

Date	Message
21.08.18	<p>High Street</p> <p>Good to increase pedestrian area and stop vehicle traffic crossing over at the south of monument, in front of butchers. However Vehicle traffic should be one way up the High Street, not 2-way as suggested.</p> <p>This traffic could be access-only (residents, delivery and disabled) from the left turn at the north end of the town bridge (outside Martin's shop).</p>
21.08.18	<p>Tarrant Street</p> <p>One-way for motor vehicles , two-way for cycles (as suggested by LUC).</p> <p>Access-only (residents, delivery and disabled) motor vehicle restrictions at entrance to Tarrant St.</p> <p>Wider pedestrian access required - change of road level /surface type to create pedestrian priority area from entrance off High street to Arun Street.</p>
21.08.18	<p>Ford Road (Arundel End)</p> <p>Wider Pedestrian access on Ford Road toward Arundel Town centre required for child buggy, wheelchair and cycle use.</p> <p>Pedestrian Crossing/raised surface required across Ford Road near path down to river and underpass route to town centre.</p> <p>Cycle path required to Ford Station and linking to South Coast Cycle Route</p>
21.08.18	<p>Old Gasworks site, Ford Road</p> <p>Creation of a wayfinding junction/ orientation point (providing shelter, information, tap water refill point, waste bin) for cyclists and pedestrians routes converging toward riverside and underpass. Also for nature appreciation of birds (including Nightingales), butterflies, trees, plants and river Arun wildlife. For examples, see Arundel WWT and Kingley Vale Information Shelter.</p>
27.08.18	<p>I have been a resident in Arundel for just over four years. Arundel offers a very pleasant environment due to its protected status as a conservation area, however, in my view lack of connectivity, ageing population and a lack of central focus of the town that attracts tourists and visitors will lead to a decline in visitor numbers and the vibrancy of the town. It is notable that many residents of Arundel travel by car, often even for short distances, rather than by bike or by foot. Cycle lanes along the Ford road, to Arundel station, along the existing Arundel bypass and neighbouring villages could improve the situation. There appears to be an oversupply of housing for the elderly when there is an undersupply of housing for young people, attracting young people is crucial to ensure future growth and prosperity. It also appears that there is a large supply of holiday lets, especially in the centre of town, notably smaller sized dwellings which could instead be starter homes for young couples and families. I believe a St Yves approach should be considered.</p>

22.08.18	<p>Having looked at the LUC proposals for the development of the Street Scene in Arundel, I have the following reservations:</p> <p>High Street</p> <p>The proposal to make the High Street two-way traffic all the way round past the Quay, to enable the other section of the High Street to be pedestrianised, will create many problems and concerns.</p> <p>First, the safety aspect. The stretch of the High Street , now one-way, between Motte & Bailey on the corner and down to The Swan is very narrow, particularly where the Pizza Express is, with Pegasus Estate Agency and The Bathroom Shop opposite. This would be a very narrow two-way street and would also be a nightmare and dangerous for pedestrians trying to cross it with traffic coming from both ways. It would require a pedestrian crossing to make it safe and that in turn would create traffic hold ups, which you don't get now. Not only that, Arundel has many large delivery vans and lorries coming in to the centre, along with buses too. This stretch of the High Street is just too narrow for two of the larger vehicles to pass one another and hence traffic gridlocks will be created. Just like the Ford Road.</p> <p>Second, this proposal would require the removal of several essential, much needed and much used ,by residents and visitors, short term, 1 hour, parking spaces. I cannot underline enough how important these spaces are. They are used by people who just want to go to the Post Office or newsagent or charity shop to drop something off or even to get a take away coffee or take a quick coffee and snack at a local café . They are constantly used by residents who don't live in the town and who find the walk too much or too long, especially when it's raining. They are used by people coming in from the surrounding villages. They are also used by visitors breaking their journeys on the A27 who want to pop into the town to use a toilet or for a coffee or snacks. Taking these away and leaving everyone fighting for one of the few spaces that are left, always busy too, would just deter people from coming</p>
22.08.18	<p>Crown Yard Car Park</p> <p>Third, the removal of the Crown Yard car park would also be a disaster. This is a VERY popular car park because it is in the Town Centre. It is ideal for people who have mobility and walking problems especially in bad weather. They would find the Lido car park too far out. They would find the proposed new car park in Fitzalan Road impossible, and even the one in Mill Road is quite a distance for some to deal with if they are in a space on the far side of it or the overflow. My nephew and family recently visited on a Tuesday and the Mill Road car park was full, they had to go to The Lido car park.</p>

22.08.18	<p>The Old Printworks Arcade</p> <p>Finally, I am surprised that there is no mention about dealing with the problem of enticing people into The Old Printworks Arcade. This has always had a history of people not wanting to use it for some strange reason and many businesses that have tried trading there over the years have had difficulties or units have remained empty. Surely this should have been recognised in the plans and solutions to the problem considered ? Perhaps instead of taking away the Crown Yard car park, the arcade could be the home of the artisans workshops and stalls planned for Crown Yard. That perhaps would then become more of an enticement for people to use it and by leaving the car park there, everyone would be happy.</p> <p>Whether we like it or not cars are here to stay. This Town is particularly reliant on visitors coming in, it would die without them. Therefore, we must accommodate those who need their cars to come to the town, locals and visitors. They need to be encouraged not deterred. That is a danger and no amount of aesthetic enhancement and regeneration will encourage them in if parking and easy access becomes a big problem.</p> <p>LUC claim in their proposal that they know Arundel well, with one of their team living in Worthing. I'm sorry but with the issues and problems I have outlined above regarding their plans, I believe that they perhaps don't know it, and it's needs and how it operates, as well as they think they do. I am sure that the Town can be enhanced and improved in several ways but not at the expense of losing much needed existing facilities. It's a classic case of "If It Ain't Broke....." !</p> <p>I am unable to come to the September 4th meeting regarding these plans and therefore I hope my reservations above will be considered.</p>
23.08.18	<p>Bridleways</p> <p>As a member of the Arun District Bridleways Group, could I respectfully draw your attention to the fact that you do not mention the Arundel Riding School, who have been a local business since 1960, in your 2014 Neighbourhood Plan at all. It would, I know, be greatly appreciated by them if this could be addressed in the revised Plan. The Arundel Riding School should be a valued resource both because it is a healthy outdoor leisure activity, but also because it adds to the tourist offering of Arundel. Within the Plan, there is much mention of walking and cycling, but none of horse riding, a sport entirely synonymous with the historic town of Arundel and its proximity to the South Downs National Park with its many bridleways. The Riding School and other local horse riders would, I am sure, greatly appreciate the support of the Town Council to ensure that the School and horse riding can continue to thrive into the future. This could include considering the needs of your horse riders when championing new or improved off-road routes and not just walkers and cyclists, to encourage an inclusive community atmosphere.</p>

26.08.18	<p>As I raised the question of the garage land between Canada and Pearson, I thought I should look at it a bit harder . Several issues arise :</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 The playground there is not shown on the Community Assets map. (playgrounds at Surgery and Mill rd. are shown) 2 The map shows Jarvis Rd ending at Dukes Close; with no vehicular access to ACE. This is not our direct concern, but it does show that the map can be inaccurate, which is important when we look at the garages. 3 The map shows the garages in yellow, implying they are residential. If one can look at the space and ignore the yellow, one can see how big it really is. 4 The space is actually an L, with a northern turn at the Jarvis Rd end. However, the map has put a garage across the turn , so again one has to ignore that to see the full extent of the area. 5 I can't see that we have ever discussed this area; although we have looked at many smaller ones. 6 While looking at the Assets map, I notice the Stables aren't on it. I thought we had discussed that the Stables are an asset ? Should they be formally listed ? Taking this a bit further...we have listed commercial concerns like the pub's, so shouldn't the Trout Fishery be an Asset ? <p>Happy to implement / facilitate any of the above, if I can help.</p>
28.08.18	<p>I think the amount of work that has been put into this is incredible and a great credit to the town who should be justifiably proud of your dedication. Unfortunately I cannot make the meetings but my thoughts for what they are worth on the plan are as follows: I firmly believe we should not be pressured by Arun to provide more housing than is absolutely necessary. The thought that if we provide more than ADC are calling for will put us in their good books, seems utterly crazy to me. We should fight at all costs to preserve the beauty and uniqueness of Arundel and part of that is its isolated 'feel', perched on a hill dominated by a castle. In particular I think we should be very wary about allowing urban spread and particularly, in-filling towards the proposed A27 by-pass. I personally do not think there is a UK housing crises as far as quantity is concerned, I believe a lot of this is circulated by the government in order to keep the house building industry buoyant. Recently, senior executives from several major house building firms have been selling off shares because they think the market is going to slow. I think Brexit is going to have a huge impact on the number of houses we need. My point being, I don't think we need to worry about quantity so much as quality and type. There are plenty of fill in plots that could provide lovely, well built, affordable homes for families who would like to live in Arundel and I think greatest emphasis should be put on these. The Blastreat site in particular should be one of these. I think the Mayor is doing some wonderful things with her initiatives over food waste and plastic free environments and the town plan could help her with strongly emphasising the need for green/recreational spaces - Tarrant street should be blended with car and pedestrian use, removal of street signs and one 'cobbled' surface, allowing vehicle access but predominately a safe place for people to walk and 'hang out', outside cafes and bars. I think the town quay could be made a lot more attractive and blended with Jubilee Gardens and the new space (ex toilet block) across Mill Road. Again the removal of street signs etc and one type of surface could help. More bike parking facilities etc. Bike/footpaths to Ford Station and Littlehampton along the river (and to Amberley for that matter) a definite</p>

ANP2 - Informal Consultation
Comments Received

31.08.18	<p>I was delighted to learn about the visionary and positive Streetspace proposal last night. I think it's wonderful and shall spread the word.</p> <p>I think there will always be negative voices, although I must admit I had trouble understanding what Kaye and Philip were complaining about given there is a clear proposal to increase pedestrian and cycling paths.</p> <p>I just have a couple of suggestions for the presentation next week, that might address some of the negative comments you will no doubt receive.</p> <p>1) I don't know if you might be able to replace the picture showing the high rise buildings with something more suitable for a small town audience. Poynton in Cheshire might be a good example, the scheme won an award. There must be others. I will try and find a suitable picture.</p> <p>2) A level street surface is much safer for elderly people and easier to navigate for people with children in buggies.</p> <p>3) On the point of parking on the high street in Arundel, and the proposal to install a foot bridge to link up to a car park on Fitzalan. Might it be possible to indicate the walking distance from the car park? I can't imagine it's that long from the bottom of Arun Street to the proposed car park?</p> <p>Is it appropriate to talk about finance at this point and what ADC, and perhaps other authorities, have committed to?</p> <p>In any case, well done for getting it to this point. Perhaps the consultants can come up with other successful examples for shared spaces in market towns?</p>
06.09.18	<p>I attended the second consultation meeting last night in the Town Hall - Tuesday 4th September. I thought James's presentation was excellent - he obviously had mastered his brief and gave an excellent outline of all the proposals. Of course not everyone in the room agreed with everything that is in the plan. I wish people would understand that we will never get a full consensus because the issues in the plan - like more housing - will always affect us in different ways. At least we are being given the chance to comment and the comments will be looked at and considered. And it is often the case that an issue raised at grass-root level is sometimes important and recognised by the town planners as something they had not fully understood, as one they have got wrong and one that they need to correct. So well done James we are fortunate indeed to have someone who is a good listener, understands all the issues and has the towns best interests at heart</p>

ANP2 - Informal Consultation
Comments Received

05.09.18	<p>My position in the community working in a popular public house gives me a unique and valuable insight to what the opinions of the visitors and the local residents feel about the town generally. My opinions have taken conversations with both areas of this visiting and residential community into consideration. I strongly object to the proposed development on the Crown Inn car- park as I feel that this area provides parking for visitors with mobility problems directly into the heart of the town. The public toilets provide central relief for the residents and visitors. Additional 'artisan' space, I feel, is not needed or wanted by the residents and central parking for commuters that allows free overnight off-road parking is highly needed within the town. The need for free toilets in the town is regularly discussed. The toilets at the Museum are often busy with queues extending to over ten people when coaches arrive. During the festival, doors were propped open for free use by the users of this facility as the coin receipts on the door were filled. These toilets have been a heated point of discussion for many years and something must be done to provide relief for the community. Public houses and other businesses are increasing taking the weight of the 'toilet visitors' and it's becoming a sore point for both the businesses and the visitors being that toilet paper isn't free :-). I appreciate that there was an arrangement with the council when the museum was built, but this historic arrangement must be revisited. The proposed 'shared space' pedestrian/driving plans for the high street don't make any sense to me. I'd like a detailed explanation of the plans for traffic on the sharp corner. The buses rest on the Town Quay reducing road space and I highly doubt two articulated lorries facing each other with a parked bus on the Quay would manoeuvre efficiently and safely. James argued that the end of Maltravers street 'worked' at the roundabout end, but I would like to point out that the residents disagree pointing out that the parking causes obstructions and is dangerous and also needs to be addressed. I'm also concerned about the additional concentrated flow of traffic so close to the riverside and the consequences of this.</p> <p>Pedestrianising the High street would allow the farmer's market to be more condensed</p>
04.09.18	<p>Before any houses are considered around the fitzalan rd area , the issue of parking needs to be sorted. Keep building houses where are all the parking facility's. it's bad enough when festival etc is on . So needs a lot more thought. Also the blast treat site should be affordable housing for the young not more oap places</p>
01.09.18	<p>In my former capacity as tour guide for Arundel Museum i came to realize that few,if any visitors to the town had any idea that it was once a busy port and also a ship building town.....I feel more could be done to remind folk of its heritage by way of information points perhaps along River Rd or in the public gardens.</p>
09.09.18	<p>I cannot see the need for a "new" centre (16).The present centre (around the war memorial) works perfectly well.Closing one side of the lower High Street to vehicles will not work-it will simply cause more congestion on the other side. I oppose any further development in Fitzalan Road. (7 &8) .It is a narrow congested Road with traffic &parking problems plus inadequate drainage.I am against using open country for a car park or housing development.Also a footbridge serves no useful purpose when there are already 2 bridges. The attraction of this historic Town is enhanced by the surrounding countryside.Let us hope the open spaces can be spared from 'the search for new housing space.'</p>

