

**COUNCIL**  
**11 December 2023**  
**Written Responses to Questions from the Public**

<b>1</b>	<p>Why has Horsham District Council indicated in the draft LP a preference for a development in Billingshurst with a Developer who refuses to build a relationship with our community and, in our opinion, has no intension of delivering anything other than the bare minimum they are required to under planning law? All our efforts to try to meet and discuss with them have been refused and rebuffed. This is in direct contradiction of the HDLP paragraphs 10.117 and 10.118.</p> <p>The draft LP also fails to recognise the legal requirements of the Localism Act 2011 and the Levelling Up and Regeneration Act 2023, both of which put people at the heart of development decision making, and are meant to give local people significantly more influence over the issues that make a difference to their lives. This includes development. Local development should be about more than just planning law.</p> <p>There have been no community infrastructure improvements in Billingshurst over the past 15 years. Why is the District Council ignoring the views of Billingshurst residents in favour of a development that is inferior in terms of its offer for new community infrastructure and facilities? Bellway have still not built the primary school and dentist that they were supposed to have as part of their last development project in Billingshurst (564 houses). It is outrageous that Bellway are allowed to transfer this promise to the draft LP. It is not enough for a developer to give empty promises and only state intension to provide community infrastructure as is the case in the draft LP.</p> <p>Billingshurst was once a rural village with poor services and facilities. It is fast becoming a deprived urban area. A community with 10k people (and rising) expects its District Council and Councillors to seek the best deal for the community. The Bellway planning proposal is not the best deal. There are better community infrastructure and facilities being offered by the Western Development.</p>
	<p><b>Thank you for your question.</b></p> <p><b>While I note the claims that there is more support for the proposal to the West, we have received no clear evidence one way or the other. In the Regulation 18 consultation we received 11 supportive comments for the allocation of West of Billingshurst and 243 objections. The East of Billingshurst received 33 comments of support and 279 objections.</b></p> <p><b>That's the only formal evidence we have available, and it shows public opinion divided roughly 50/50. It was also apparent when myself and officers met with the Parish Council recently to discuss the Plan, that there were supporters and opponents of both options. We understand that the promoters for Land West and East of Billingshurst have both attended a Parish Council meeting.</b></p> <p><b>Furthermore, I would question whether residents understand the context of what's at stake with regard to the future growth of Billingshurst, given the widespread feeling that the village has already grown too rapidly.</b></p> <p><b>All sites tend to be opposed to least some degree. Therefore it's impossible to satisfy every demand. But that doesn't mean consultation makes no difference at all. There have been numerous improvements to the plan to reflect</b></p>

	<p><b>community concerns. You can find many of these changes in Appendix 2 of the Cabinet / Council report.</b></p> <p><b>Over the past 15 years there has been some investment, such as enhancements to the Doctors Surgery and contributions to the NHS. New playgrounds and open spaces have been delivered as well as much needed homes, including affordable homes, which help keep the village centre vibrant and viable.</b></p> <p><b>But yes, I would agree that not enough has been done historically to compensate for all the growth. We aim to fix that, both through the Local Plan process, and with other funding not dependent on development.</b></p>
2	<p>Strategic Policy 12 - Air Quality</p> <p>Additionally, referring to Air Quality. Rightly, I believe this and the resulting health issues, are key areas of concern for local residents. The plan mentions traffic as being the biggest concern and then lists a number of other contributors but fails to mention the large incinerator that is due to be built. This will be a major contributor to air and ground pollution both from the plant itself and the increased HGV movements. Is there a reason that this has not been mentioned specifically?</p> <p>Is there a reason that the soon to be built incinerator is not mentioned in the list of other contributors to air pollution?</p>
	<p><b>The response to this question is set out in the written replies to the Cabinet meeting</b></p>