

<b>CORRESPONDENT</b>	<b>Page/Policy/Proposal</b>	<b>SUMMARY</b>	<b>ACKNOWLEDGED</b>	<b>CHANGES MADE TO PLAN</b>	<b>OBSERVATIONS &amp; RECOMMENDATIONS</b>
001 Jessica Clarke	Page 25 / Policy 3	Objects to policy 3 of the Plan. Feels that to limit the level of new housing to just 50 over the Plan period is too few. Concerned about Lindfield only having an aged and affluent population. Need to think about younger people.	18.11.13	Changed	Policy 2 has been redrafted and now does not include any limits.
002 Pam Bloomer	Page 25 / Policy 3	Concerned about preserving strategic gaps.	18.11.13	Noted	Policy 1 is designed to contain development within built up areas.
003 Ken Falls	Page 31 / Policy 10	Effects of Wates development not fully recognised. Potential future roads issue within the new estate. Plan does not incorporate Traffic & Transport issues generally. Cuckfield model of producing NP is better. Objectives do not address community issues and the suggested measures are weak. Need to prioritise policies into short term, medium term, and long term. Failure to identify housing sites means Parishes will lose control of where development may take place. Risk of leaving door open for developers. Schedule of evidence does not take in work of T&T Focus Group. Proposals Map doesn't show location of Wates development. Comments on State of Parishes - there are omissions and inaccuracies. Comments on Vision and Objectives - need to be wider and more representative of the community. Not inspiring - need enhancement. Comments on Policies - need to review to address impact of Wates. Deficit of affordable homes. Built up area boundary issues. Series of general questions.	21.11.13	Changed  Changed	Proposal 2 Transport & Traffic, has been enhanced to address more of the issues highlighted by that Focus Group.  No landowner has put forward a site for affordable homes but the submission version of the plan includes a revised Policy 2 that increases from 6 to 10 the max homes in order to enable some affordable homes to be generated.
004 Geoff Heath	See 003	Supports Ken Falls's above comments.		Changed	See 003
005 David Edwards	Page 30 / Policy 8	No action plan for environmental issues. Lack of detail about delivery of infrastructure. Are the new ATCs really going to be protected? Too much uncalled for housing development threat. Agrees with some of the Plan.	Pop in (KEH)	Noted	Paragraph 2.26 relates the Bio-Diversity & Landscapes recommendations.
006 Barrie Neill	Page 30 / Policy 8	Not a Plan - a statement of policies. Brook Lane ATC issue (inclusion of newer houses).	Pop in (KEH)	Noted	All houses in Brook Lane will be included.
007 David MacMillan	Page 32 / Policy 11 & 12	What does "sustainability mean"? Community policies (thinking of alternative use of facilities) is good. Wates is not a guarantee of being free of need to accommodate more housing. Councils must merge to survive. Agrees with some of the Plan.	Pop in (KEH)	Noted	Refer to Policies 1 & 2 for housing.
008 Eleanor Brown		Mostly agrees with Plan.	Pop in (KEH)	Noted	
009 Kevin Tyson	Page 30 / Policy 8	Agrees with policy of zero development outside of the urban boundaries. Brook Lane ATC boundary point. Agrees with some of the Plan.	Pop in (KEH)	Noted	Refer to Policies 1 & 2 for housing and all houses in Brook Lane will be included.
010 Miles Mayall (1)	Page 32 / Policy 12	Assets of Community value should include Hayward's Heath Golf Club and course in LRPC.	Pop in (KEH)	Noted	List of Community Assets has been reviewed
011 L C J Brown	Page 32 / Policy 12	List of asset value should be extended. Is it only for those that might be sold or otherwise vanish. Why, KEH for example. Agrees with most of the Plan.	Pop in KEH	Noted	List of Community Assets has been reviewed
012 Mike Allen		Agrees with all of the Plan. Thanks to participants.	Pop in (KEH)	Noted	
013 Christine Irwin		Agrees with most of the Plan.		Noted	
014 Mary Allen	Page 31 / Policy 10	Would cycle route to HH station be possible. Further allotments in Lindfield Parish. Agrees with some of the Plan.	Pop in (KEH)	Noted	Cycle routes beyond our area are possible but are considered outside the scope of this plan.