ANP2 - Informal Consultation
Comments Received

08.09.18	<p>I've been to the meetings... I've seen the plans... And all I can say is wow! What a great idea. We moved from Arundel from Brighton 2 years ago where we have seen first hand what 'pedestrianised' (yes I know it's shared space!) areas can do for a community and businesses. They are, put simply, wonderful. They create spaces where communities can gather, increase local trade and look sharp! Ok so I think you know my options on the fitzalan proposal where the horse field is so I won't get too much detail here. Suffice to say they are not welcome... At all... (I can explain in detail if you want, just drop me a line). Oh and the car park, I'm pleased you liked my idea of the overflow. Anyhow, keep up the good work. Arundel needs forward thinking to bring in more peeps. Oh and I really think you should spend more money on the Mill road play park, not the Canada Rd one. Both parks need work I agree, but by making Mill road park your priority you will bring more families into Arundel for days out who will spend more money, and by proxy they might just move here! All the best!</p>
06.09.18	<p>Thanks for this – personally I think there is scope for new housing and parking along Fitzalan road but I understand that there is a great deal of opposition to this part of the plan.</p> <p>Congratulations on pulling all this together, it's a huge amount of work and you deserve huge credit. I guess a lot of the plan depends on the outcome of the A27 route!!</p>
12.09.18	<p>Firstly, "thankyou" to James Stewart for all his hard work, and for his presentation to the town at the Town Hall. I was disappointed so much of the response focused on the negative, and felt that James handled it very well. We are lucky in the town to have such a committed councillor. Re: the plans, I will list my feed back for ease by numbers: 1) I really like the idea of restricting vehicles, and am enthusiastic about the shared space idea. 2) Similarly, the town use of Crown Yard, rather than it being a car park also represents an exciting prospect. 3) Obviously another car park space would have to be found. The Fitzallen Road suggestion may not be appropriate for reasons of flooding and sewage...? So, perhaps another needs thinking about? 4) As with the above car park idea, the housing suggestion in Fitzallen Road may not be a good idea? But...we do need housing for first time buyers, and, as Sue Simpson said, we must take some new housing. Of the suggested possibilities, the best sites would seem to be : the iron works on Fitzallen Road, the former gas site on Ford Road (providing that off site parking is provided) and for a LOW NUMBER of houses next to the allotment to the south of the town. 5) A very strong plea for a cycle path to Ford Station and to the town from the South please? How can we be Green town wanting to decrease traffic, if we do not encourage local cycling? I hope you find this useful. Thanking you.</p>

13.09.18	<p>Overall I am very positive about the update of the Neighbourhood Plan. The LUC Streetscape Project seems along the right lines and the proposals for Crown Yard look good. I noticed a reference in one of James Stewart's slides about the 'threat of private vehicles' that I think is really fundamental: the vision for sustainable transport is absolutely central to the quality of life for residents and the success of the business/visitor proposals. The debates about car parking need to be set in this wider context. The concept of the new bridge is the sort of radical thinking that is needed to give Arundel the vibrant future envisaged in the Neighbourhood Plan's aspirations: let's hope a way can be found to proceed with the development of the housing and other sites to generate the funds to proceed. I am delighted to be part of a community so supportive of increasing the amount of affordable housing: the more social rent housing can be incorporated into the proposals, the better. The proposals for site 11 are important as it seems there is scope to agree terms with the landowner to safeguard design and other standards rather than rely on commercial models which in the current market will not deliver solutions in line with the aspirations of the Neighbourhood Plan. I really hope the sites on Fitzalan Road can progress too, overcoming local objections, flood risk and so on, and facilitating the new bridge access. I'm also concerned progress can be achieved to upgrade and sustain the Victoria Institute. . The concept of the new bridge is the sort of radical thinking that is needed to give Arundel the vibrant future envisaged in the Neighbourhood Plan's aspirations: let's hope a way can be found to proceed with the development of the housing and other sites to generate the funds to proceed. I am delighted to be part of a community so supportive of increasing the amount of affordable housing: the more social rent housing can be incorporated into the proposals, the better. The proposals for site 11 are important as it seems there is scope to agree terms with the landowner to safeguard design and other standards rather than rely on commercial models which in the current market will not deliver solutions in line with the aspirations of the Neighbourhood Plan. I really hope the</p>
----------	---

ANP2 - Informal Consultation
Comments Received

16.09.18	<p>I am generally in favour of the "Shared Space" plans for the Town Centre. HOWEVER, I am totally opposed to the proposal for two-way traffic around Bank House. The road becomes far too narrow for two-way traffic and the mini-roundabout at the Bridge would become even more of a nightmare. I am personally in favour of the plans for Crown Yard, but I think it is vitally important that you consult all Town Centre traders about this (and not just 2/3 Members of the Chamber of Commerce). I know that several traders have very serious concerns about the loss of car parking in the centre of the Town. I am TOTALLY OPPOSED to the idea of putting garish Route Markers all over our historic Town. Turning to Housing Development: 1) The Town's infrastructure must be seriously considered before building large numbers of new houses. We currently have shortages of both Children's Nursery and School places. We also have an overloaded GP Surgery and Pharmacist. 2) If the Mill Road Car Park is to be drained for all-year-round use, there is no need for Car Parks to be built on the flood plain in Fitzalan Road - and, consequently, there is no need for a footbridge across the river (which would, in any event, spoil the views from the Town Bridge). 3) I am TOTALLY OPPOSED to the idea that more houses should be built on the flood plain in Fitzalan Road. The displacement of surface water in that area could only serve to increase existing problems with flooding and sewage disposal. This idea would also displace the horses from the Riding Stables and, of course, cause much distress to the many people who bought their houses because of the views they enjoy across open fields. 4) The preferable place for house building would be the field off Ford Road, running along to Priory Lane. This would inconvenience the few people who have views across that field, but would be much more appropriate than most other sites. However, 150 houses would be far too many and I would suggest that 80 - 100 would be more acceptable. On the green areas, I have few views, but I think that the practicability of changing the layout of the Ford Road is highly questionable. Finally, I feel that all "saved" policies should be included in ANP2 (rather than relegated to an Appendix). The new Neighbourhood Plan will comprise BOTH the new</p>
18.09.18	<p>Pedestrian access needs improving. Suggested that a short footpath be made between Canada Rd. and the corner of patients' car park. This would avoid long way round from down the hill to get to the surgery via the vehicle entrance which can dangerous from traffic speeding round the blind corner.</p>
18.09.18	<p>Saw this article and wondered if we should be more radical in Arundel? 'For me, this is paradise': life in the Spanish city that banned cars https://www.theguardian.com/cities/2018/sep/18/paradise-life-spanish-city-banned-cars-pontevedra?CMP=Share_iOSApp_Other Currently holidaying on Ile de Re where the main method for getting around after you have arrived is cycling.</p>
23.09.18	<p>Development of land in Fitzalan Road Message I write to register our strong objection to any development of this site. This is a major flood risk and the land provides a valuable addition to the flood plain and is critical for Fitzalan area to remain unfolded</p>
22.09.18	<p>I have been following the ongoing discussion & speculation on local Facebook pages regarding proposed development of the horse field on the bottom end of Fitzalan Rd. It would be a travesty to build houses on this site. I wonder what the impact would be on the flood plane as this field floods on a regular basis. The adjoining street is already bottle necked with traffic. I would urge any plans to develop this field to be abandoned Many thanks for your consideration</p>

ANP2 - Informal Consultation
Comments Received

23.09.18	Re site 8 - Building houses on this horse field would be massively impactful upon the flood plane putting the local community at risk. Thank you
23.09.18	<p>To start with I would like to voice my disappointment at the lateness of being made aware of Fitzalan road horse field being site 8 on your proposal for sites for additional housing .It was implied that we had been informed in February of this proposal - we had not.</p> <p>I along with my family will be strongly opposing the development of site 8 on Fitzalan Road.</p> <p>We live at in Fitzalan Road so have the emotive reason for not wanting building on this site . We wake up to green space and horses in the field every morning giving us a sense of space, calm and happiness and this was the main reason for the purchase of the property. Arundel was chosen as it is a small town and not built up like most other towns in the area.</p> <p>Less emotively we all oppose the development of this site as it is a greenbelt site there is no previous structure on this land . The government policy on planning concluded “the restrictions on the location of housing on the greenbelt are in place to prevent gradual erosion of the greenbelt boundaries overtime and to maintain openness” this is used to prevent urban sprawl , this is a problem we can already see spreading up the river from Littlehampton.</p> <p>When I have not got the beauty of the horses in the field I have the pleasure of many of the residents of the wetlands trust living on the pond that the field becomes with any heavy rainfall , this is usually for many months every winter. The field acts as sponge to take up extra water which allows our terrace some protection from flooding from the river . If you build on this site this water has to go somewhere and we are more likely to flood and have problems . There are already some houses further down the street that are unable to use their gardens as they are water logged. It is unfair of the council to put this extra pressure on us . We already find it harder to get insurance for our properties. On the same subject this area is flood zone 3 there should be a sequential test . As there are other planning application in better areas these should be considered preferentially to the site at Fitzalan</p>
24.09.18	<p>My objection is to ANP8 Land of Fitzalan Road Have the council examined the cost of creating a no flooding area on the proposed site as it is the only part of Fitzalan Road that when there is heavy rain it gets flooded. Should this proposal goes through and flooding does occur will this not increase the cost of home insurance for all residents of Fitzalan Road My main concern is parking most homes have two vehicles so is the proposed site going to have sufficient parking for 40 vehicles if not where does the council think that the extra vehicles will be able to park because as it is now parking especially at weekends is very difficult. Another big problem which will happen is access on to the A27 as it is at the moment if driving from Fitzalan Road eastwards it can take over 10 minutes to gain access on the A27 with the extra traffic this will take a lot longer unless the council are proposing that drivers should drive via Fitzalan Road /Queens Lane then get access an accident waiting to happen. Have the council examined a covenant that I believe exists that if there is a building on the proposed site that can be seen from the cathedral then it cannot be built. The nice thing about living in Fitzalan Road is having the field which is ANP8</p>

ANP2 - Informal Consultation
Comments Received

24.09.18	<p>I find this website very confusing - it is almost guilty of too much information! This is a public forum and too much jargon is being used that is difficult to understand. It needs a 'user friendly summary - perhaps with links to more detail. But to actually comprehend what is happening an immense amount of time clicking from page to page does little more than confuse! Having said the above I would like to comment on a couple of points; 1. I understand the requirement for more homes- particularly for younger people - and believe the proposal for a development of between 50 and 150 houses west of Tortington to be the most sensible solution. This would be the least disruptive to most people and allow sensitive planning to be adopted. 2. I do NOT support the idea for changing crown yard carpark into business/commercial/creative space with the idea of building a new carpark in Fitzalan Road with a foot bridge into to town - this is a ridiculous waste of money and very much 'pave paradise and put up a parking lot'!. IF these facilities are need why not build them on Fitzalan Road instead? The Crown yard carpark is very much needed in particular for older visitors/residents who cannot walk very far. It is also vital for evening visitors and workers who do not want to walk far late at night.</p>
25.09.18	<p>These proposals for development in Fitzalan road are totally unacceptable on the grounds of building on unsuitable floodplain land and serious drainage issues we have already. The impact on local residents will be affected with increased noise and pollution and parking issues. Caroline Moore</p>
25.09.18	<p>I strongly object to the proposed sites developments in Fitzalan road 6,7,8,9,13,15. How can it even be considered to build houses and a car park on green belt and floodplain land. The fields in Fitzalan road resemble lakes throughout the winter even with the local farmer keeping the ditches clear it would still be a major problem even worse with a car park hard standing and house developments. Serious drainage / foul issues are already here and would only be exasperated. Increased pollutions noise light and vehicle emissions would be to the detriment of residents. These developments would impact for residents trying to park their cars at their property as people would try to park for free first and higher volumes of footfall in the area , unsafe for pedestrians in area with no footway and blind bend ,risk factors. Any notion of a new footbridge is ridiculous , we already have one. This would be totally out of keeping and would blight the area.</p>

25.09.18	<p>The residents of Fitzalan Road were surprised to hear of the building proposal for the horses field (site 8) opposite Dalton's Place. This is especially because of the lack of communication, making it appear a rather sneaky approach. Not one of our residents received this supposed leaflet and many residents do not have a computer making these proposals extremely difficult to access. It almost seemed as if the council wanted it to be kept quiet, so it could be a fait accompli.</p> <p>The present beautiful vista to and from Arundel will be ruined if this proposal goes ahead. There is already a covenant in place protecting the view from top of Kings Street. And the stunning panorama from Crossbush hill across the brooks, is currently a row of pretty Victorian cottages, which will become a suburban stretch of new rooftops. The same sprawling metropolis as any other newly developed town.</p> <p>We need to take into consideration that any development on our precious flood plains will be the death of the green lungs of Arundel, which cocoon our town. Once development begins on the green belt south of the town, there will nothing to protect the fields between us and Littlehampton. The building developments in Lyminster and Wick are already fast encroaching towards the A27.</p> <p>This band of flood plain either side of the river Arun, is the last remaining green corridor between Brighton and Portsmouth.</p> <p>We also have a duty of care to our environment. The flood plains are how the land around Arundel manages the base flood water of the river Arun, without increasing the surface water elevation more than one foot. This particular field (site 8) is often deep under water in the spring and after heavy rainfall. The presence and extent of wetlands, provides great richness and diversity of wildlife and gives depth to the level of groundwater.</p> <p>The delta plains tend to be very flat, which is always attractive to developers. And although it is possible to build on these areas with piling and attenuation ponds, the increased run-off from the roads and structures would be channelled through our already poor drainage</p>
----------	--

ANP2 - Informal Consultation
Comments Received

25.09.18	<p>I write to formally object to the suggestion that Fitzalan Road could be a potential site for new housing or a car park. Quite frankly, the suggestion is absolutely absurd – the field at the bottom of Fitzalan acts as a flood plain as this is blatantly obvious to anyone that knows the road; building on this spot of land would cause greater risk of flooding elsewhere and put Fitzalan houses at risk (being so close to the river). Furthermore, a housing development or car park is a negative move for homeowners in the road; it will devalue the market value of houses significantly, especially those houses that look out over the field or live next to it. Parking is already an issue on the road and the suggestion of a car park (presumably pay & display) or additional housing will undoubtedly reduce the available space for current residents (not acceptable) + as we already know there are many, many visitors that choose to park along the streets to avoid paying.....look at the road during the Festival.....this will get worse because you'd draw visitors to this area of Arundel and they'd attempt to park on the road instead of paying.</p> <p>Whilst I am broadly opposed to any developments in Arundel (because the infrastructure will not be expanded accordingly.....it never is e.g. doctors surgery where you often have to wait ages for an appointment), if there has to be a development it would be better positioned on higher ground as this would have a lesser impact on water levels and it makes sense to opt for a spacious greenfield site that expands the town from the peripherynot shoehorn a development into an already populated area.</p> <p>I understand the drive to build more houses (as a nation), though it has to be said that the South East is already heavily populated and there are many places in the country that could accommodate more housing + would welcome it. However, the suggestion that a historic and beautiful town such as Arundel should have more houses rammed in will totally ruin the town – as a long-term resident on Fitzalan Road and a lengthy family history in Arundel, I will not accept any proposal to develop on Fitzalan Road. I would also like to point out that as our Council you are supposed to protect our interests and this should include</p>
25.09.18	<p>I wish to oppose the plans to build a new parking lot houses on the horse field as I feel it will increase the risk is flooding and we are already struggling with keeping business open so why do we need more shops on crown yard Carpark. If we are to have more houses built I feel these should be on the area labelled 10 on the neighbourhood plan as I feel this would cause the least disruption and have less impact on flooding.</p>
25.09.18	<p>I would like to oppose the plans to build on the horse field in Fitzalan road as I feel it will cause increased risk of flooding and extra parking traffic problems.</p>

