity value of open countryside in the South East.

Robin Lightwood

I am writing to lodge a protest in respect of the proposal to build 4000 new homes in the area of Adversane/North Heath.

Have all opportunities to develop Brown Field sites and redevelopment of existing urban and semi urban areas been exhausted?

I cannot imagine how a town with a population twice that of Pulborough today, with all the necessary infrastructure to support it, can be possible. This is a beautiful and tranquil area of countryside, the habitat for a wide variety of wildlife and also

agricultural land. An area of designated Public footpaths and bridleways which are vital as a means of giving many people access to the countryside.

I am also concerned that a development in this area would lead to it becoming a dormitory town due to the lack of employment prospects locally. This in turn would lead to much heavier pressure on the A29 and other smaller local roads. Increased CO2 emissions and traffic congestion would surely be detrimental to the Neighbouring villages of Pulborough, Billingshurst, West Chiltington, Thakeham and Storrington.

How could the existing infrastructure cope with the potential increased demand on doctor's surgeries, hospitals, schools and facilities for the teenage population?

I am extremely concerned about this proposal and hope that my views will be taken into consideration.

Alison Purchase

Option 8 - development at Adversane. I object to this major development on the following grounds :

- ◆ it is a greenfield site. As a matter of principle it seems to me that brownfield sites should be redeveloped in the first place as a matter of course.
- ◆ development of this scale would totally overwhelm the existing scant infrastructure of the area. Amongst other things, extra schooling placement, water and sewerage provision, health services would be required as well as the total rebuilding of the existing –and already busy - A29 road and other local roads such as the B2133 to provide for the extra traffic that such a large development would create. If it planned to build 4000 new homes over the period, that would mean at least an extra 4000 cars in the area together with all the vehicles to service the building and operation of the development.
- ◆ the negative environmental and road safety impact that such extra traffic would undoubtedly cause, particularly at a time when the effects of climate change are a real cause for concern.
- ◆ it is suggested that there would be a new railway station at Adversane. While it is admirable that thought has been given to this – all too often ignored – issue, it would mean in practice that passengers from Pulborough and stations south of Pulborough would incur extra travelling time, on what is already a slow train service. Indeed in time, it is quite possible that the current stations at Pulborough and Billingshurst might be closed to concentrate services from Adversane. If that happened extra traffic would be created to get to the single station from the Billingshurst, Pulborough, Storrington and Petworth areas.

Option 9 – Limited development in Pulborough

- ◆ I support the proposal to build an extra homes on the west side of the A29 at Stane Street, Pulborough, on the proviso that it is carried in a manner sensitive to local issues, and that there are distinct benefits to the local community. For too

many years, Pulborough has been regarded with little interest by Horsham District Council, and it is time that there was some development to allow Pulborough to grow to meet local needs, and hopefully encourage extra shopping provision. As I understand it, from the literature that HDC has put out such development would have little negative impact and there is sufficient infrastructure locally to not cause any overloading of services such as schools etc. As such it would seem an admirable part solution to achieving your overall ambitions.

J A Wright

The Proposed West Glebe Field Development Pulborough. I wish to lodge my objection to the above proposed development.

The West Glebe Field falls within a designated conservation area and as such should only be considered for development if at all, after all possible brownfield sites have been exhausted. Although the development indicates that after completion the main access to the proposed site would be via the A283 Station Road, Church Place would inevitably see an increase in traffic. It is likely that during a long construction period alternative access to the site would also be via Church Place, a narrow country lane without footpaths and totally unsuited for large vehicles or heavy machinery. This would create a long term noise nuisance and a real danger to pedestrians and local traffic particularly at the junction where the lane meets the A29.

It would be the loss of an acknowledged ancient green field site with historical attachments to its particular corner of Pulborough. Along with the destruction of wildlife habitats and many rare plants.

It would remove for many, the enjoyment of a quiet rural environment that at present exists and is associated with both the Church and its Churchyard. But also go towards the continual chipping away at what little is left of 'old' Pulborough. This is clearly of some import to the Council/Government as many of the local buildings are listed.

Peter Meer

I write to register my objection to Plan 8.

If there is indeed a requirement for more sustainable housing, I do not understand why an area of outstanding beauty, which supports a number of rare flora & fauna has been proposed as the site for 4,000 homes, when it is surrounded by existing towns and villages that could each possibly accommodate a small quantity of additional houses and be serviced by existing amenities and services without putting too much additional stress on the existing infrastructure.