015 Verity Brown		Pleased about no more development in Lindfield as has had so much recently. Is the Plan being joined up at WSCC re: PRH, schools, etc. Agrees with some of Plan.	Pop in (KEH)	Noted	Community Focus Group investigated local provision of health services etc, however such services are outside our control.
016 A J Fleming	Page 30 / Policy 8	Brook Lane ATC boundary point. Agrees with most of the Plan.	Pop in (KEH)	Noted	All houses in Brook Lane will be included.

<b>CORRESPONDENT</b>	<b>Page/Policy/Proposal</b>	<b>SUMMARY</b>	<b>ACKNOWLEDGED</b>	<b>CHANGES MADE TO PLAN</b>	<b>OBSERVATIONS &amp; RECOMMENDATIONS</b>
017 Miles Mayall (2)	Page 30 / Policy 8	Brook Lane ATC boundary point.	Pop in (KEH)	Noted	All houses in Brook Lane will be included.
018 S Shortland		Agrees with most of the Plan. Well thought through - a sensible growth plan to ensure integrity of the old Village.	Pop in (KEH)	Noted	
019 John Samuel		Agrees with most of the Plan. Birchen Lane development must be opposed - effects on infrastructure, environment and traffic. Housing cannot be divorced from facility and movement across our joint complex.	Pop in (KEH)	Noted	Birchin Lane application for new housing is mainly in Haywards Heath and was submitted to MSDC after the consultation closed.
020 Mr G Chapman		Agrees with some of the Plan. Happy in principle with cycle route, but needs detail, e.g. hedge removal, path lighting, etc.	Pop in (KEH)	Noted	Plan can not provide such details.
021 Peter Desmond		Agrees with most of Plan. Happy with consultation process and for support of the PCs in the endeavour to maintain the character of the Parishes and services. Concerned about infrastructure issues from new big developments - need to provide this in order to meet increased demand.	Pop in (KEH)	Noted	Community Focus Group identified such current infrastructure issues.
022 Robert McDowell	Page 31 / Policy 10	Concerns with Transport and Roads. Wants traffic calming measures, e.g. extra lights and crossings. Detailed traffic plan is necessary. Refers to problem of expanding Lindfield School. Problems will be exacerbated with more housing. The Plan needs to address these issues.	03.12.12	Changed	Proposal 2 Transport & Traffic, has been enhanced to address more of the issues highlighted by that Focus Group.
023 Pam Bloomfield		Concerned about land opposite Walstead Manor Cottages, Scaynes Hill Road. Strategic gap issue. Mid Sussex has done its bit for housing.	18.11.13	Noted	Policy 1 is designed to contain development within built up areas.
024 Richard & Carolyn Hawkins		Agrees with most of the Plan. What about reference to Scaynes Hill Village Plan of 2011. What is cost of Plan and who is paying for it. Why is Ricoh involved, as they are a property developer. There are marked differences between the two Parishes. Plan needs more on improving telecommunications, broadband speeds, mobile signals. What s.106 monies will the Parishes get for the Wates development. The Sloop should be included in the list of assets. Northern part of Scaynes Hill seems to have been left out. Did not receive the survey forms with Lindfield Life. Need to improve communication if want engagement.	27.11.13	Noted  Noted  Noted	Scaynes Hill Village Plan 2011 does not deal with Housing, Broadband, Cycle routes or Allotments and so was not considered as essential evidence. Both Parish Councils have reported the cost of the plan to their residents and Policy 5 is designed to encourage the extension of high speed broadband to Scaynes Hill. Distribution is difficult in parts of SH.
025 Neil Kerslake	Pages 24 & 25 / Policies 1, 2 & 3	Does not believe that in housing terms the Plan is consistent with the District Plan. Problems with including windfalls. Believes that specific sites should have been cited. Consultation is flawed because 50 homes will not be accepted through the chosen delivery methods. Too many Local Green Spaces - not compliant with the NPPF definition. Future housing needs not properly addressed. No mention of social housing. Public involvement and encouragement has been abysmal. Process is still too secretive.	02.12.13	Changed  Noted	No sites offered by landowners so we have been unable to include any, Policy 2 relating to windfalls has been amended to assist the possible provision of future affordables. 50 Focus Group volunteers abysmal and many community events held and attended ????