ANP2 - Informal Consultation
Comments Received

25.09.18	<p>Green space policies. For cities, vast housing estates and unimaginative building programs yes, green spaces are essential but we live in a town where no house is further than a couple of a hundred metres from country. We are on the edge of the South Downs and its National Park. We have the Arun Valley in all its splendor and the luxury of the Sea not five minutes away. Why do we want to spend precious resources, and artificially bring the country any closer. Some people can't handle the seagulls and pigeons that enter the towns airspace without getting all in a flap! It's perfectly fine as it is. The town has evolved to its present shape and size through its long history and it appears to have a happy balance of residents. It's a happy town! In addition to this, it appears to be drawing a good number of visitors. Maybe, more than it can cope with, judging by the urge to build more car parks every year. Why do we keep focusing so much on luring more visitors? They come regardless of 'shared space'. They come for the castle, the cathedral, the lake, the roaming about from antique shops to ice cream parlours and the town in general. They don't come for the burger bars, they can get those anywhere. They come for a change of environment. They aren't coming to see the 'Development of Arundel', that's the last thing they want to see! We certainly don't need a new roads layout scheme. If it's to stop pedestrians getting knocked down, well I'm sorry but I can't remember the last time there was a major accident. More likely hood of a accident with a tight two way system being introduced. If it's to have more market stores in the square on regular weekdays, then I say look at Chichester and how the rate paying, permanent shops are doing with market stalls pitched up in front of them all. They are lost, hidden and forgotten behind the canvases. And in the winter lets remember how bleak and empty the shopping precincts, sorry- 'shared space', look. They are a great place to gather when your drunk and don't want to keep stepping out of the way of cars. The area shown as an example of the 'shared space' in Brighton, I have visited twice this year and both times it was lit by the flashing lights of the police cars as the police tried to subdue party revellers. The only other people who will benefit from the</p>
25.09.18	<p>Think any plans to take away car parking in the town will adversely affect the parking for residents...</p>
26.09.18	<p>I am writing with concern over the the proposed building plans for fitzalan rd. I feel the facilities are not right as drainage,parking and access in and out .i do appreciate that arundel needs more housing but the ford rd proposal if the by pass goes ahead would be the most suitable. I feel where ever they go they need to put in the infalstructure to go with it</p>

26.09.18	<p>Overall, the consultants seem to be more concerned with gilding the lily of Arundel as a tourist town than making life easier for residents. Paving over part of the High Street by the War Memorial and devoting the other side to two-way traffic is both daft and dangerous. Filling in Crown Yard will deprive the town of much needed central parking. Frailer residents who live south of the river or on the outskirts may need to visit the dentist, the osteopath or the chiropodist or have heavy items or animals to carry to the Post Office, Dry Cleaners or Vet. The nearby free parking spaces aren't always available. Too many are taken up in Mill Road by large long-stay vehicles. Could that not be tackled? The plans for housing and car parks in both parts of Fitzalan Road are, of course, anathema to those of us who live there. I gather the fact that the fields are lakes after heavy rain is being disregarded (isn't that against Government policy?) but unless the new home owners and their cars fly up into their new residences, there will have to be a measure of hard landscaping - and the displaced water will have to go somewhere - probably into our gardens and living rooms. Anyway, the idea that houses on stilts, which may look charming amongst the flat fields and dykes of the Netherlands, are a good idea on the edge of a small historic English country town is architectural vandalism. The South Downs National Park Authorities are querying the by-pass - will it actually happen, especially as Carillon, who would have quoted cheaply, went bust. If it doesn't, a major increase in the number of cars attempting the already very difficult access onto the A27 from Fitzalan Road will be even more of a traffic hazard. There seems to be a presumption that the Riding Stables - whose horses use the upper Fitzalan Field - will be disappearing in the near future. Is this a given - or simply a grab for the land to make money out of housing? If so, the very good work done by Riding For the Disabled will be lost, much to the detriment of those less fortunate. The parents of riders spend money in the town while their children master their steeds.</p>
26.09.18	<p>We appreciate the need for new houses in Arundel, particularly for the young and families. In respect of site 7 it is unclear whether the plan allows for housing or a car park or a combination. We support the development of this land for housing as long as there is consideration to the flood risks and to the character of the area (i.e. nothing like the proposed Renaissance development on Fitzalan Road). We do not support the area to be used as a car park due to the difficulty of access via Queens Lane, speeding cars (which is already a problem) and dangers in crossing the road. It is also a concern from a flooding point of view and increasing the risk of flooding to existing properties. In respect of site 15 it is unclear whether the plan allows for housing and/or access to a proposed foot bridge. We support the development of this area for housing with the same considerations as above. However we do question the need for another bridge across the river as the two existing bridges are not that far apart and seem sufficient for a town of this size. We appreciate the work that has gone into developing the plan and appreciate being able to provide feedback.</p>

26.09.18	<p>I'm writing with feedback as both a resident and a business owner in the town, regarding Draft Policy AR4 of the Arundel Neighbourhood Plan and the ideas that have been put forward for redesigning the town centre from the LUC Streetscene Project. Firstly having tried to navigate the ANP website, it is not that clear whether the full LUC proposals are formally part of the AR4 policy, however assuming they are I would then give the following feedback on some specific points-</p> <p>2.Re-designate Crown Yard as a connective public realm space for artisan units, performance space, possible housing & green space.</p> <p>This seems like real blue skies thinking, which is great, but I would assume not ready for inclusion in a ANP at this stage. The loss of a central town car park would also be a huge issue (most consumers want to park as near to where they shop as possible, hence the popularity of out of town supermarkets and retail centres). . I worry that this would simply be a scheme for Arun DC to make money by selling off a large plot of land for residential development and for more retail/café development which is not actually needed in town (and I doubt the development in and off itself would attract enough extra footfall to make it economically viable anyway).</p> <p>3.Build a new foot/cycle bridge across the River Arun, from Fitzalan Road to the bottom of Arun St. This will link a new car parking area to the town centre and create a circular walking route around the town.</p> <p>Again some great blue skies thinking, but moving a car park even further away from the town centre doesn't seem practical on many levels and would probably be exorbitantly expensive to build.</p> <p>4.Take into account existing proposals (A27 improvements, 20mph zones, cycle path along River Arun to Littlehampton, etc).</p> <p>Cycle path along river to LA and Ford – great ideas and good for local tourist economy and public health</p>
26.09.18	<p>I wanted to voice my serious concerns regarding the proposed development of the field next to the current bypass bridge at the southern end of Fitzalan Road. It seems incredible that that area is even being considered for development as anyone who lives or visits anyone who lives down that road knows how impossible it is to find a car parking space after 6pm. Even if the new houses come with their own parking area there are never enough places provided for the modern family. The most serious argument would be regarding the level of the water table in that area, it is very prone to flooding following heavy rain, as are all the gardens down that road. Surely any more development will only exacerbate that problem. I very much hope that the powers that be will reconsider this being a viable plot as it certainly is nothing of the sort.</p>

ANP2 - Informal Consultation
Comments Received

23.09.18	<p>1) Keep Crown Yard Car Park as it is. 2) Do not change the car or pedestrian areas in the town. Trees would not thrive in Tarrant Street! 3) A pedestrian/cycling bridge would be a expensive WHITE ELEPHANT. 4) Building houses and a public car park on site 7 would cause further flooding and drainage problems on an already designated agricultural flood plain. Insurance would be extremely difficult and expensive. Fitzalan Road is a narrow Road and already has severe problems, access would cause further problems. Views approaching Arundel would be adversely affected. 5) Building houses and a public car park on site 8 would cause the same problems as on site 7. 6) Houses on site 11 and 12 would be good. 7) A car park on site 2 would be good. 8) A further car park could be made on the field behind the car park fields off Mill Road . 9) Transport is needed for older residents to GP, Hospital, etc, plus social events. 10) Better publishing of events, news, what's happening. Not everyone is online. The whole of Arundel was supposedly leafleted re ANP2, well it definitely wasn't.</p>
26.09.18	<p>Having just been informed of the Arundel Town Council proposed sites for its Neighbourhood plan/ 2018-2019 and been given information by one of my neighbours of these plans, with the notice that the closing date for objections, comments would be the 30th September, I wish to know why these plans were discussed by the council earlier in the year and yet nobody knew anything about this until about two weeks ago and why weren't the residents informed by post of what could have such an effect on our lives? I attended a get together of local residents at the Arundel Lido on Tuesday who may be affected by these assessments and I wish to make some comments regarding how they were derived in the first place.</p> <p>Taking site one for example as a local green space with the area surrounding it(Stewards Copse) all a green space, is a little illogical.</p> <p>Site 2 which is available and where a few houses could be built, then why not?</p> <p>Site3 I can understand because it is working riding facility.</p> <p>Site4 and Site 5 because of ANP1 Policy 9 is anyone's guess because you cannot find this even though I spent hours trying to!</p> <p>Site6 and again would help the council towards the number of houses that are required to be built.</p>

26.09.18	<p>Sites 7 & 8, under statutory law and because of the flooding these sites undergo each year, these sites were already rejected when their plans for a new Surgery to be built back in the 90's. Access is not good and the increase risk of flooding to neighbouring households would be increased as well as the historical view when coming from Crossbush would be affected.</p> <p>Site 9 when finally the new bypass is approved would create a wonderful green space.</p> <p>Site 10 same reason as for sites 1 & 6!</p> <p>Site 11, the logical site for more housing, would be safe from flooding and would have good access and could accommodate up to 150 houses.</p> <p>Site 12 and as part of the Dukes estate I can understand why this site was not considered.</p> <p>Site 13, we have sufficient sheltered housing in Arundel and if the revised planning application is rejected, the best place for some cheaper housing for the young with retention of the old brewery and artisan workshops?</p> <p>Site 14 and a similar reason as for site 9.</p> <p>Site 15 The industrial units would again be a consideration once the former tenants were willing to move to another industrial site out of the town.</p> <p>Site 16 The Crown Yard is vital for people who work and visit Arundel and because of the mainly older generation that visit out town. They are not as mobile and it provides an important public toilet service.</p> <p>The plans of putting new parking in Fitzalan Rd with a connecting bridge across the Arun begs belief. It would ruin the landscape of the town and having the High Street pedestrianized would again affect not only the business community in Arundel but also locals who use the parking spaces to do their local shopping, Pallants, the Butchers, Drycleaners, Bakery, Bookshop, pop in for a cup of refreshment and the effects this would have on our surrounding streets for deliveries etc. and closed all year just, for a few days of celebration when the street is closed down anyway.</p>
----------	--

ANP2 - Informal Consultation
Comments Received

27.09.18	<p>We live in Fitzalan Road opposite the horse field. Have done for 27 years. It's a beautiful place to live. The river behind, the field with horses and wildlife to the front. Of course that is why everyone bought their houses along here. So although one can say "you can't buy a view", when it comes to the nitty gritty of potential development, lets be honest, that's probably one of the the main reasons people get upset. But it's not the only one. The road, lovely as it is, is not without its issues. Waste water we hear is a problem. Parking is difficult and getting more so. More houses and hence more vehicles will only add to that. Houses will no doubt have their own garage/ parking space, but that still impacts hugely on parking spaces. The gaps still have to be left for cars to drive into their own driveways. The field, of course, floods badly. We all know that. It was one of the reasons it wasn't built on before. But we also have had problems with flooding on the other side of the street. Not from the river. Up through the gardens. It happens to several gardens every year. We were flooded badly twice. Water came up through the ground halfway down the garden and flooded the summer house at the end. I don't just mean our feet got wet. It was up to our knees. Photos attached. The flooding caused a lot of damage and we had to fight our insurance company for compensation. We were lucky it went down the garden towards the summer house at the end and not the house itself. So...filling the field that floods anyway, with houses, will surely only exacerbate the problem. Worrying for existing residents, catastrophic for new houses.</p> <p>The site can be seen from London Road which surely contravenes the Policies Map. (attached) We have concerns about water and waste. The field itself is a haven for wildlife. We've even watched bats flying around at night over there. Any extra housing and residents, of course adds pressure to an already exhausted doctors surgery, schools, that goes without saying. We also have concerns about all the houses bought up by companies that turn them into Air BnB's. Lets hope all the new affordable homes don't go the same way. Our thoughts would be site 11 makes more sense. On the outskirts of town. By a main</p>
----------	---

27.09.18

I have previously mentioned I wholeheartedly support the proposed town pedestrianisation and turning the existing crown yard car park into an 'artisan' Qt. It's such a great plan for our town! I moved from Brighton and have seen first hand how this increases trade to a community not decreases it due to a few parking spaces being removed.

I don't think I went into detail about housing on my last comments.... So please read on!

- Both Fitzalan sites (7 & 8) raise many concerns to me.

1. They are on a lowland coastal and flood plain grazing marsh and as such are priority habitat. Building on a flood plain for many reasons, when there are other options available, is simply a bad idea (let me know if you want me to go into these, but I'm sure others will voice these adequately)

2. The parking is currently dangerous for existing residents (windmill side of bypass).

Emergency services have had issues in the past reaching houses at the end of the street due to being blocked in. More houses, even with some sort of car park, will make this worse.

3. The services, specifically drainage, are beyond inadequate. Routinely gardens and fields on this street flood.

4. One of the sites is a horses field, I note other housing options have been dropped due to being 'horses fields'. This causes a disparity.

5. While the new bypass has still yet to be decided I have concerns that if the proposed option does not go ahead and an alternative option, which uses the existing bypass, does you may have issues with the location of said Fitzalan houses.

Ok so thoughts on number 11 Tortington

1. This appears to me to be the most viable option for the town.

2. There is no real impact on local residents I can see. The site would essentially be a 'new' estate. Access would be separated.

