

Notes from ANP2 Presentation Session on 4 September 2018.

The Chairman informed those present of the various stages involved in the review of the Neighbourhood Plan and detailed the information that had been obtained from the various focus groups and the recommendations of the LUC street scene project that had been commissioned with monies from Arun District Council. The aforesaid project suggested the creation of shared spaces (where pedestrians and bicycles would have priority on shared areas) green spaces; play areas; possible use of the Crown Yard car park as housing/artisan/café areas; cycle paths and pedestrian path links throughout the town; signage and trails.

The Chairman opened the meeting up to questions

LUC Street scene Project

Comment/Question and Answer Session

Q. When will it happen

A. If included in the NP after it is adopted. Some of the housing projects would help pay for it and so would WSCC and ADC

Q. What will be the speed limits along the roads?

A. Chairman confirmed that 20 mph speed limit would apply from 2019 but not along Ford Road and the road to the Black Rabbit

Q. What about dog walkers ? will they have to share with cyclists which could prove a hazard.

Q. If we are in the top 10 best destinations in the country why do we need to change anything?.

Q. The proposals are designed for tourists.

A. The green spaces and footpaths are designed for residents. The shopping area does not always meet the needs of residents but these suggestions could help them enjoy the town more.

Q. The NP process and the meeting had not been well publicized.

Q. Why the Council not published a booklet describing the proposals for the NP and dropped it off to each resident in Arundel.

Q. Do not rely solely on electronic means of distributing the information.

Q. What consultation has taken place for those south of the bridge?

A. The consultation was only at an informal basis – there would be further opportunities for attendance at the formal consultation stage. Further, this process was two way – it relied upon residents being proactive and informing the Council how they wished to be consulted and to look out on the website and numerous notice boards for meetings dates and ask when the Councillors attended the Farmers Markets.

Q. Welcome engagement with children.

Q. The proposals for the Crown Yard car park were good but moving cars to a flood plain was not right.

A. As a result of this being raised at the meeting last week (30 August 2018) discussions had already taken place with the Norfolk Estate to determine whether the car park at Mill Rd could be extended.

Q. What about the two way traffic at the town quay and the bus stop and large vehicles in the event that the traffic flow is changed?

Q. Crown Yard car park is valuable asset used by residents for overnight parking – there is a constant battle to find parking so this existing car park is a valuable asset

Q. Want to discourage cars in the town centre

NP Policies and Site Assessments

The Chairman outlined the policies in the existing NP that would be saved and those that would be deleted and introduced.

As to the site assessments:

Site 1) Horses Field – excluded as protected in the NP and Local Plan as a local Green Space

Site 2) Plots below Howards Garden – excluded as less than six dwellings so considered a windfall site.

Site 3) Riding stables – concerns about losing this resource so will not be put forward in the early stages of the plan for development but we will recognise that if it stops operating it may be available at the end of the plan period.

Sites 4) (Also known as Daisey Field) and 5 (Mill House Farm) at The Causeway – Remain unchanged in terms of allocation as possible car parking either for the Lido and/or for a nursery.

Site 6) Plot at Queens Lane – smaller than 6 so not considered as part of the NP process but a windfall site.

Sites 7) and 8) Fitzalan Road – housing and car parks (car parking to compensate for possible loss of car parking in Crown Yard as a result of LUC suggestions).

Site 9) Land off A27 roundabout – LUC proposals as green space but possibility for business use.

Site 10) Possibility for development for 2 houses so not considered in the context of the NP but as a windfall site.

Site 11) Field off Ford Road – considered for 50- 150 houses with 30% affordable housing through a community land trust. Originally there were concerns about the additional traffic but access would only be from Ford Rd. Ecology and biodiversity would have to be managed but much needed affordable housing could be secured by way of CLT.

Site 12) Castle Stables – saved policy no changes.

Site 13) Blastreat – saved policy although there may have to be some amendment to the wording of the policy.

Site 14) Old Gas Works – up to 35 dwellings.

Site 15) – Industrial Units – landowners have confirmed that they are not making the land available for development but wish to continue letting it out as small light industrial units

Site 16) Crown Yard - LUC proposals with substitute car parking in Fitzalan Road (being considered because of LUC's suggestion as a site for possible housing and car parking).

Comment/Question and Answer Session

Q. There is a flood plain in Fitzalan Road – ridiculous to assume it could

accommodate housing.

A. Appropriately designed houses could overcome this constraint

Q. Why are the nurseries not located at the schools – there should not be the introduction of private nurseries – should be supporting the schools

Q. Why do we need the footbridge?

Q. The houses in Ford Rd would change the face of Arundel – there should be concern about cars being parked along Ford Road and that there would not be the necessary infrastructure to support such a scheme

Q. There will be too much pressure on schools and doctors

Q. Small scheme at Ford Road might be acceptable if it provided affordable housing

Q. Sites 7 and 8 are in the flood plain where the bottom part of residential gardens are already blighted by flooding

Q. Site 11 should be developed it does not have any of the flooding constraints etc that exist along Fitzalan Road

Q. Sewerage system cannot cope with additional development along Fitzalan Road

Q. Queens Lane – too much traffic along Queens Lane

Q. Sites 1 and 8 both known as horses fields locally why if the first is protected the second one is not?

Q. Site 11 should be given support for the element of affordable housing on the site

Q. What about the infrastructure? We cannot get doctors' appointments at the moment without waiting a long time

Q. Why not put the additional housing that we need along the line of the new proposed A 27 By pass

Q. We do not need the foot bridge