026 Natalya Deane	Page 25 / Policy 3	Agrees with some of the Plan. Concerned about element of Plan permitting development on land adjoining the existing built up area. Need to preserve the existing boundaries of the built up area, e.g. around Walstead. Progressive creep will erode strategic gaps.	Pop in (SH)	Changed	Policy 2 has been redrafted.
027 Sandra Grainger		Agrees with all of the Plan. Huge effort is needed to restrict all this development. Worried about Wates construction.	Pop in (SH)	Noted	
028 Welland	Page 25 / Policy 3 page 32 / Policy 12	Agrees with some of the Plan. Very supportive of intention to maintain separation with Haywards Heath. Strongly agrees with small scale housing developments. Strongly disagrees with any proposal for LRPC to acquire SH Village Centre. SH Social Club closure would enhance the Inn on the Green. Use explicit language in the Plan, not implicit language. Say what you mean!	Pop in (SH)	Changed	Community Assets list has been revised and as the ownership of SH Village Centre has now been identified, it has been removed from that list.
029 Annabel Moir		Interesting - hope it succeeds in getting public support. It should do.	Pop in (SH)	Noted	

<b>CORRESPONDENT</b>	<b>Page/Policy/Proposal</b>	<b>SUMMARY</b>	<b>ACKNOWLEDGED</b>	<b>CHANGES MADE TO PLAN</b>	<b>OBSERVATIONS &amp; RECOMMENDATIONS</b>
030 Richard Powell		Agrees with all of the Plan.	Pop in (SH)	Noted	
031 David Foster		Agrees with all of the Plan. Worried about how much notice will be taken of the Plan in practice.	Pop in (SH)	Noted	
032 Mary Sheppard (Chair of Bolney NDP)		Agrees with some of the Plan. Well explained. Very helpful displays. Some issues in common with Bolney. Challenging and well considered.	Pop in (SH)	Noted	
033 Ivan Yatnyan (lives outside Parish in Ardingly)		Agrees with some of the Plan. Food for thought.	Pop in (SH)	Noted	
034 Steve Elliott	Page 31 / Policy 10	Suggests conversion of the present footpath between Scaynes Hill and Lindfield to a cycle way. Then cyclist would have no contact with car traffic. Consider converting most of the network of footpaths to modern cycleways with lighting, etc.	09.12.13	Noted	Lindfield Rural Parish Council will consider this suggestion when progressing the cycle route.
035 Southern Water	Page 25 / Policy 3 page 29 / Policy 7	We seek recognition in Policy 3 of the need to provide a connection at the nearest point of adequate capacity; to ensure that Policy 7 does not unduly restrict the provision of utility infrastructure; an additional policy to support the provision of infrastructure.	06.12.13	Change	An amendment has been made to Policy 6 Local Green Spaces.
036 Sue Spooner	Page 32 / Policy 12  Page 35 / Policy 13 Page 25 / Policy 3	Does not believe that the Millennium Hall should be included in the "Assets of Community Value" (no.12) as already owned by the Community. Also the Infrastructure Investments Policy (no.13) talks about acquisition of the Hall. Believes desire of the community is to extend rather than acquire it. Comments on Housing Policy (no.3) in that puzzled by the restriction to 6 units. Notes that in call for sites the advert specified "up to 10". 10 in Lindfield might be problematic, but not Scaynes Hill. One proposal in Village is for 9. Why the decrease from the 10 maximum?	05.12.13	Change  Change	Community Assets list has been revised and as the ownership of SH Village Centre has now been identified, it has been removed from that list.  Policy 2 has been increased to 10.
037 Ron Skinner	Page 24 / Policy 1 Page 25 / Policy 3	Concerned about status of field to the north of the Welkin. Could be sustainable for development. Not owned by anyone in the two Parishes, so may not have been aware of the Plan. Concerned about number of homes to be provided for. DP is still under examination. What would happen if the number goes up. We should not rely on being required to "build the odd house over the next 20 years". Despite MSDC assurances, there will be mounting pressure on Lindfield. Housing policies seem inconsistent. Policy 1 takes a very positive approach, but policy 3 makes clear that the two PCs will resist proposals for anything over 6 units. What about the land at Great Walstead School. Is this one of the small sites. NP needs to address assessing future proposals, not just about resisting them. Needs a set of protocols to analyse the suitability and sustainability of any development proposals to help shape future development.	04.12.13	No Change	Great Walstead School had been consulting local residents about restoring/redeveloping their site to provide approx 35 homes, the site however is in the countryside and includes some listed buildings. It therefore fails the Policies 1 & 2 and it was thought it would be better if the school followed the normal route of submitting a planning application to MSDC.