3. More social / community spaces could be created here (parks, playground etc) as a condition of building. This is not possible elsewhere

ANP2 - Informal Consultation
Comments Received

27.09.18	<p>I am not sure where to start really.... I have lived in the town the last 20 years, but have lived within a 10 mile radius all of my life.... I remember it before the bypass (sorry, temporary relief road) as a child, when we had real business here, all of that being replaced with Antiques in the 1980's and then with cafes in the 2000's... All of these business require passing trade. The published documents cover a lot of ground, and the meeting I attended covered further ground that I do not find mentioned on this site. So I will discuss the topics as I remember them: Bypass: As and when the actual bypass actually happens, that would be a good time to consider traffic and parking issues. Currently there is sufficient parking in the town, and the 1 hour limits in the town centre work well. Tarrant Street is frequently deserted during the day much to residents annoyance !! Shared Use of High Street: Not actually a bad idea..... the street scene would look lovely, and as long as nobody actually wants to drive through the town it would make sense. Currently much traffic uses the town as a rat run to avoid the relief road hold ups so I could see this actually working. I have seen a lot of schemes like this in London and on the Continent... Crown Yard: A ridiculous idea I am afraid. Remember Crown Yard is not a heritage asset for the town as it did not actually exist until the early 1980's !! (when this area was cleared of other buildings to make the current car park (and what a god send it was)). Artisan Units.... well we already have a lot of those currently used by antiques dealers.... lovely idea I must admit, but it is valuable parking, especially for anyone with a disability. I would suggest that the best use for this area would be disabled parking only during the day... plus an electric buggy scheme or something like that. Car Park behind Fitzalan Road and associated foot bridge: Interesting but crazy idea I am afraid. Presumably you would site this at the bottom of Arun Street.... and compulsory purchase a couple of Fitzalan road bungalows to create access on the other side of the river.... and stuff a car park next to the allotments.... access from the relief road ?? Not sure there is any call for this part from making access to the Kings Arms easier... Just a very expensive solution to a problem that does not exist... The existing car park on</p>
27.09.18	<p>I attended a recent meeting in Arundel Town HALL recently and found the current proposals/information very interesting. I fully understand the need for arundel to provide additional housing over the coming years. The one big concern I have is any proposed new builds on Flood Plain. During the meeting we were told frequently by James Steward that lots of countries build on a Flood Plain and I quite agree with him. My main concern is that, if building does take place on the Floor Plain, it is completed properly and no corners are cut in order to save money. I am concerned that some of the larger proposed building plots (around Fitzalan Road) may be on potential Flood Plain and I am worried how this will affect Arundel as a whole.</p>

ANP2 - Informal Consultation
Comments Received

27.09.18	<p>Below are my comments on ANP2 as proposed to date. I will start with the areas nearest to my home at 44 Fitzalan Road.</p> <p>The proposal for housing on sites 7 and 8. These are both risk level 3 (the highest possible risk) flood plains and should not be built on while other sites are available. They both flood substantially in the winter. Please see the attached photos taken of the site 7 field in the winter taken from my upstairs window. It is like this every winter. On the map of the proposed sites for housing there are a number which are on the hills and not part of the flood plain, particularly site 11 which, I understand, would accommodate all the housing requirements.</p> <p>The proposed car parks on both sites 7 and 8 are equally on the flood plain and inappropriate for that reason alone. In respect of the proposed public car park on site 7 this is unnecessary as further parking facilities which would handle the parking lost by converting Crown Yard and extending the Lido could easily be created by expanding the current Mill Road car park. As you know we do have a parking problem in Fitzalan Road during the Festival and Arundel-by-candlelight, but this is due not to the residents or the people who work here, but to people coming in from outside the town looking for FREE parking. This also applies to Mill Road. A new parking facility would not solve this problem and would only make it worse. The problem could easily (and cheaply) be solved by putting double yellow lines along the field side of the road. The proposed footbridge across the river. This is singularly the worst part of ANP2. It could only be built at huge expense. Money which could well be used for more suitable regeneration in the town. It would be an eyesore ruining the view of the town from the other two bridges and destroying the views of those who live along the river on both sides. It would also severely disrupt the lives of those who live in the Lillian Holmes bungalows. There is already more than adequate pedestrian access to the town via the other two bridges. The proposed development of housing at the Blastreat/Greenhurst site. This is currently under dispute, but the Town</p>
27.09.18	<p>Thank you for all the hard work. I have a couple of comments...firstly the Green space ideas are all very well, but until a decision has been made about any bypass, it is impossible to make any constructive comments. Arundel is choc full of 2nd home owners, holiday lets and Airbnbs, which depletes the housing stock considerably, thus elevates prices and so the cycle of unaffordable homes continues. Recent development on the Eagle Brewery site is by no means at maximum occupancy, and yet again is very costly, excluding many who would like to live in the area. I appreciate all this might be very difficult to reverse, but how is it proposed that any new houses would not suffer the same fate?</p>
27.09.18	<p>I don't know if this is a hoax or someone's idea of a silly joke but a sign has appeared suggesting OUR Town Council wants to build a footbridge across the river.</p> <p>If that is the case I suggest this will become a permanent blot and white elephant in the most lovely town in West Sussex; absolutely ludicrous.</p> <p>I would urge you to throw this idea out of your minds now.</p>
27.09.18	<p>I welcome new housing in Arundel for a range of demographics. I do not think housing should be made available on existing green sites (fields etc). Please reconsider the blastreat site for suitable housing and the castle stables. Both are currently used and could be repurposed. Could some of the car park at Arundel station be repurposed for housing? Good for transport links and the car park does seem a little oversized to me.</p>

27.09.18	<p>Please find commented below our concerns and comments of the proposed plans regarding Housing and general changes to Arundel the Town.</p> <p>Firstly, want to say that the committee should give very careful consideration to effecting the view when coming into Arundel from Cross Bush, as this truly breath taking, for residents whom have seen it a thousand times and more so for visitors to our town.</p> <p>Housing – Proposed plots (7 & 8) both these plots are on a flood plains that continually become water logged with the winter months, this in turn brings abundance of wildlife to the fields. The road is currently very busy with traffic that would only increase with the two proposals. The lack of drainage would also be a grave concern and potentially lead to flooding and we remove a flood plain.</p> <p>The proposal (Plot 7) of adding car parking and a bridge into town would be a blot of the view from two current bridges, also have issues regarding the rivers tow path, which also floods daily with the tide. Also concerns of misuse of the car park at night. I would review the option in extending Mill Pond carpark, as the most logical and cheapest option.</p> <p>Looking at the proposal, I feel that it would be better approach to seriously look at adding to newer parts of the town as an extension, focus on plots 10 & 11, these would have the least environmental impact, regarding flooding, wildlife or aesthetics to the way our town looks.</p> <p>Before we encourage more retail into the town, we should ensure we can meet demand at present, too many times we see business come and go, to encourage even more is irresponsible. The Town (I) and our visitors don't mind that we are not pedestrianised, it's part of the charm.</p> <p>Before I end, just wanted to say the process of consultation needs a review, as it's NOT worked in informing the residents in Fitzalan Road.</p>
27.09.18	<p>I have read the recent neighbourhood plan and have the following concerns; Both schools in Arundel are at capacity and do not have the ability to cater for increased housing especially the suggested 150 in the Torrington Rd. There is only 1 preschool in Arundel and again this is full. If there does need to be additional housing there needs to be additional infrastructure to cater for these. Also the thing I love about Arundel is that it's small and green, by building on our green fields I feel it will make it less appealing! I feel that there should be more development in creating green spaces, cycle paths etc I am concerned about the plans to make the high street pedestrianised and removing free parking. It is rare that a day visitor would use this parking but locals certainly do. I could understand for specific events e.g. farmers markets, festival, Arundel by candlelight, Saturdays during summer etc but not all the time. I think that rather than making the high street more appealing it would make it more difficult for many and mean they use other shops instead.</p>

27.9.18	<p>I am writing to fully oppose any development plans proposed for Fitzalan Road. As a resident living in the house next door to the site of the proposed area for new houses (1 Fitzalan Road next to the field), we purchased our property because of the open space; any development on that site would undoubtedly devalue this property by a substantial amount. As local residents are aware, the field for the proposed development site is a vast flood plain, surely building on the site will have an impact on other properties regarding the risk of flooding, especially being so close to the river?</p> <p>This end of Fitzalan Road has some of the oldest cottages on the street and to build new houses amongst them would most certainly affect the historic aesthetics of the road (unfortunately as in the case of numerous historic towns, new development initiatives have completely ruined the charm and character of historic places). Arundel is steeped in History and its aesthetic historical charm must be maintained for future generations.....this is why the town is kept alive and thriving; developments, new builds and car parks will be a step closer to it becoming completely ruined with new and unnecessary initiatives; the developments you propose would significantly overdevelop this small and peaceful town. Furthermore, new houses would mean a growing population and how would this accommodate the already oversubscribed doctors surgery, the pharmacy where customers have to already endure agonising queues and long waits for prescriptions? A new development will surely reverberate and have an effect on the wider local infrastructure of our public services (not to mention schools that are already to full capacity)?</p> <p>The community on Fitzalan road is a friendly and welcoming one, and we openly discuss issues; I can assure you that we are ALL opposed to a development project completely ruining the aesthetics of our historical road, not to mention the potential overcrowding!! You are our council and need to consider a) residents' wishes and b) Maintaining and protecting open spaces within our historical town. I have attached photos of this beautiful field that you want to destroy: it is outrageous!!!</p>
---------	---

ANP2 - Informal Consultation
Comments Received

27.09.18	<p>I am appalled to have received through my letter box this evening (27/09/2018) a letter from the Fitzalan Road action group informing me that a consultation operated by yourselves is about to close. AT NO POINT - has anyone from your organisation informed residents of these plans, AT NO POINT has anyone put a leaflet through the door, and at AT NO POINT has anyone from your organisation seen it fit to knock on anyones front door or even put a sign up on a lamp post. The rank amateurism your organisation has shown along with the disregard for people who live here is quite frankly beneath contempt. In this day and age I am sure it is not even beyond the limited wit of complete incompetents such as yourselves to AT LEAST advertise in the town this was happening. Instead it is left to a small group of bemused and frightened residents to photocopy leaflets at their own cost, to stumble around in the dark posting through their neighbours letterboxes into the late evening in the hope this "plan" may gain some wider attention outside of your clique. The decision to build on water meadows on sites 7 and 8 on a flood plain quite frankly beggars belief and I feel needs only limited comment Residents here already have to contend with a chocked and polluted A27 bypass through the town with the resultant disruption and noise. The parking arrangements are already chaotic. To bring further development to this part of the community (already one of the most densely populated areas of the town) is totally unacceptable. The council have been told for years by local residents that the policy of doing sweetheart deals with private retirement companies who build vast ghettoised and gated flat complexes in the town is both ignorant and short sighted. We are now told another one is about to be built. There is much anger in the community - anger to which you people some how seem to be blind and deaf towards. These short sighted policies have left the town without affordable housing and limits the abilities of local people to carry on living here as the housing supply is already in such short demand, I would suggest whoever is running this project looks at potential brown field sites within the town and looks at some sort of sustainable and affordable housing development. In addition to this the council</p>
27.09.18	<p>re site no.8 on the draft housing plan. This field is part of the flood plain for our area and is frequently under six inches of water during wet periods. The sewer system cannot cope with the present number of houses and during wet periods the drains all back up and the toilets in our homes are not able to be used. Southern Water have promised to resolve this issue but as yet nothing has been done despite Arundel Council getting involved. If further houses are built it will make the problem worse unless there is a dramatic update to the present sewer system. Where will all the flood water go during wet periods?</p>

28.09.18	<p>I would like to address some local residents concerns re ANP's shared space scheme for crown yard car park / high street</p> <p>The two main concerns I can see are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Trade will decline for shops due to no one hour parking.• Lack of one hour parking for those less able (local residents). <p>Many local residents may question the evidence for pedestrianisation and trade. Feeling Arundel should not miss out on such a good opportunity I have found the attached document (Impact of pedestrianization and traffic calming on retailing) to hopefully assist in your decision making. One choice stat i saw was:</p> <p>Table 1 - Proportions of retail hotel and restaurant businesses reporting changes in annual turnover</p> <p>Retail increase of 83%</p> <p>Hotels increase of 28%</p> <p>Restaurants increase of 63%</p> <p>The article is a bit dated but has some very pertinent info. I would also like to highlighting Littlehampton's paved developments on the front by the mouth of the river (and how that is now a very popular area), and Shoreham's shared high street (east street, photos attached) which has helped make the town thrive and shoreham's market has become one of the best around and a winner of food and drink award 2017. Re lack of one hour parking for less able locals. I have a bit of a idea - not sure it's doable though as I don't know who controls the main car park.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Allow free one hour parking in the main carpark (or just for local residents)! <p>I actually think this will increase trade (but have nothing to base that on!) Anyhoo keep up the good work! I for one commend you.</p>
----------	--

28.09.18	<p>Hi James, I'm wholeheartedly behind the proposed pedestrianisation (yes I know it's shared!) of crown yard / high street area. I am 100% sure this is the correct thing for the town. I'm sure Lucy has spoken to you re the Fitzalan meeting the other day. There are many concerns!</p> <p>The two main ones being:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trade will decline for shops due to no one hour parking. • Lack of one hour parking for those less able (local residents). <p>Many people at that meeting questioned the evidence for pedestrianisation and trade. Feeling Arundel should not miss out on such a good opportunity I have found the attached document for you (Impact of pedestrianization and traffic calming on retailing) to hopefully assist you in your presentation. One choice stat i saw was:</p> <p>Table 1 - Proportions of retail hotel and restaurant businesses reporting changes in annual turnover</p> <p>Retail increase of 83%</p> <p>Hotels increase of 28%</p> <p>Restaurants increase of 63%</p> <p>The article is a bit dated but has some very pertinent info.</p> <p>Oh also you may want to highlight Littlehampton's paved developments on the front by the mouth of the river (and how that is now a very popular area) and Shoreham's shared high street (east street, photos attached) which has helped make the town thrive and shoreham's market has become one of the best around and a winner of food and drink award 2017. I've also attached something from when Shoreham did the same (not sure if it helps)</p> <p>Re lack of one hour parking for less able locals. I have a bit of a idea - not sure it's doable though as I don't know who controls the main car park</p>
28.09.18	<p>With regard to the Arundel Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>I object to the proposal of building on plots 7 and 8 in Fitzalan Road due to the flooding these fields regularly suffer from. Building on these fields would cause problems for the residents.</p> <p>I do not think there is need for a pedestrian bridge over the river. Walking into to the centre of Arundel is a short walk over the existing bridges. If that idea is rejected could the money that would have been spent to build it be used to build a new bridge on the bypass that is in keeping with the look of Arundel.</p> <p>I would like to see a reasonable number of houses built on plot 13 Blastreat/Greenhurst if the Swallow brewery building was to be used in the design and the houses didn't impact on the poor sewerage in Fitzalan Road and the parking spaces covered the number of houses/rooms built.</p> <p>Plot 11 would also appear to be a suitable spot to build as it doesn't appear to impact detrimentally on the community.</p> <p>If the land on plot 14 doesn't flood it also seems like a usable area for housing.</p> <p>Crown Yard car park would be a good place to have more shops/retail.</p> <p>If Crown yard becomes a retail area I would like the Mill road car park to be extended to make up the car parking spaces. I would also like to keep some 1 hour parking in the town for the shops that would possibly lose trade if their customers couldn't park nearby such as Pallants, the Butchers and the Barbers.</p>

27.09.18	<p>I write in response to your invitation for comments regarding the Arundel Neighbourhood Plan, and will restrict my observations to what I know i.e. Plots 7, 8 and 15, having lived in Fitzalan Road, Arundel, for twenty-six years, since 1992.</p> <p>Plot 15 - Blastreat and Greenhurst</p> <p>I have already written two letters about Plot 15, the Blastreat/Greenhurst site, stating that there are already at least seven properties in the Arundel area for retirement, and that Fitzalan Mews across the road from me offers all kinds of accommodation across the spectrum of society. It seems to work well, and could serve as a blueprint for Plot 15, which apart from the garden in front of Greenhurst house, is a brown field site.</p> <p>Plot 8 - Fitzalan Road the south side of the new bridge - a Greenfield site</p> <p>This site was turned down when building the new Arundel Surgery there was mooted. One of the main reasons was a flood issue. This field takes an enormous amount of water at times of rain, and high river levels. This is still a valid point. Filling a flood plain with concrete could have dire consequences as illustrated by the Chichester floods. Furthermore, building here will seriously impact on the way of life, and rural views, of the residents along that section of Fitzalan Road.</p> <p>Plot 7 - Fitzalan Road the north side of the new bridge - a Greenfield site</p> <p>I have just looked again at the pen and ink drawing of Arundel Town from the south east, obviously drawn from the bypass area, and sold to me at the door by the person who drew it. As people drive along the bypass, and those who cross the plain on the train, see Arundel rising up from the green fields, it makes an aesthetically pleasing picture, and tourism is one of the town's major industries. We would hope to keep this a place people want to come to for spiritual refreshment.</p> <p>It would be nice if Arundel could accommodate more people, and in different age groups, but realistically towns and countries are finite in what they can absorb.</p>
29.09.18	<p>What am I hearing?! Are you serious about removing the essential facility of one-hour free parking? How can you not see that this free parking lies at the heart of why Arundel is a successful rural town!</p> <p>I live in Slindon and currently choose Arundel every time over any other place for all my local quick stop shopping, charity shop deposits, regular breakfast & coffee purchases on the way to work.</p> <p>This news matters to me and will negatively affect me so much that I totted up how much I've spent in the past month and the rough value of my charity giving, and I believe I've contributed something in the region of over £200 in just one month!</p> <p>Access to free parking is essential to the productivity and profitability of Arundel's businesses not to mention how it enables those spontaneous meets when you see friends and others who one knows. In other words, free one-hour parking SUSTAINS A COMMUNITY!</p> <p>Perhaps you're looking to create a ghost town instead!?????! NEVER HAVE I HEARD A MORE SHORT-SIGHTED SUGGESTION.</p>