There are no major employers in the immediate vicinity. Therefore any new comers to the area would be commuting daily via car or rail – thus increasing the carbon footprint. The carbon issue will inevitably increase in time if the new site is built, drawing Billingshurst and Pulborough together by further ribbon development along the A29 and infilling causing urban sprawl. Close-knit West Sussex village

communities separated by greenbelt would become an idyllic of the past in this region and the new Plan 8 settlement would be a dormitory town that sucks the retail heart out of its neighbouring villages.

Plan 8 proposes 4,000 houses plus a railway station – would the building of a station be the responsibility of the Council or a rail company? Is it economically viable to build a new station when Billingshurst is only 2 miles north of the proposed site and Pulborough just 3 miles south? Surely, commuters from the new town would travel to one or other of the existing stations. Alternatively, both existing stations may be shut and their current users would then need to travel to the new site; which would require an extremely large car park to accommodate the commuters' vehicles and obviously, this would put further pressure on the current roads and necessitate the building of further facilities:

Roads, shops, cafes, petrol stations, churches, schools, medical centre, sewerage works, water pumping station, gas, electricity, police, fire and ambulance services would need to be increased; the list goes on!

If one considers 4,000 homes will house circa 12,000 inhabitants plus another 8,000 daily commuters to the new railway station the proposed 255 hectares is probably not large enough to accommodate the resulting requirements – this then begs the question: will the rest of the 480 hectares in Adversane/North Heath be built upon to support the new project?

When you take the time to consider in depth the potential final outcome, I trust you will agree with me and my fellow objectors that Plan 8 is fundamentally flawed and unsustainable – please reject Plan 8 and allow everyone from the surrounding area to continue to enjoy this outstanding example of truly beautiful West Sussex Countryside.

Paul Curry

My name is Christopher J Page and I live at Highcroft Farmhouse, Gay Street, Pulborough, West Sussex RH20 2HJ.

I am absolutely shocked to read of your proposal to build a new town if 4000 homes in the Adversane and North Heath area. Surely you should be using all brown field sites before going on to use green field sites on the scale that this proposal entails?

I cannot imagine the scale of the infrastructure that would be needed, in addition to the 4000 houses, to support the houses and the 10,000 population that would be likely to live there, in addition to a new railway station. I just cannot believe, or accept, that there are not better options in the District.

This is a lovely part of Sussex that would be totally ruined if the proposal went ahead. It would not only ruin the actual area of the proposal but that surrounding it for miles.

Christopher J Page

We are strongly opposed to the creation of a new town at Adversane, West Sussex. It is a green field site and if this proposal went ahead it would have a hugely detrimental effect, not only on the wildlife, but also on the existing local amenities which are already under pressure. The A29 traffic is already heavy without the additional burden of a further possible 10,000 cars and the added pollution that would come with it. There are insufficient local jobs, local schools could not cope with the number of additional pupils, and the local hospitals are too far from this proposed new town. The idea of building another station, when Pulborough and Billingshurst are only 6 miles apart, seems ludicrous. Surely it would be more sensible to build on a brown field or urban site rather than destroy a site like this and cause such a negative impact on this region of Sussex?

Jeremy and Davina Instone

I am writing to you to express my objection to Option 8, the proposed new development at Adversane / North Heath.

- ◆ The area already has an overburdened infrastructure, which this will only add to.
- ◆ The proposal already recognises that there are not enough school places available, and that it would therefore be necessary to build new primary and secondary schools within the development.
- ◆ The roads in the area are already overcrowded, it being very difficult to get onto them from side roads. The A29 in particular is already very busy, with the section in Pulborough from Church Hill to the Swan Bridge a major bottleneck. This problem becomes even worse in the summer with the holiday traffic. There is no feasible way of improving this section. Providing a bypass with a new section across the brooks is hardly a realistic option considering the difficulties and expense involved.
- ◆ It is hard to imagine that Brinsbury, excellent though it may be, can offer significant employment or educational opportunities for a new development of some four thousand homes, domiciling some 16-20 thousand people.
- ◆ I feel it would benefit the local community more if planning approvals were given to small scale local developments of a few houses and applications from individuals, rather than large anonymous estates built by national companies.

J M Goodsell (Mrs)