038 Lindfield Preservation Society	Page 25 / Policy 3  Page 25 para 4.6	The statement of policy context is incorrect and unsafe. There is no evidence to support the proposed housing limits. They also include a dangerous acceptance of further green field development. The Plan contradicts itself - sets a limit of 6 homes, but hints at exception for land at Great Walstead School. Precedent would be created which would undermine any attempt to enforce a lower limit elsewhere. Affordable housing policies are vague and therefore unlikely to be enforceable. Concludes by questioning whether the Plan would be deemed sound by inspector. Developers will have no difficulty in picking the things they like and demolishing the things they don't, e.g. the policy. constraints, on the grounds they are vague, inconsistent and lacking in evidence.	05.12.13	Change	Policies 1 & 2 have been revised and the school site is not included or supported by the plan (See 037)
039 Ron Skinner (2)	Page 24 / Policy 1	Has doubts about compliance with DP especially on housing numbers. MSDC will not support the housing policy as it is too restrictive. Policy cannot be delivered. Can't simply ring fence Lindfield against future development whatever the size, and expect other neighbouring parishes to bear the brunt. Policy 1 needs explanation of how this can be done. Large scale applications will still come forward. The NP should define a set	09.12.13	Noted	See 037 (Comment sent to both Councils)

CORRESPONDENT	Page/Policy/Proposal	SUMMARY	ACKNOWLEDGED	CHANGES MADE TO PLAN	OBSERVATIONS & RECOMMENDATIONS
		of protocols and work methods to make assessments based on a number of criteria. The SHLAA Practise Guidance could be used to provide a framework for this process.			
040 Jacqui Groves	Page 25 para 4.6	Wants the Great Walstead School land included as a site within the Plan, as the proposal should be supported.	10.12.13	Noted	See 037
041 Colin Baty	Page 25 para 4.6	Wants the Great Walstead School land included as a site within the Plan, as the proposal should be supported.	10.12.13	Noted	See 037
042 David Foster	See 038	Supports comments of LPS, and is concerned by their findings.	10.12.13	Noted	See 038
043 Lindfield Preservation Society (2)	Page 31 / Policy 10  Page 32 / Policy 12	Greatly concerned that the original research and analysis compiled for inclusion in the State of the Parishes report, forwarded to AiRS was not included in the report. The recommended policies of the Landscape and Biodiversity FG was not included for discussion at the workshop. The recommended policies of the L&BFG have not been included in the pre-submission Plan. With the exception of cycle routes, none of the Transport & Traffic FG recommendations appear to have been included in the pre-submission Plan, nor have the discussions at the workshop on road furniture, retention of the current layout of the Post Office corner, walking distance to bus stops, and 20 mph speed limits. The L&BFG policies should be incorporated into the Plan. Need to beef up the policies in view of how they were exposed by the Wates application. No mention of the rural economy. Need for environmental policies. Need to try and secure infrastructure investment. Assets of Community value should include the footpaths network. Comments include a number of suggestions for improving the Plan. Also outlines some corrections.	10.12.13	Change	Paragraph 2.26 added for L&BFG recommendations and Proposal 2 enhanced to cover the T&TFG issues.
044 Claire Bridges	Page 25 para 4.6	Wants the Great Walstead School land included as a site within the Plan. Good opportunity for housing development.	11.12.13	Noted	See 037
045 John Pilkington		Plan as stands is inadequate to protect the interests of the village. It is essential to present hard evidence in support of specific proposals. The pre-submission Plan is to vague, and will not stand critical examination of a legal challenge. The work of the Focus Groups appears to have been ignored, and where they are mentioned, not backed up by detailed evidence which was presented to the consultants, and from which the Plan was supposed to have been constructed. Concludes that the Plan is unsatisfactory and needs to be rewritten.	11.12.13	Noted	Paragraph 2.26 added for L&BFG recommendations .