29.09.18	<p>I have been lucky enough to be a resident of Fitzalan Road Arundel for the past 17 years. Previous to this I have resided in King Street, Surrey Street and Tarrant Street; totalling 30 years as a resident of Arundel. As such I feel very strongly that the proposals to build housing on the flood plains opposite the existing houses in Fitzalan Road are poorly throughout, and of no gain to residents, or the town itself. In fact, quite the opposite. The horses field (Plot 8) in Fitzalan Road is a very important open green space, and considered to be a great asset to the town. Having looked extensively at the proposed plans I am curious to know why the other horses field (plot 1) has been disregarded as a 'Local Green Space', and the horses field in Fitzalan Road has not. Surely the same criteria should apply to both? In addition to this, whilst Plot 1 has been identified as a 'ground water flood risk', Plot 8 has been identified more seriously as 'part of Coastal and floodplain Grazing Marsh and lies within Flood Zone 3, an area with a high probability of flooding'.</p> <p>My year long observations of the field show it to be frequently and regularly flooded. I question why Plot 8 it has not been disregarded for this reason when there are other, more suitable plots available.? In the Neighbourhood plans it actually states of Plot 8, 'This is a sensitive sight with significant landscape and flooding constraints. Therefore the sight is not suitable for housing development'.</p> <p>The current drainage system in Fitzalan Road cannot cope with the existing houses and is frequently needing external help from pumping vehicles to operate properly. I am very concerned that the risk of flooding and standing water will heightened and exacerbate the already struggling drainage system if this building were to go ahead.</p> <p>I hope that you consider my opposition to the proposed building on plot 8 as seriously as my concerns.</p>
----------	--

ANP2 - Informal Consultation
Comments Received

28.09.18	<p>I am very concerned that there has been insufficient consultation on the proposals under consideration. We have received no documentation on the proposals, nor does there appear to have been information promulgated around the town. We were unaware of the proposals until today. Site 13, the development of the Blastreat site, has been previously proposed for development. However, each proposal appears to have received more and more objections. The most recent, by Renaissance Homes, has had over 1500 objections by local residents. That is a huge number of objections for a single site; it speaks volumes for the strength of community feeling. To include this site yet again, would be to ride roughshod over the concerns of local residents. To propose further development on the flood plain seems incredibly short sighted. We need to plan for resilience. Our forefathers knew the risks of building on flood plains and we need to heed their experiences. The only site proposals we should be taking forwards are those sites that are elevated away from the flood plain. Sites 7 and 8 and 13 are all subject to flooding. They don't just flood once in a hundred years, they flood every single winter. There are strong reasons why sites 7 and 8 have never been built on – they are on flood plains. The Planning Dept. has received numerous photographs of flooding at the Greenhurst/Blastreat site, and these are a matter of public record. We desperately need our green spaces to be preserved if they are to be available as soakaways. If we build on the meadows, or hard surface over them, those flood waters, which we see every winter, will impact all of the Fitzalan Rd and Queens Lane properties. Whilst it is entirely possible to build in a way that might protect new properties, it will not protect the existing residents. Their homes will all be at increased risk of flooding if these proposals go ahead. The proposed new cycle bridge, whilst seemingly an attractive idea, appears to be wholly linked to building a car park on Fitzalan Rd. Notwithstanding the flood risk, this road has two blind bends, no continuous footpath, and is already subject to regular closures/blockages by deliveries to the Co-op. How can you possibly consider routing more traffic down this road as a good option? The plans that have put forward seem wholly</p>
28.09.18	<p>I feel I do need to object to the proposed development of sites 7 and 8 as both are flood plains and flood regularly with very little rain and Fitzalan road is already very congested with parking. I also appreciate the idea to connect the town with a foot bridge and car park south of the town but object to it as the town is served by two bridges already and has a large car park in Mill road that could be developed effectively, I understand the need for the neighbourhood plan to provide homes and would happily support affordable homes on the brown field sites around the town (No's12,13,14)</p>

28.09.18	<p>Firstly, to make some positive points about ANP2, I would like to comment on the proposed housing development on Site 11. As this area appears to represent an extension of the development which provided a high proportion of affordable housing at a previous time of need for this, it seems sensible to develop it further now. Site 11 is on higher ground than sites 7 and 8, so less likely to flood. It is also in a position where housing is unlikely to affect the views of the historic town or those views towards the Downs and the area of outstanding natural beauty.</p> <p>The development of Crown Yard might enhance visitors' experience of Arundel, but is it viable, since, for some months of the year, especially November, January and February, there is a greatly reduced number of visitors to the town?</p> <p>The Town Council's proposal to provide affordable housing on the Blastreat/Greenways site is a good idea, whereas the application by Renaissance to build a retirement facility on the site most definitely is not a good idea.</p> <p>Unfortunately, I find some of the other proposals in ANP2 questionable:</p> <p>The proposed footbridge is unnecessary. There are two bridges across the Arun in Arundel, situated only ten minutes' walk apart, and they both provide adequate pedestrian walkways, and in the case of the A27 bridge, safe underpasses for crossing the A27. An additional bridge on this short section of the river would be a waste of money.</p> <p>The proposal to build housing and car parks on Sites 7 and 8 is a cause for concern. These two sites are both Level 3 Flood Plains. We should not build anything on flood plains. especially not car parks.</p>
28.09.18	<p>Dear all, I am concerned about a number of sites listed for consideration in the new plans. As there are several brown field sites listed, it doesn't make any sense to me why any green field sites are even being considered, especially those which are already in agricultural and equestrian use, such as the two sites off Fitzalan Road. These green field sites are invaluable in maintaining the peaceful atmosphere in the area and were a key consideration for us when we moved to the area a few years ago. I am concerned that areas which are already problematic for parking will be thoughtlessly developed and have seen many cases of new developments added to parking problems when they are built. The parking requirements made on developers when putting schemes in place are not adequate for modern living (and in practice to do not insist on a reasonable number of spaces being allocated to each property) and as a result new developments frequently end up with cars being parked in a way which block traffic and do not allow enough space for emergency service vehicles to fit through. In my personal opinion, if the aim of the proposed scheme is to free up existing houses by building new properties that would encourage people to downsize then a more practical solution would be to build flats and bungalows as near to the town centre as possible. If the aim is to build houses for younger people trying to get on the property ladder then new build sites are rarely suitable. Most developers add a 20% premium on a new house, making them far less affordable than a second hand home and when the government backed help to buy scheme ends, which it is likely to do before any new development in the area is completed these new homes will be even less affordable for this market. Again a flat or second hand home will be far more suitable for these buyers, and the best way to free these up will be to build suitable homes for older people and encourage downsizing. Finally I understand the desire to link to two halves of the town but should we not also look to link the town to the train station, as houses with good access to a mainline station would appeal to buyers of all ages. Why are no suitable and sizable sites in this part of town being considered? Thank you for taking the time to read this</p>

28.09.18	<p>I write to raise my objection to the proposal of building on Fitzalan Road Site number 8.</p> <p>As a resident of Fitzalan road a major concern is the parking that is difficult and occasionally impossible for current residents. Whilst all are courteous and accommodating we are at a breaking point, people are having to park across gateways on occasions causing access and visibility issues for all but specifically the elderly and those with small children. Leaving the road in the morning to join the A27 during peak traffic time takes on average over 5 minutes to join the traffic flow. I am sure there would be an accident if cars (that would ultimately come with any new housing development) causing a rise in the number of people trying to access this during the morning rush hour.</p> <p>I do appreciate that there is a need for housing in Arundel but a small road already struggling with its residents cars is unable to safety take any more.</p>
28.09.18	<p>I have lived in Arundel since 1996 and have noticed the increasing congestion on the A27 in both directions, this will undoubtedly be further increased with the introduction of the additional properties proposed by this plan. The route to Littlehampton via Ford Road is ridiculously congested due to cars being parked on one side of the road for the first few hundred yards restricting traffic flow to one lane. In my opinion a new bypass must surely be given priority before further development takes place. My feeling on the proposed developments is that it will impinge on the already overstretched infrastructure.</p> <p>The two 'greenfield' sites on Fitzalan Road (7 & 8) are low lying and already act as a massive soak-away for the area - to add some forty dwellings would inevitably increase the flood risk. The drains at present cannot cope with extreme weather conditions and frequently back up into residents' homes.</p> <p>The 'brownfield' site at the Blastreat factory of a proposed forty-six dwellings is far too many for the area and, is there a need for more retirement homes? There are already more retirement homes in Arundel than required. Half the number would be more attractive, and allow for adequate off-street parking, with small gardens, and make more suitable 'starter homes' for young people trying to get onto the housing ladder.</p> <p>The other 'brownfield' site in Fitzalan Road (15) which presently houses small industrial units including Enterprise Garage which serves the local residents very well is shown as being proposed to make room for 10+ homes, this far too many for such a small area and will certainly cause more congestion and parking problems in this already crowded road.</p> <p>The proposed site adjacent to the roundabout on the Causeway is also below river level, and must act as a massive soakaway, and building in this area will also increase the flood risk, possibly causing the A27 to flood, and closing this section of a very important east/west trunk route.</p> <p>It has also been mooted that a footbridge across the river might be considered between Fitzalan Road and River Road. Surely if we are ever to have a new Arundel Bypass the</p>

28.09.18	<p>Dear Sir Re neighbourhood plan 2018 My comments on the plan are as as follows: Proposed housing in Fitzalan Road I wish to register a protest in the strongest terms. Both of these areas (Sites 7 & 8) are situated in a flood plain-Level 3. These fields are frequently under water, especially in the winter months. Although proposals may be made to address this issue, the fact remains that the water will need to be displaced elsewhere, and will raise the probability of flooding locally. The flood risk and coastal change government document requires a sequential test for this type of land, and recommends that building is kept out of the coastal plain. There is very limited access to the area, which already has an issue with car parking. Pedestrian access within the town There are proposals to ban cars from town centre roads, and some car parks. The town needs footfall to keep it vibrant, but does not need car parks situated on the town outskirts. This will have the effect of making residents go outside the town to other ares where parking is free, easier and with shopping facilities. Certain areas eg Tarrant Street, could be pedestrianised over the weekends, or during special events eg the Town Festival, Arundel by Candlelight etc. Parking in Crown Yard is vital to allow residents to use the town, not for use as another Artisan type unit, that will have limited appeal. New Builds There are various other sites, that have better facilities, access etc within the town. However, if between 50-150 dwellings are to be built, the town infrastructure needs to keep pace. (Hopefully there will be low cost housing to encourage young people to buy/rent) Examples would include easier and more available access to medical facilities, a chemist in the High Street, more places within pre school nurseries and a careful calculation of the school places within the town, more recreational facilities for teenagers, and a selection of businesses (that do not include more tea shops , antique outlets or restaurants) to enable residents to stay within the town, and not migrate to out of town retail parks for basic amenities. I would also make a comment about the lack of public consultation and short time scales that have happened with this document. No flyers have been distributed to some areas, and not everyone has access to either a computer or</p>
----------	---

28.09.18	<p>The joy of living in Arundel for 13 years has always been that when I approach the town from Crossbush and look across the beautiful vale to the town I experience a sense of well-being and contentment.</p> <p>However, now I feel a definite concern for its future— primarily because of the lack of accommodation for the young workers and professionals who work here, many of whom have to commute from Littlehampton, Bognor or Worthing. At present there is nowhere affordable for them to live - especially if they also have young families. This will be an ongoing need for this if Arundel is to thrive.</p> <p>Our Steering Group of Town Councillors and the current Mayor, Lucy Ashworth, have been really helpful in mapping out the sites available for development. I do agree with a number of the proposals for additional housing within the town limits but appreciate that there are many problems to overcome: risk of flooding, accessibility, schools, medical and other facilities including those for recreation and, indeed, brown waste disposal.</p> <p>I have heard mention of a footbridge across the Arun and consider this a waste of money. I am concerned it may cause more congestion and the displacement of current dwellings.</p> <p>My following comments are in response to specific points in the ANP2 “Sites to be Assessed”:</p> <p>1. Agreed 2. Could be used for car parking if accessed from London Road 3. The stables and its facilities are a great asset and any redevelopment should not be considered</p> <p>4. Agreed, parking best option for this low-lying water saturated site 5. Agreed, nursery excellent idea 6. No comment 7. This site could be used if adequately drained.</p> <p>Assurance as to adequate drainage will be absolutely essential otherwise potential residents will have to face overwhelming insurance costs and/or not be able to obtain a mortgage. I am a resident of Fitzalan Road and do have very serious concerns about road access to this site and the potential loss of outlook for current residents. Surely access from the (current A27) bypass - Queen Street or Ford Road could be possible - 8. Similar</p>
----------	---

29.09.18	<p>Questions regarding various Planning Proposals and Assessment documents provided by Arundel Town Council</p> <p>CONSULTATION, COMMUNICATION AND TRANSPARENCY</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It's noted that there was a meeting on February 21st 2018 which made reference to the Project Plan and timeline. Why is it that many people in Fitzalan Road only learnt about the plans and consultation deadlines less than four days ago? I understand that there have been comments with reference to the distribution of a small flyer but having checked with many people in Fitzalan Road, this simply did not happen and therefore people are either being misinformed through incompetency or by deliberate lack of transparency. Also, even if these flyers had been distributed, I question whether the single act of distributing a single small flyer constitutes proper consultation with the community. 2. Why have certain sites in the Assessment ANP2 Assessment Map already apparently been removed from the short-list before the first deadline? 3. In the notes attached to the ANP2 map there are various references to ANP1, however this document has not been made accessible to those who need to see it and is still unavailable. How can the deadline have any value and still be applied, if key documents are not visible to those responding? 4. Why was there the need for an 'emergency' meeting three days ago, during which the Mayor kindly turned up when the Arundel Town Council knew of these plans and failed to share them with the wider community properly seven months ago? 5. During this emergency meeting I was told that the website had 'hundreds of documents on it' meaning that any new documents would at best be hard to discover. When I visited the website I found the navigation to be seriously lacking, there was no document search facility and both the 2018 and the 2014 links pointed to the same index page being that of the 2018 documents. Why are the necessary documents not all properly accessible via the website with good navigation, a search facility and no erroneous double linking preventing
----------	---