046 Rebecca Hogan	Page 25 para 4.6	Para. 4.6. Pleased to see recognition of the School as important local employer, and education facility, and that local community keen to see school continue to succeed. Support would be better manifested by allocating proposed development site put forward by the School. Help with long term viability of the School.	17.12.13	Noted	See 037
047 Robert McDowell (2)	Page 25 / Policy 3	No mention of housing provision for senior citizens specifically. Issue of downsizing. No local modern sheltered housing accommodation with facilities, or other upmarket complexes.	17.12.13	Change	Policy 2 (ii) proposes that developments on windfall sites should include a number of smaller homes suited to first time buyers or to older households.
048 Ian Hacke	Page 25 para 4.6	Wishes to lend support to Great Walstead School's plans to develop its facilities. Very important asset. Wants this proposal supported as part of the NP. Will allow the School to flourish for many years to come.	17.12.13	Noted	See 037
049 Carol Bacon	Page 25 para 4.6	As teacher at Great Walstead School, aware of need for redevelopment. Housing scheme will go on brownfield site, and very much supports the proposals. Would urge PCs to do so as well.	17.12.13	Noted	See 037
050 Marilyn Slater	Page 25 para 4.6	Wants the proposed redevelopment of a disused area of Great Walstead School to be included in the Plan as part of an allocated area. Fully supports the current	17.12.13	Noted	See 037

CORRESPONDENT	Page/Policy/Proposal	SUMMARY	ACKNOWLEDGED	CHANGES MADE TO PLAN	OBSERVATIONS & RECOMMENDATIONS
		proposals, and wants the PCs to do so as well.			
051 Alison White	Page 25 para 4.6	Supports the proposals for Great Walstead School, and the enhancement of its facilities. Supports the inclusion of this housing development scheme in the NP.	17.12.13	Noted	See 037
052 St. Augustine's C.E.P School, Scaynes Hill	Page 25 para 4.6	No mention is made of this School in the NP. It is a significant asset for SH. One of aims of Plan is to give communities direct power to develop a shared vision of their neighbourhood. Having the School is important for the sustainability of the community, and its presence and contribution should be recognised in the Plan. Need to amend 2.5 so that School is mentioned along with the other community amenities.	17.12.13	Noted	
053 Mrs Lynch	Page 27 / Policy 5	Concerned that NP stated housing policy will just be ignored by developers (see. already Sunte House, Birchen Grove, etc.) Does not agree with policy 5. Shops will inevitably be moving into the service sector, which the Plan should allow for. Need focus on things that cannot be done online. PCs should not take any extra pressure from Ashdown Forest Special Area of Conservation. Plan should not be obsessed with affordable housing. Will Plan help us defend our corner rather than relying on local MP.	17.12.13	Noted	The plan has to conform to the NPPF and this restricts the possibilities for Housing Policies and must respect the Ashdown Forest legislation. The Housing Needs Survey has identified local need and the plan itself provides only a small opportunity within Policy 2 for additional affordable homes.
054 Stuart Kirbell	Page 25 para 4.6 Page 25 / Policy 3 Page 29 / Policy 7 Page 30 / Policy 8 Page 32 / policy 12	Inconsistency regarding housing policy, but support for development at Great Walstead School. Not clear on whether or not supports development on greenfield sites, again using example of GWS. Already loss of separation between HH and Lindfield along north east border with HH. Does not address lack of non-sporting youth facilities. How was this dealt with if at all (see SWOT analysis). Need to define/consider what constitutes a local employer. How is the 6 or fewer houses justified. How will the Plan stop a domino effect of small scale development in the countryside, given that add ons to the built up boundary will extend the boundary. Para 4.15 is dangerous given increase in growth over the last couple of years. Statement needs to be qualified to exclude recent years or only to include small sites. Policy 7 should not the new recreation area as part of the Wates provision not be included in the list of local green spaces. Why is Dukes Road not listed as an ATC. Recommends adding Scout Hut on Eastern Road, and pavilions on Lindfield Common and Hickman's Lane to list of Assets of Community value. Plan stops short of being progressive. Does need to suggest some sites, although understands reasons why not in. Would like to see support for self build or projects for community value. Need more policies to allow farmers to strengthen their businesses.	17.12.13	Noted Change No Change	See 037 for Great Walsted School. Policies 1 & 2 have been reworded to contain development within the built up areas of Lindfield & SH while the Windfall limit has been increased to 10 in order to provide some possibilities for affordable homes, the No 10 being supported by historic statistics provided by MSDC. Policy 7 does contain the Lyoth Lane recreation area that is referred to.