29.09.18	<p>7. Please could you explain why both the consultation and proposals and thus responses for new housing and where to locate the new housing have been folded in with the consultation, proposals and responses to the LUC document and why the deadlines appear to be the same. While I understand that there is a small amount of relevance between both nonetheless they are separate proposals and therefore surely should be dealt with separately?</p> <p>8. It is noted in the Project Plan that the two key consultation periods ('2.03 Pre Sub informal consultations' and 2.10 Reg 14 Consultation Period) are both when people would be particularly busy and distracted by other things. In the case of the former 2.03 being post Summer Holidays with families with children going back to school and in the case of the latter 2.10 being just before Christmas. Why were these consultation periods set at times when it must have been known that people would be particularly busy and thus distracted?</p> <p>9. In a document provided by Arundel Town Council, (please see attachment 1), it is noted that 'There are five stages to the Neighbourhood Planning Process' and then goes on to list them. The first is stated as 'Ask the People what they want – through workshops, focus groups and consultation February to September 2018'. Please can you provide to me and other residents of Fitzalan Road who would like to know (and also others, who I'm sure would be interested to know) a list of the dates when these focus groups and workshops were held as well as details of the locations they were held at and who attended them. Please can you also supply the questions or details of documents you used at these workshops and focus groups which enabled you to 'ask people what they want'.</p> <p>10. It's probably worth mentioning a quote from a document titled 'Consultation: The Legal Requirements' created by Landmark Chambers who are 'a leading chambers in the UK offering integrated advocacy and advice in Planning, Property, Environmental and Public Law'. The quote is 'Public participation and consultation lies at the heart of the statutory planning process'. The document goes on to say that consultation 'that is undertaken must</p>
29.09.18	<p>I recognise and appreciated that Arundel needs to make a contribution to increased housing allocation targets and that there are reduced opportunities for this, given the town's distinct location and current layout. I am very much against the use of Site 8 (land off Fitzalan Road) for a number of reasons, but the main one being the fact that this areas is floodplain. Whilst I know that careful use of design technologies can be used to potentially overcome flooding of new build properties , I believe there could be serious implications for the existing housing on this part of Fitzalan Road if the flood plain field was build on. Ground water levels in this part of Arundel are high and many of the residents in the area suffer from flooding in their gardens during the winter months. We rely on open areas of flood plain to take the pressure off the impact of further flooding as we see the impacts of climate change and of course the changes likely to come as a result of the Lower Tidal River Arun Strategy. In addition to these issues, it is unlikely that the existing sewerage infrastructure could cope with additional housing in this area, including the effects from rainwater runoff from new areas of hardstanding. I do, however, believe that site 15 - the industrial units on Fitzalan Road) could make a small contribution to the housing requirements, and of course the much large Tortington site. I do recognise though that this site has a considerable number of issues of it's own.</p>

ANP2 - Informal Consultation
Comments Received

29.09.18	<p>I am writing to lodge my objections to any further development in Fitzalan Road, whether it be additional housing further down or the development of the Blastreat site.</p> <p>The reason for this is for a number of reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The flooding risk this will create to the already at risk houses there. 2) The over stretched sewage system that already creates problems for residents in Fitzalan with raw sewage coming up in their houses when the water level is high. 3) The dangers that come with additional traffic flow on roads not designed for this level of traffic. 4) Parking - there isn't enough for the residents that are already there. 5) The design and structure will ruin our beautiful town. <p>These are to name just a few concerns.</p>
29.09.18	<p>We would like to register our objection to the proposed changes to the parking arrangements in the High Street - removal of 1 hour free parking. The convenience this offers to customers of local businesses cannot be under estimated. Removal will effect trade. Considering the possible minimal revenue this will generate and the additional policing of the scheme can not make this viable compared to the possible damage it will do. Try and keep the look and feel of a small country town.</p>
29.09.18	<p>Hello I have lived in Fitzalan Road nearly 15 years parking has always been a problem as most homeowners these days have at least 2 cars. To allow new homes to be built on the field at the windmill end of Fitzalan Road will only increase the problem even if parking is included in the plans. This field is also part of the flood plain after heavy rain this field is always heavily water logged and I cannot think that building houses on it will improve this.</p> <p>Arundel' s facilities such as schools doctors etc are already stretched building more homes will only make matters worse. This road is mix of quaint cottages and houses and a development of modern houses will be totally out of keeping with the rest of the area. It will also bring more traffic to a road that has no turning area and is already struggling to cope with every day traffic movement. I strongly object to this development and hope that the council sees sense.</p>

29.09.18	<p>Response to ANP2 Site Assessment provided by Arundel Town Council</p> <p>GENERAL</p> <p>1. I refer to the question in my previous document about why certain sites have been taken off the short-list prior to the deadline.</p> <p>2. I refer to the question in my previous document as to how the deadline can be maintained when key documents e.g. ANP1 have not been accessible.</p> <p>3. I refer to the question in my previous document about whether the consultation has been both adequate and fair, with particular reference to both communication with people who might be affected, and the time given to residents to respond.</p> <p>SPECIFIC</p> <p>Site 1. It is not possible to comment due to the lack of access to ANP1. However, taking the name of this site, why is Site Number 8 also not considered as a Horses Field</p> <p>Site 2. With the requirement to build between 50 to 150 houses, even if one or two houses could be built here, why is it being discounted?</p> <p>Site 3. It is stated that it is 'coming to an end'. What is coming to an end? If 'it' is coming to an end within five years, then it would be available from 2023 and not 2025 as stated.</p> <p>Site 4. No comment as no access to ANP1 document</p> <p>Site 5. No comment as no access to ANP1 document</p> <p>Site 6. With the requirement to build between 50 to 150 houses, even if one or two houses could be built here, why is it being discounted?</p> <p>Site 7. In a document on the Arun District Council website it clearly states the following (see attachment 2): Development will only be permitted within the gaps if:</p> <p>It would not undermine the physical and/or visual separation of elements</p> <p>It would not compromise the integrity of the gap, either individually or cumulatively with other or existing proposed development</p> <p>It can be located elsewhere</p>
----------	--

29.09.18	<p>This site breaches all three of these conditions so it's unclear as to why this site has been included. Therefore, contrary to what is said in the document, this land is neither available for housing or car parking.</p> <p>Access is difficult and there would be a risk of increased flooding to neighbouring households and it would be very costly and difficult even irresponsible to build on this field. The historical view when coming from Crossbush would be very negatively affected.</p> <p>Site 8. In a document on the Arun District Council website it clearly states the following (see attachment 2): Development will only be permitted within the gaps if:</p> <p>It would not undermine the physical and/or visual separation of elements</p> <p>It would not compromise the integrity of the gap, either individually or cumulatively with other or existing proposed development</p> <p>It can be located elsewhere. This site breaches all three of these conditions so it's unclear as to why this site has been included. Therefore, contrary to what is said in the document, this land is neither available for housing or car parking. This site has been previously rejected. Access is difficult and there would be a risk of increased flooding to neighbouring households and it would be very costly and difficult even irresponsible to build on this field. The historical view when coming from Crossbush would be very negatively affected.</p> <p>It is also a horse's field but this has not been noted in the Assessment as it has been for Site 1. Site 9. It's extremely concerning that the town is being described as being in two halves and how is it a pivotal point in the town simply because there's currently a roundabout there.</p> <p>Site 10. Noted but why does this not also apply to some of the other spaces being considered?</p> <p>Site 11. Clearly the best option on which to build as it would accommodate the full 150 buildings and would not be in breach of planning policy.</p> <p>Site 12. No comments due to no access to ANP1 document</p>
29.09.18	<p>I am disturbed to see a sign in the high street shops informing us of your intention to remove the one hour parking bays.</p> <p>As a local resident I am concerned that I have not received any communication regarding this and I despair in trying to find more information on the website.</p> <p>The notice of the meeting for Saturday has only been seen by chance and at very short notice.</p> <p>You have a duty as our elected council to be more "public" about this issue and to give both residents and retailers ample opportunity to absorb the issues regarding the proposals and to react accordingly. This is your elected duty.</p> <p>Please will you be kind enough to give me more details as I have been unable to find the information on the website and in the council minutes.</p>

29.09.18	<p>Response to LUC Proposal provided by Arundel Town Council</p> <p>CARS AND SHARED SPACES</p> <p>1. This is probably the area of most concern and the one that's most contentious. It's likely that both the shared spaces concept and the removal of the car park in Crown Yard would have a negative affect on businesses in the town, possibly wiping many of them out and thus ripping the heart out of the centre of Arundel. This is because many people who live on the outskirts of Arundel and in outlying villages often go into town to get something small such as a haircut, something from the butcher or a Sunday newspaper. This trade would most likely disappear.</p> <p>2. Arundel is only really stretched during events such as the Arundel Festival or Arundel by Candlelight when part of the town is often closed to traffic anyway. At other times of the year particularly outside Summer, or during weekdays or in the evening the town is quiet, which is part of its attraction. At these times there is much less of a traffic problem and little need for more parking than that already available in the town.</p> <p>3. The examples of towns given in both the presentation and documents have much higher populations and levels of visitors than Arundel. It is likely that most days, the shared spaces would have few people on them. The same would be true in Crown Yard if the car parking is removed. Take a typical weekday in say October through to March and the shared spaces will be mostly be unused. While the thought of Outdoor Theatre or Cinema is good, unfortunately with the UK weather being as unpredictable as it is, the spaces would rarely be used for such activities.</p> <p>4. I also agree that making the road to the side of the memorial a two-way road is ambitious.</p> <p>5. While moving most of the parking to Mill Road might make sense during major events, it may not be wise outside these and simply put off people going to Arundel.</p> <p>6. If the 5A bypass is built, then it's likely that the through traffic in Arundel will</p>
----------	--

29.09.18	<p>Following today's meeting in the Town Hall, I would like to raise the following objections. One of the more ludicrous suggestions emanating from LUC was the suggestion that the pavement between Arun Street and School Lane should be widened. As it is now, massive delivery trucks rumble down the street far too often with wheels on the pavement. Exiting from my front door is already hazardous, not to mention dodging cyclists who frequently ride on the pavement.</p> <p>I am against any change in Crown Yard and the suggestion of shared space in the High Street is unacceptable. There is already a problem with weekend drinkers from out of town who tend to congregate around the Red Lion, leading to fighting from time to time and requiring bouncers at busy times. If the current space was to be enlarged I believe it would attract even more people and exacerbate the problem.</p> <p>I think it more than fatuous to show images of pedestrianised areas in big cities such as Brighton with plenty of access roads available.</p> <p>I also think removing valuable parking places just to enable traffic to flow in both directions, in a reduced space, on the High Street is not viable.</p> <p>Of course visitors will always be welcome to visit this small historic and beautiful town however, overall, there does seem to be a definite bias towards visitors as opposed to those people who actually live here and pay their Council tax.</p> <p>I am surprised and disappointed that there was so little mention of the putative flooding problems that we face, most especially since the Environment Agency is seeking to reduce their maintenance of the river banks. Rather than pay expensive London based consultants for unrealistic schemes the money would be better spent on protecting the town from flooding in the years to come.</p> <p>As became apparent this afternoon, there has been a regrettable lack of information emanating from the Town Council on many important issues surrounding the current Neighbourhood Plan, and I would hope that this disappointing situation can be resolved so</p>
----------	---

30.09.18	<p>Dear Sirs and Madams</p> <p>Entering Arundel from Cross Bush the view of the town is stunning and I would not wish to see this destroyed as I'm sure all will agree.</p> <p>A car park and more building of houses will destroy this image south of the river, Arundel needs to keep it's compactness to maintain the character of this beautiful town. What next? Will the building carry on until we link up with Lyminster then Wick and Littlehampton. This certainly appears to be the trend unfortunately.</p> <p>As a resident I feel the following ideas would be more appropriate for the site opposite Fitzalan Road. I believe this site should be enhanced for every ones benefit rather than destroy it.</p> <p>For a good few years I have enjoyed the privilege of hedgehogs visiting my garden. The maximum to date at one time eight (not an easy head count). My efforts have been featured in the Bell Magazine and the West Sussex gazette. Now I have sick or under weight hedgehogs brought to me for help. I don't pretend to be an expert. I have collected ones locally and re homed from Brent Lodge wild life centre. W A D A R S have also picked up little ones from home and my office at work. Cars are a hedgehogs predator and a car park and more traffic along Fitzalan Road will not help. I would rather not see squashed remains outside my house.</p> <p>I think Arundel can offer so more than a castle.</p> <p>Arundel Nature Park</p> <p>I am currently contacting the following organisations to muster interest and support for an alternative project ;</p> <p>The Bumble Bee Preservation Trust</p> <p>The Butterfly Conservation Trust</p> <p>The Peoples Trust For Endangered Species</p> <p>"The Bat Man" and "Robin " (P S D R)</p>
----------	---

30.09.18	<p>I would also like to contact celebrities with local and wildlife connections for support and The West Sussex Education Authority with a view to introduce a new conservation area to educate younger children about wild life, before more species become extinct.</p> <p>To include fun interactive games and challenges to enjoy learning about our countryside and its plants and animals.</p> <p>The schools in Arundel and other local primary schools could may be have a small plot to grow their own fruit and vegetables to try and encourage healthier eating for the children. Fun days during the year themed to the appropriate time, Bats in October...Halloween, Easter Bunnies etc.</p> <p>This area to also include a picnic area and a park area for everyone to enjoy closer to the town and for Arundel dog owners another option for walking. For many years in winter I have slid my way through the slimy mud and puddles along the river bank (cattle doesn't help matters and can be intimidating) or up to the top of your boots in Binstead Woods.</p> <p>Parking</p> <p>Will always be a problem with roads built for horse and cart transport and not cars.</p> <p>How Ever..</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 A park and ride car park could be introduced at White Ways which is already a car park. 2 Extend the Lido car park towards the roundabout for school transport, disabled parking only and a drop off point for the park and ride to visit the Arundel Nature Park only. 3 A second car park at the north end of town near "The Castle Stables" so two routes in and out...At present if you do manage to park you often have to queue to get out of the town. When Castle Events, Corpus Christi, The Festival and Arundel by Candle Light are in town what better place to be able to park. Open a second entrance at the top gates to the Castle. 4 Add another visitor centre to encourage the use of this car park in winter. Using the Castle Stables
----------	---

30.09.18	<p>There are such beautiful walks on our door step that so many can't share.</p> <p>The river bank could be made wheelchair friendly with an alternative to swing gates/styles and an access friendly surface . Not Mud...</p> <p>Having just returned from a visit to Marwell Zoo I could not believe how many people were being pushed in wheelchairs for what seemed like miles. God help the delightful people that were pushing them with high spirits although it must have been hard work. Everyone seemed so happy.</p> <p>Apart from the river bank the Klondyke Lane and either side of the stream just before Swanbourne Lake to the river bank could also be made accessible for everyone. Visitors may not be aware of this route.</p> <p>No pavement between The Black Rabbit and Swanbourne Lake.</p> <p>The longer routes from the Black Rabbit to Amberley and via the Ghurka Bridge to be very much upgraded. Walks I have often walked with my dogs, enjoyed lunch and caught the train back to Arundel.</p> <p>Arundel train station was built with the permission from The Duke at the time with the proviso that ALL trains would have to stop at Arundel. So why not today? As a resident of Arundel who quite often uses trains for longer journeys arranges to travel from Ford or Barnham because the service from Arundel is an added problem as you must link up with the Southern trains from Brighton to Southampton. Adds an extra connection to your journey which I have often been subject to. That's if indeed the trains are running or on time.</p> <p>Visitors to Arundel must be put off a journey by train with the lack of service and Arundel is not on the Coastal Line so it's not a straight forward journey.</p> <p>I am forwarding The Arundel Town Councils email address to the above named organisations and individuals to access support for my views for Arundel in the long term.</p> <p>Please maintain the centre of the town, can you really squish anything else in?</p>
29.09.18	<p>I'm getting in touch on behalf of Kim's Bookshop regarding the proposed plan to remove the one-hour parking bays on Arundel High Street. We oppose it on a number of bases.</p> <p>Unfortunately, as we are unable to attend the meeting, we felt the need to address this matter via email.</p> <p>We feel very strongly that this will have an adverse effect on the businesses in the town centre. Passing trade have a tendency to make the most of the turnover of parked vehicles, and more than a few local businesses depend on people being able to dash in and out quickly.</p> <p>In addition, we find the hourly limit on the road useful when it comes to unloading our company vehicles, which are constantly travelling between our two shops to transfer stock as well as to drop off privately-bought books from house calls. Changing the regulations would make it much more difficult for us to do this.</p> <p>It feels like an inconsiderate and unnecessary measure to take in a town which is already struggling in contrast to previous years, as other business owners point out. Passing trade has always been a strong focus above local support in Arundel, and this move will reduce what little we get even further.</p>