055 Parker Dann on behalf of Great Walstead School	Page 25 para 4.6 Page 24 / Policy 2 Page 25 / Policy 3 Page 25 para 4.6	Comments on need to Strategic Environmental Assessment - supports PCs comments at para 1.6. Says that MSDC's blanket approach for deciding the issue is entirely inappropriate. Does not agree that a SEA needs to be done even if GWS site is included. Suggests that the PCs submit two screening requests to MSDC, one with the scheme in the Plan, and one without. Despite Wates, the NP should plan positively for the Parishes needs in the future. Suggests separation of policies on spatial planning - one for Lindfield, and one for Lindfield Rural. Development on brownfield land outside of the development boundaries should not be precluded. Policy 3 is unsound. It is far too prescriptive, and does not allow for planning applications to be treated on merit. Just 3 dwellings per hectare (on the 6 or fewer) is nonsensical. Disagrees with comments in Para 4.5. Expresses support for further development. Is pleased by comments in Para 4.6 regarding value of the School as an important local employer. This would be better manifested by an actual site allocation. Concerned by words "adhere to these policy constraints". Suggests a specific policy for GWS. Comments on MSDC's failure to meet the Duty to Co-operate. Sees this as warning that housing numbers are not adequate, and that the figure will go up. Plan needs to plan proactively for this.	17.12.13	Noted	See 037
056 Martin Higgins		Completely supports the submissions of the LPS.	17.12.13	Noted	See 038 & 043
057 Chris Owen		Refers to resource difficulties of commenting in detail on all NPs. Notes that highways	17.12.13	Change	The Plan has been amended so that Ifrastructure

CORRESPONDENT	Page/Policy/Proposal	SUMMARY	ACKNOWLEDGED	CHANGES MADE TO PLAN	OBSERVATIONS & RECOMMENDATIONS
(WSCC)	Page 31 / Policy 10	infrastructure projects, e.g. cycle route, traffic calming, will need support/decisions at CCL level, and funding. Expects Plan to be in general conformity with DP, and all other strategically held documents.			Projects that need agreement with and support from other local authorities such as WSCC are treated as Proposals to reflect those situations.
058 Mark Bristow (MSDC)	Page 25 / Policy 3  Page 27 / Policy 4  Page 35 / Policy 13	Some corrections needed - is "Submission District Plan", not "Submission Local Plan". Suggests minor additions to some of the wording. Policy 3 III is not clear. Policy 3 IV - strongly recommend deletion of this part of the policy, as do not believe is justified or enforceable. Need a policy on affordable housing in policy 3 rather than just supporting in the text. Warns about effect of the 6 threshold on s.106 contributions, though CIL may change this. Currently PCs won't get any infrastructure monies. Policy 4 - recommend removing text that indicates B1 use only and replacing with "small scale and low impact". Policy 6 - needs to be strengthened in respect of sustainable economic development. Welcomes protection of High Street shops, but does not protect other business sites, e.g. Lindfield Enterprise Park. Broadband policy needs to make specific reference to supporting the rural economy. Suggest links to DP on Rural Economy and Tourism. Supports policy on aims for infrastructure provision, but not to be taken as a prioritisation list. Clarification needed on aspects of Policy 13. CIL funds cannot be used to fund deficient existing infrastructure. On para 5.7 suggest need to delete reference to CIL draft charging schedule, as DP Inspector says that this must also be withdrawn. Also as to date reference "perhaps in 2014".	17.12.13	Change	Recommendations from MSDC have been included in the revised Plan.