ANP2 - Informal Consultation
Comments Received

29.09.18	Thank you Mr. Stewart for a very informative and interesting presentation on the new Arundel town plan today . I thought all of the ideas for the centre of the town to be innovative, creative and exciting. As to the housing developments and the proposed sites , I just wish to record my objection to either of the Fitzalan Rd sites . Both of these fields are prone to flooding and the road access is very limited , I think they should both be put forward as designated green spaces instead . Many thanks to you all for all the hard work you have put in to these proposals, and also for allaying our fears that the residents will have unwanted changes thrust upon us without consultation
29.09.18	I Object to building on site no 7 because it floods! I support building affordable housing for young families on the blasttreat site. But only houses! Not high rise flatso! . Ford brownfield sites are more suitable!
29.09.18	Having attended two of the meetings regarding the proposed developments I would like to register my opposition to the housing/car parking proposals for the two sites in Fitzalan Road (7 and 8). The objections have been aired in the past and still remain relevant, i.e. this is a floodplain which can look like a lake after heavy rains and is therefore totally unsuitable for development. Also, allowing development on these fields would set a very bad precedent as developers would take this as a green light to buy up and build on any land between here and Littlehampton! I understand that Arundel needs to provide affordable houses (50?) but as the Dunlop estates will provide 16 and if Blasttreat was sympathetically developed the suggestion was that could provide 26? further dwellings this would go most of the way to providing the necessary houses. If more were needed these could be provided at the land adjoining the allotments in Ford Road. The ideas for making a green space out of the roundabout should (hopefully) the 5A option go through is very good and could unite both sides of Arundel which is now divided by the A27, and the existing bridge could be made into an attractive asset to the town. I feel, in conclusion, that if the Horses Field near Pearson Road can be safeguarded then there should be no reason why the field in Fitzalan road should not be treated equally. I would like to express my thanks to James Stewart and colleagues for trying to organise some disparate views and for doing their best for the town

29.09.18	<p>As residents in Otters Quay in Fitzalan Rd we wish to register our strong objections to the proposals to build up to 150 new homes and a large new car park off Fitzalan Rd. We also object strongly to the proposal to build a new third bridge for pedestrians and cyclists across the river Arun.</p> <p>It would appear that the above proposals were drawn up by London based consultants with little understanding of or interest in safeguarding the history, culture and attraction of such a beautiful town. The proposals show no regard for the massive pressure on the infrastructure of the area and the massive increase in the risk of flooding which would result from their implementation.</p> <p>The location of the proposed large new car park and new homes is on the flood plain and coupled with the eventual residential development of the Blastreat/Greenhurst site will dramatically increase the flood risk in the area. Given the need for more housing, preferably not age related, there are brownfield sites available in the area which should be developed without the adverse consequences of the current proposals.</p> <p>We object to the proposal to build a new bridge over the River Arun. There is absolutely no need for a third bridge which would be an eyesore and ruin the views of Arundel and the River Arun from each of the existing two bridges and from many other vantage points. Fitzalan Road is already a very busy and dangerous road with a narrow thoroughfare. Implementation of the proposals for residential development and the car park would lead to a massive increase in traffic and in danger to both traffic and pedestrians alike. The infrastructure of the area (sewage in particular) is barely adequate at present and would not be able to cope with the increased pressure that would result from implementation of the proposals</p> <p>FOR ALL THE ABOVE REASONS WE STRONGLY OPPOSE THE CURRENT PROPOSALS</p>
----------	--

29.09.18	<p>Firstly, thank you for the commitment and efforts made on the towns behalf. My wife and I being residents of Arundel object in the strongest terms to a footbridge across the river. - the plan speaks so much of creating green spaces but yet does not look to protect the existing jewel in Arundel being the serene and peaceful public gardens at the bottom of Arun St/River Rd. It really is such a peaceful and relaxing well used space. Please do not allow it to be sacrificed to accommodate an access route to a footbridge. -Such a bridge does not add value to the residents of Arundel. It is not a short cut to the shops for either side of the river and will become an unused white elephant and a sad legacy to a towns neighbourhood plan. There are no amenities in Fitzalan Rd for tourists (Or potential cafes etc as the leases have all been renewed surrounding the units by Enterprise Garage). Who is going to use a disproportionately expensive bridge ? -Any such structure would not enhance or even nestle into this beautiful section of our river. it would look cluttered. -The bridge would be subject to maintenance and repair. Without doubt this would be "extremely" expensive and would fall to the council tax payer of Arundel. At some point it would need major repair, removal or replacement. -A bridge would also attract noise in the center of a peaceful residential area at night with youths gathering on the bridge. Additionally the bridge will be a magnet in the summer for youths to jump from into the dangerous waters as they already do from the A27 bridge especially as seen this summer. An accident here or worse is not only foreseeable but also tragically inevitable. We have a responsibility not to engineer this into our plan. -From the feedback from those around us I urge you to recognise that a bridge is not wanted by the people of Arundel, in fact it's proposal is causing great concern and anxiety. I would further urge the committee to remove this proposal out of the plan at this early stage.(it may also cause a rejection of the neighbourhood plan later in the referendum as a lone item). Footpath along river ; again expensive, doesn't add value and will affect the river bank life and residential privacy of these properties along the river by increased pedestrian traffic. So a bridge is what we</p>
----------	--

29.09.18	<p>I write to oppose the potential development of either site on Fitzalan Road and the Causeway, out of the development still listed as potentials.</p> <p>I do however support the gas works at ford as long as this provides plenty of parking and a safe way to enter on to the Ford Road as this land is an eyesore and already concreted on. And I also approve a maximum of 50 homes on the dukes land at Ford but again parking must be made a factor in this and also entry on to the busy road and alternative ways in and out.</p> <p>1. Building a carpark at Fitzalan Road is obserd as this land is always flooded, and it only has two right of way into this road the main A27 and Queens lane into Fitzalan Road. Fitzalan Road already struggles with ridiculous parking issues as it already is, and if parking restrictions go in ie yellow lines where are the cars going then, without the new homes proposed as well. I suggested the council simply use Mill road car park's overflow. Also I dispute the proposal of a footbridge across the river going from Fitzalan Road as this would mean members of the public walking past elderly accommodation any time of the day and night and make them feel extremely vulnerable and uneasy, noise etc. Also how will this benefit the locals? as they won't park down Fitzalan Road just to bolt to get milk or meat etc so local businesses will lose a lot of local business. Also we're the trustees informed? As there responsibly for the land and without there say nothing can go on that land, also why spend all this money until these facts and information found out? And the current bridge is gradually sinking over the so called temporary relief road? so why don't we spend money on that? and look at making that secure and make it fit into the environment and ARUNDEL more? We would have 3 bridges in less than a mile and there's no need. I know this has been mentioned but London is a city of about 7 million people and has 15 bridges across the Thames, which is about 470,000 people per bridge. Arundel is a town of about 3000 people so 3 bridges means 1000 people per bridge. Also the views broken again and no real purpose. Do we really need another bridge? Also with the loss of parking in town</p>
----------	--

30.09.18	<p>thank you very much for the presentation yesterday and of course for all you are doing for the town- i thought the presentation was one of the best ive every seen.</p> <p>I was upset and somewhat embarrassed that some of the residents seem to feel left out and fail to understand that we are only at stage one of 5 stages , every one has the right to object or make observations at any time and in any event every one can vote at the referendum stage.</p> <p>Moving forward I have the following questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. why do site for less that 6 units not qualify for site allocations? 2. you said yesterday that arun have asked for an informal quota of circa 50 units. is this the accurate number now? Ive also heard 100 units being banded around. Appreciate its not strictly a quota but im calling it a quota for simplicity. 3. I understand that the castle stables and the gas works sites are SAVED from the last plan to the new plan. These 2 sites provide 16 and 35 units respectively ie 51. therefore we can meet our quota from these two alone? 4. i understand that blastreat also provides 24 units. so we have a surplus of units? 5. what are we considering any further sites? 6. I understand ANP2 has a policy about Heritage Assets. can we put something in about increasing the conservation area boundary to incorporate the swallow brewery? <p>additionally, i think we should mention important street scene features as well as buildings including but not limited to the flint wall that surrounds greenhurst (next to blastreat) which appears as a fixed boundary structure on the 1840 maps and can be followed around much of the queens lane area.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 7. Can i see a draft of the conservation area/ heritage policy? 8. I understand policy7 of ARP2 specifically relates to the swallow brewery. can i see a draft of this. I made some important discoveries about the swallow brewery last year that even mark philips was amazed to learn
----------	--

ANP2 - Informal Consultation
Comments Received

30.09.18	<p>10. i personally think the idea of an unengineered shared surface road would work and i totally understand crown yard as a community space. people seem to be confused by it. surely it is no different from south street and west street in chichester on which busses pass . also, bognor has done the same only 2 years ago along the high street. similarly, some of the best heritage towns in northern europe do the same: honfleur, san sebastinan, bruges, amsterdam, copenhagen, the list is endless. arundel and honfleur (where i own a flat) are historically linked trading ports.</p> <p>if you google cara courage , she is a global community space expert and might be a good contact for crown yard. she lives in brighton and loves arundel. she is a consultant for AHA! From what ive heard, people are very upset about the possible loss of convenient short term/ free parking. I wonder if the council / chamber of commerce can subsidise the mill rd over spill car park so it is free? this will sort it.</p> <p>11. i understand you are having a steering group meeting on tuesday. Can i join the steering group?</p> <p>12. FYI im not quite sure you are correct to say that the norfolk or angmering estate owns the river bank/ toe path on the south side. my land registry title shows i own the path.</p> <p>13. Im not averse to the foot bridge idea but cant understand why people are so against it. can we discuss this.</p> <p>14. my email to you of friday mentioned other sites. is it too late to addd/ consider further sites.....for example, what is wrong with the BT site in fitzalan rd? it is huge and ugly.</p>
----------	--

ANP2 - Informal Consultation
Comments Received

30.09.18	<p>I live in Fitzalan road and attended a meeting held by the Council to discuss the ANP in the Town Hall yesterday which I understand had been hastily arranged to discuss and address some unfounded rumours and speculation that were circulating concerning planned development in Fitzalan road. James Stewart discussed the process by which the current town plan was being updated and answered questions from the floor. @100 attended - many from Fitzalan road. We were told that the ANP is currently in at the first stage of lengthy process and that this stage is an idea collection/ discussion one. Nothing has been agreed or commissioned by the Council. We were told that 16 sites had been put forward by landowners for potential housing development the field abutting Fitzalan road being 2 of these sites. There was a lively discussion about an apparent lack of communication of the process by the Council which centred on an A5 leafletting exercise to all residents which those in Fitzalan road refuted was delivered. Be that as it may, it was suggested, and I agree, that any future postal communication has got to be more "in your face" - not an A5leaflet to be chucked in the recycling bin because it's just like another of 100s of pizza flyers and other such bumph. I suggest all future postal communication is delivered in a clearly stated envelope - something along the lines of "Arundel Town Plan - Important document for discussion and action by xx/xx/xxxx" Feedback from this stage of the process is required by today, which is why a community minded group of Fitzalan road residents were instrumental in raising awareness this week and getting the meeting arranged. In no particular order my feedback on what was discussed yesterday is: (1) I do not agree with the need for a wooden footbridge in between thee two bridges, This would be sited behind the Alms Houses - the residents of which were apparently unaware of this - another example of c.ommunication breakdown. We do not need a third bridge spanning 400 meters of river (2) I do not agree with any housing development in Fitzalan road. It's on a flood plain and there are other more suitable sites on offer. A 1000 home development with potential for a senior school was discussed at Tortington for example. (3) I do not</p>
----------	---

30.09.18	<p>I've included below some feedback and suggestions for the Arundel Neighbourhood Plan and would also like to thank James and the team for their hard work so far. Judging by Saturdays meeting at the town hall it can't be an easy exercise!</p> <p>In general I think many of the proposals represent a huge opportunity for Arundel. As James mentioned in the meeting today, the nature of retail has changed so significantly that local businesses are now, I suspect, even more dependent on visitors for trade than ever. I think the new public spaces, if supported by adequate parking facilities, would not only improve the town for residents but attract new visitors to the town.</p> <p>Arun Street to Fitzalan Bridge</p> <p>In terms of specific feedback, the only significant concern I have is over the proposed new footbridge. Assuming that the bridge would still need to support navigation of the river, it would naturally have to be quite high above the water level – I would assume the same sort of height as the existing Queen Street bridge. To my mind that poses two challenges, the first being privacy for the nearby homes as pedestrians would likely be able to see directly into homes and gardens.</p> <p>The second challenge is the scale of the structure required and its impact on the areas either side of the river. In order for the footbridge to be accessible to less able residents and visitors its gradient cannot be more than 1:12, and is recommended to be around 1:20 – so 20 meters of span for each 1 meter of elevation. Given the height and width required to support navigation at high tide, it would need to be quite a large structure that would need to start well into the public garden at the bottom of Arun Street – perhaps into the road itself. I'm not sure how it could be dealt with on the Fitzalan side due to the lack of space. Perhaps an even larger diagonal bridge? But again, that would impact privacy of even more homes along River Road.</p> <p>Business Hub</p> <p>One suggestion I have, perhaps for Policy AP5 relating to business hubs, is around</p>
----------	---