059 Steve Trice HHTC		HHTC is concerned about the evidence base being used, especially the State of the Parishes report, which makes direct reference to land in Haywards Heath. Feels that the SoP report contradicts the Plan, as housing is very low, but the SoP report does show developable land albeit outside the Parish Boundary. Directs developers towards HH. Notes that Plan states that Lindfield Parish is located some 2 miles north east of the Town of HH. Gives impression there is a strategic gap. Refers to effect of Wates development. Lindfield and HH has no gap, but there is a gap between the Town and Scaynes Hill. Commends the Plan for reference to Community Assets. Would have liked an opportunity to discuss the Plan prior to publication, as they are doing. Welcomes the Plan though, and refers to good joint co-operative working that has been fostered over the last 3 years.	17.12.13	Change	Revisions to the Plan have been made as a result of these comments from HHTC.
060 Jenny and Jamie Bewick	Page 25 para 4.6	Write to register support for the proposed development at Great Walstead School.	17.12.13	Noted	See 037
061 D W Hill	Pages 24 to 27 / Policies 1,2 & 3.  Page 27 / Policy 5  Page 31 / Policy 10	Generally comprehensive and well considered. In some limited areas though, notably Housing and Business, there is a lack of realism. Housing Policy is unrealistic, and it won't make developers go for smaller new market homes, at the expense of providing more profitable homes. Naïve to think that the Wates development has done the job. Policy will not meet future requirements for affordable housing. Refers to numbers on Common Housing Register. Refers to problems of the DP. Numbers will go up, and MSDC already concluded that the most sustainable location for more houses is east of Lindfield and south of Gravelye Lane. Sensible policy to provide opportunities for small businesses within the built up area. Despite infrastructure problems, etc., sites need to be allocated for this, even if means the loss of small parcels of green field land. Also, look to extend former farm buildings and other sites on the fringes of the built up area. On policy 5, need to address parking. A policy of discouraging other uses in the High Street does not materially assist the retention of vital shops. New development, e.g. the Limes helps sustain local shops. Policy 10 - creation of dedicated cycle route from Scaynes Hill to Lindfield is misconceived, and cost would be disproportionate to the benefit. Better to have a dedicated small bus service with use of s.106 monies. Concludes that the Plan does not change apparent previous policy of non-engagement with developers, and so better to have a site led Plan, giving a number of sustainable locations.	19.12.13	Change  No Change	No sites offered by landowners so we have been unable to include any, Policy 2 relating to windfalls has been amended to assist the possible provision of future affordables.  The proposed cycle route from Scaynes Hill to Lindfield has considerable support from residents of Scaynes Hill and so is included as part of the Proposal 2 within the plan.
062 Bell Cornwell Town Planners	Page 25 / Policy 3	Claims LLNP cannot be advanced because of status of DP. Given the uncertainty over the DP's figures the Wates argument can no longer be sustained. 50 houses in the Plan period does	17.12.13	Noted	MSDC have advised that all local NPs can proceed and recently Cuckfield's passed examination.

CORRESPONDENT	Page/Policy/Proposal	SUMMARY	ACKNOWLEDGED	CHANGES MADE TO PLAN	OBSERVATIONS & RECOMMENDATIONS
on behalf of HH Golf Club		not comply with principles and objectives of the NPPF. Will not meet needs of ageing, and expanding population in terms of meeting specialist needs, e.g. extra care accommodation and retirement villages. Suggests the Parish Councils revisit their detailed response on behalf of HH Golf Club to the DP and the SHLAA process. Suggest that because of problems with the DP, the LLNP is withdrawn.			
063 Graeme De Lande Long	Page 13 para 2.25 Page 29 / Policy 6 Page 31 / Policy 10 Page 32 / Policy12	Para 2.25 - there are at least 3 Sites of Nature Conservation Interest which are not mentioned. Scaynes Hill Common, Walstead, Henfield and Nashgill Wood and Walstead cemetery. Para 3.2 error - "serving the villages of..." not "town". Policy 6 error - should be villages plural. Policy 7 - should be mentioned that the Common is a SNCI. Policy 10 - equally important to provide for a route between Scaynes Hill and Haywards Heath. Policy 12 - Village Club and Scaynes Hill CEP School should be added to the list of Assets of Community value. These are assets of significant importance to the local community. Notes correction at Annexe A evidence base - delete/amend	17.12.13	Noted	The safe cycle route being currently proposed is from Scaynes Hill to Lindfield as it would enable children to cycle to Lindfield's schools and to Oathall College on the Lindfield/Haywards Heath boundary, other cycle routes are possible. These additional possible Assets were considered not to be worthy of listing. Para 2.25 has been amended to include the only SSSI at Blackrock Lane and reference to a small number of SNCI's in the Rural area.
64 Natural England	Para 2.3 & para 2.5	reference to the Winslow Town Council website. We recognise that the Plan makes very limited firm commitments to development (notably no residential allocations) for the plan period. We welcome recognition (para 2.3) of the High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, the proximity of the Ashdown Forest designated habitats and (para 2.25) areas of Ancient and Semi-Natural Woodland (Birchen Wood) and the Scrase Valley and Chailey Common Local Nature Reserves. The links to the policies of the Submission District Plan (notably DP13, 36 and 37), which presumably (inter alia) mean the NP needs to make limited reference to ensuring that local landscape, designate and other habitats (such as BAP habitat and wildlife corridors and stepping stones) are protected and enhanced through the development of windfall sites.	28.10.14	Change Noted	
65 Environment Agency		Based on the environmental constraints within the area, we therefore have no detailed comments to make in relation to your Plan at this stage.	14.10.14	Noted	
66 Southern Water		Repeat of original response 035	6.12.13	See 035	
67 Wivelsfield Parish Council		Request for comments on the Plan was consider on 16th September - WPC will look at the Plan on the web site and any comments applicable from this parish's point of view will be forwarded to you by the closing date. No comments were received by 31st October 2014.	9.10.14		
68 Gatwick Airport Limited		The parish of Lindfield is outside of our 'physical' 15km safeguarding area. The only concerns we would have with any future proposals at this distance would be if any wind turbines were to be proposed. We would then request that the airport is notified at the earliest possible opportunity. Therefore, we have no concerns with regard to aerodrome safeguarding and the neighbourhood plan.	1.10.14	Noted	
69 West Sussex County Council		Repeat of original response 057	1.10.14	See 057	
70 SGN Design		Receipt for email requesting comments on the Plan, no further response received by 31st october 2014	18.9.14	Noted	
71 Danehill Parish Council		Receipt for email requesting comments on the Plan, no further response received by 31st october 2014	18.9.14	Noted	
72 Lewes District Council		Receipt for email requesting comments on the Plan, no further response received by 31st october 2014	18.9.14	Noted	
73 Network Rail		Receipt for email requesting comments on the Plan, no further response received by 31st october 2014	17.9.14	Noted	
74 Ansty & Staplefield Parish Council		Receipt for email requesting comments on the Plan, no further response received by 31st october 2014	17.9.14	Noted	
75 Homes & Communities Agency		The Agency does not have any asset holdings within this area and therefore our comments and involvement is limited. However, The Agency supports the principles contained within Neighbourhood Plans in relation to the creation of successful places by increasing the supply of housing and jobs and ensuring that these meet the needs of the local community and provision of a high quality sustainable community.	17.9.14	Noted	
77 Horsted Keynes Parish Council		Receipt for email requesting comments on the Plan, no further response received by 31st october 2014	17.9.14	Noted	

<b>CORRESPONDENT</b>	<b>Page/Policy/Proposal</b>	<b>SUMMARY</b>	<b>ACKNOWLEDGED</b>	<b>CHANGES MADE TO PLAN</b>	<b>OBSERVATIONS &amp; RECOMMENDATIONS</b>
78 Cuckfield Parish Council		Receipt for email requesting comments on the Plan, no further response received by 31st october 2014	17.9.14		Noted
79 East Sussex County Council		Receipt for email requesting comments on the Plan, no further response received by 31st october 2014	16.9.14		Noted
80 Horsham and Mid Sussex CCG		Receipt for email requesting comments on the Plan, no further response received by 31st october 2014	16.9.14		Noted
81 English Heritage		Receipt for email requesting comments on the Plan, no further response received by 31st october 2014	16.9.14		Noted
82 Chailey Parish Council		Just to confirm that received your email of 16th October and forwarded the NHP documents to Chailey Councillors. Chailey is at the starting stage of its own NHP and as yet I have not received any comments on the Lindfield Plan.	05.11.14		Noted