ANP2 - Informal Consultation
Comments Received

30.09.18	<p>I'd be interested to hear if this sort of proposal has factored into any thinking so far.</p> <p>Communications</p> <p>My final suggestion relates not to the Plan itself, but to the communications around it. I have a lot of sympathy for the team as they've clearly put a lot of time and effort into the exercise, and over the last week or two have probably come in for some largely unwarranted criticism.</p> <p>My own impression is that this probably isn't related to the proposals directly – I think when explained they are very positive – but that many people I have spoken to simply weren't aware of the planning exercise, or indeed the task groups that were representing their part of the town. I've had to manage change and communications for large projects as part of my work, and I believe there are a few relatively simple things that can be done to help improve this for the rest of the process, and indeed for other exercises the town council undertakes in future. I'm very happy to help out or talk further, but in short I would suggest the following.</p> <p>Internet and Social Media</p> <p>There were clearly good intentions around the communications for ANP2, the website is pretty good, and someone went to the trouble of setting up a Facebook and Twitter account for it. The 'Arundel Sussex' Facebook page is pretty active and would seem to suggest that people in the town are responding to this channel of communication. Unfortunately however the website 'News' section isn't updated frequently – there's nothing on it about the recent meetings for example. The Facebook and Twitter feeds are also not updated, and I would suspect perhaps are not frequently checked for messages? I think actively managing these would genuinely help keep the town informed and engaged.</p> <p>I was also unaware of the Arundel Community Network until the meeting yesterday – somehow this passed me by despite living in the town for quite a few years! I'm not sure if this is an ATC initiative but it would seem to be a great resource and worth promoting and</p>
30.09.18	<p>Footbridge I object most strongly that a meeting was held on the 29/9/18 and the first we new about it was a handmade notice that appeared on the garden fence at the bottom of Arun Street on the same date, no leaflet drops.....nothing! As someone who will be greatly affected by a footbridge across the river I am totally against the proposal. As it is we have considerable disturbance during the hours of dark from both drug users and drunks in the public garden and a bridge will make it impossible for the police to deal with. The garden is enjoyed by visitors especially those who need somewhere (quiet during the middle of the day). to sit to eat a packed lunch. This proposal is on a par with the dangerous suggestion of 'shared' space in Tarrant Street which will surely result in an accident, and when that happens those who proposed it should hang their heads in shame.</p>

30.09.18	<p>I would like to thank all individuals who have volunteered their time in to reviewing the current neighbourhood plan. I would particular like to thank Lucy Ashworth and James Stewart in arranging an additional presentation at short notice. I hope those at the presentation are now assured of the process and mitigated the scare mongering rumours of the last week.</p> <p>My thoughts on the proposals are broadly supportive although I would be reluctant to agree in the referendum with any building on the floodplain or the building of a 3rd bridge without significant research on how this could be done without increasing the flood risk to existing buildings.</p> <p>With regards to Maltravers A27 roundabout, The Town Centre and Crown Yard the proposals clearly assume that a offline Arundel bypass will be built. In this scenario the roundabout area should also be considered as a possible housing and open space. Housing would help link the town from both sides of the aroundabout with Fitzalan and remove the need to build on floodplain.</p> <p>The Town Centre is in need of renovation however I would of thought a one way option should be included in the review as this potentially will allow additional car parking higher up the high street</p> <p>I understand the concept of opening Crown Yard however work is required on how this would economically improve the town. In the past when Crown Yard as been used for a fair (Arundel Festival and Candlelight) my belief that there is minimal footfall compared to the High Street and Tarrant St.</p> <p>Thanks again for the hard work. I look forward to the next stage.</p>
30.09.18	<p>We are writing to express our objection to the proposed housing development on Fitzalan Road. (Site Number 8).</p> <p>There are several reasons for this.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) There are many bats in the immediate vicinity which are protected. 2) The flooding that already exists on that side of the road is severe. Often during wetter periods the site you is covered in water with egrets feeding and ducks swimming. 3) I am concerned about the removal of this flood plain for the surrounding area. I understand that if you were to build on this site the new houses would be on 'stilts' so flooding would not be a concern to the new properties. However my garden, that backs onto the proposed site, can easily be several inches under water when the water table is high. I am concerned if the development on this floodplain site were to go ahead this issue would be exacerbated and I would have a real issue with flooding. Can you explain how the land will be drained to allow for building if this were to go ahead? 3) The parking on that area of the road is already very over crowded, there is no where for the cars the additional houses would bring to park. Where are the extra cars planned to be placed? 4) The proposal is out of character in the immediate area. <p>Site 15 seems the less invasive option. If this site were to be used to deliver affordable housing, that would attract younger families to the area, rather than the proposed retirement flats (that are not needed as there are already a good number of flats in retirement blocks that stand empty) it would deliver less damage to our wildlife and environment.</p> <p>Secondly, we would like to object to the proposed removal of parking in the town centre. Although we try and walk where possible, it it not always practical and we pop into town to use the (now few) facilities available for locals i.e. butchers and bakers. If the 1 hour parking were to be removed I believe it would have a detrimental effect on the independent</p>

30.09.18	<p>I am writing to object towards developments planned for Arundel town (you have already received an email from me regarding new houses on Fitzalan Road).</p> <p>I am objecting about taking away the hourly parking in town; for locals, it is extremely useful when popping into town for errands, locals need to be considered as well as tourists. Also, the Crown car park needs to stay for long term parking for visitors! It would be a huge shame and disadvantage for the town if it was to go. Also when Arundel by Candlelight and the festival is on in Arundel, it is used for the fairground; what a shame if this was no longer the case!</p> <p>All these development plans you have seem unnecessary and are contributing towards ruining a lovely and peaceful town!</p>
30.09.18	<p>Re: Sites 7 and 8 Arundel Neighbourhood Plan ANP2</p> <p>I was informed by my neighbours on 26th September of the latest proposal to include Sites 7 and 8 as sites suitable for building houses and a car park. This information was entirely new to me, and I also found out that there had been a recent meeting about this, but that very few people had known about it excepting those who had looked on the website. Not everyone has that facility or expertise, one would have expected a letter or leaflet drop for all the inhabitants of Fitzalan Road in plenty of time for them to give due consideration of the plans. Ethically and legally the communications on this issue in my opinion have been insufficient, especially considering the potential ramifications of a decision to build on the two fields.</p> <p>With regard to the proposals for these two sites, I strongly object that either should be pursued further. These are my reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Both sites are alongside the current A27 skirting the town and taking increasingly large volumes of long distant HGVs and delivery trucks/vans throughout each day, as well as local traffic. Pollution levels are high especially for those living closest to the road. An increase in housing means that alongside the current road pollution traffic levels will increase still further resulting in more poor air quality, noise and congestion, more access difficulties and possibly accidents. Perhaps it would be helpful to establish the final outcome of the A27 road proposal before building? 2. The current layout of the two fields is such that it provides green spaces which lessen the polluting effects for the community. They are also designated Flood Zones at level 3, so building should not be carried out in such a potentially high risk area. It is clear to inhabitants that when raining the Horse Field at site 8 floods easily and therefore absorbs water in the way it should to prevent road and property flooding. Severe drainage problems and increasing levels of saturation because of buildings, people and traffic will add to flood risks

ANP2 - Informal Consultation
Comments Received

30.09.18	<p>I am a resident of Fitzalan Road and have recently been made aware of the ANP. I attended the meeting at the Town Hall on 29th September of which I found very informative. I am a member of the Fitzalan Road Action Group, and feel very strongly about some of the proposals in the ANP2 plan. Shared space - I would like more information about Crown Yard as the plan develops, as this potentially could work although consideration needs to be given to parking, especially for the vets which is a valuable service for the town. However, I am totally opposed to the idea of the two- way traffic at Bank House. The road is far too narrow and I feel it would be far too dangerous. The whole concept of shared space is that you could be walking in an area with moving cars which is ridiculous in such a small area. Our town is not as big as Brighton. I am not in favour of the designs for the town markers. If this goes ahead these need to be more in keeping with a historical market town. Housing development - careful consideration needs to be given to the number of houses built as this will have a huge impact on the schools, overloaded GP surgery etc. With the Mill Road car park being drained and therefore being used all year round, there is no need for car parks to be built on the floodplain in Fitzalan Road and absolutely no need for a footbridge across the river. I am totally opposed to both of these ideas. I am totally opposed to houses being built on both plots 7 and 8. Both are on a floodplain and the building of flood defences as per the HELAA Assessment Summary Table would be too costly. Building works would cause further issues with flooding and sewage disposal for current residents. Wildlife would be greatly affected. Parking, even with new parking for the houses, would become even worse than it is at the moment. Horses would no longer be able to be grazed in the field and a beautiful green, semi-rural space would be lost. My preference for new housing would be plot 11 as it seems there is enough space to accommodate a new school and a reasonable amount of houses. Access to its site via a new roundabout in Ford Road would help to slow down the traffic and ensure residents near that site do not have extra traffic passing along their roads. I have been a resident in Arundel for over ten years and whilst I can see the need for</p>
30.09.18	<p>I haven't been able to find the proposal on your website, but I have heard that there is a suggestion that the one hour parking restrictions should be removed from the High Street. As a resident I would be against this. For several years we didn't have any restrictions as the parking notices were absent and there was no warden - since that has changed it has now become much easier to pull in and find a space to unload shopping, etc. During the period when the restrictions were not enforced it was not necessarily common knowledge so it tended to be mainly residents of the High Street, and office workers, who parked there, but if the restrictions were removed altogether cars would be left there by residents from all over town, possibly for days at a time, or by visitors who didn't want to pay for the car park. From Keith's point of view as a shop-keeper, he has found it better for business for his customers to be able to park more easily, so he is against the proposal too. We feel it is important for visitors and customers of the businesses in the High Street to have the option to park free for a short while rather than pay the car park fee. We saw how it would be during the time when we didn't have a warden and I would not want to go back to that. Having a meeting on a Saturday afternoon when all the businesses were working possibly didn't give a fair representation of opinions.</p>

30.09.18	<p>Following the meeting at the Town Hall on Saturday 29th September 2018, which, while allaying some apprehensions regarding the 2018 – 2019 Neighbourhood Plan for Arundel, left others and I wish to make the following points on some of the issues raised in the plans:</p> <p>Shared-space – High Street and Tarrant Street</p> <p>Arundel is a small town. There are only 4 large roads in the town, London Road, Maltravers Street, Tarrant Street and the High Street. It cannot work to make part of the High Street and Tarrant Street into shared space for traffic, cycles and pedestrians. Looking at towns and cities where such schemes have been implemented, they tend to be large cities / conurbations where traffic can easily use alternative routes. It is not a viable scheme for Arundel.</p> <p>Crown Yard – Community, Artisan and Performance space</p> <p>Yes, it is a viable space within the town centre. It is unlikely that the residential buildings surrounding the area would want it to be a performance space, due to the noise associated with cinema / theatre / music etc. How much room would be left once the office / commercial development in the space has gone ahead?</p> <p>Footbridge over the river.</p> <p>From Fitzalan Road to the bottom of Arun Street. I'm not quite sure where it starts in Fitzalan Road, but to arrive at the Arun Street / River road junction is nonsense. The river wall is already unsteady and any work on foundations for a bridge would probably weaken it further. The little garden, which is much loved and well used, would be lost. Similar arguments apply if the bridge would come over to the Ninevah garden. A footbridge is not needed.</p> <p>Site 7 & Site 8 – Fitzalan Road developments</p> <p>Water meadows are there for a purpose. They absorb water and help protect the town.</p> <p>With the Environment Agency apparently taking a step back from upkeep of the flood</p>
----------	--

29.09.18	<p>Re: Sites No 7 and 8 Arundel Neighbourhood Plan</p> <p>A week ago I was told of the above proposal to build houses and a car park on the fields on Fitzalan Road. I was also told that the deadline for writing to you with an objection was the 30th September. I was very shocked that this information had not been made widely available at an earlier date. Not everyone has access to a computer. From the meeting I attended this afternoon in the Town Hall, I understand efforts were made, but unfortunately the information did not reach many of us.</p> <p>I strongly object to the proposal on a number of grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The fields are a green space and provide much needed oxygen to the community especially as it is so near the A27. More houses and cars would add to the already poor air quality and increase noise and congestion. It would also create problems of access and the potential for road accidents. • The area is designated a level 3 flood zone. Guidelines on the Government website Flood Risk and Coastal Change state specifically that the aim of Local Authorities should be to keep building out of high risk areas. To build 40 houses on this land would increase the level of water saturation, resulting in severe drainage problems and therefore add to the risk of flooding not only in Arundel but also in Pulborough. • An increase in population would require a similar increase in the town's infrastructure. The local health services are already very highly stretched, there would need to be extra educational facilities, the sewage drainage system would need to be overhauled, it would put extra pressure on the police and other community services. There is no mention of this in your plan. • There is a Covenant which protects the residents of King Street from any building which would spoil their view. The proposed plan would spoil the view, but not only from King Street. Visitors approaching Arundel from Crossbush would no longer see a beautiful
----------	---

01.10.18	<p>Tell us more</p> <p>Briefly, as I realize I have left it too late to elucidate much: 1. Fitzalan Road is in dire need of a car-parking solution: the problem has never been addressed. Building on Site 8 will only exacerbate the problem. I believe this land should be used only for residents' car parking. 2. I do not believe there is a need for another bridge in Arundel as there are already two. However, I think the existing bridge (A27) could be improved. 3. I have heard rumours that up to 150 new dwellings are proposed. How will the GP surgery cope with such an influx? For my last appointment I had to wait for over 4 weeks. The vast new development at Wick/Lyminster I understand has no provision for a new surgery so presumably those householders will also be added to the overcrowded list at Arundel. 4. I strongly believe that new houses will be built, but none of the leisure facilities proposed will come to fruition (not in my lifetime anyway). 5. The Blastreat site should be used for mixed housing, retaining the Victorian facade, and not for yet more retirement apartments. I understand totally that such apartments are favoured by developers but I feel that it is time for the Town Council to consider the needs of residents rather than (not even local) developers' profits. 6. Arundel is a tourism hotspot, bringing in a huge amount of revenue. The view approaching the town from the station is simply stunning. Any development should be carefully designed and executed - nothing cheap and ugly - so as not to detract from this lovely view. Visitors will not flock to a town that has been despoiled by ugly development: Arundel is a special case due to its location, history and architecture and therefore should be protected at all costs. 7. Why does Arundel need more housing anyway? Isn't the vast (and in my opinion ugly) Wick/Lyminster development enough? It's not a case of "not in my back yard", it's more "not in my county": personally, I think the South-East has far more of its fair share of housing foisted upon it already. Other parts of the country should now take on their share of the burden; some would even welcome it. The South-East is fast becoming an urban sprawl, with strategic gaps between towns and villages rapidly being filled in</p>
----------	--

01.10.18	<p>Dear Sir or Madam I appreciate that we need to consider the future of Arundel but this plan does seem to fall far short of its aim and, as a new resident, feel very disappointed and indeed let down by the Parish council and the various committees. Arundel is full of charm and, for its size, succeeds in meeting both local and tourist needs. It is not big enough as a shared area in the town and there seems to be naivety that this should offer a similar experience to Brighton. Where there needs to be consideration is how to best open up the river, and the immediate area around the Waterside Cafe/ruins area. How to improve the look of the bridge and the shops such as the newsagent. Arundel is not simply the High Street! I'd also like to object to any form of development within Fitzalan Road. Long known as the Horses Field, the area is deemed to be special for both its historical use as well as the wildlife and habitat it houses. Many elderly residents have lived within the road for many years and have many memories associated with it. These memories are also shared by their children and grandchildren who come to stay or have subsequently moved into the road. It is a visual amenity and residents regularly report the sighting of hares, oyster catchers, foxes and deer plus many other wildlife that uses the natural habitat. Certainly it is wonderful seeing the families with young children standing for some time to point out all wildlife which is on their doorstep - an early education into the wonderful UK countryside. The road is both a no through road and is already densely populated with access/ turning points and parking difficult at times. Further development would greatly impact the quality of lives of residents and the small lane that accesses on to the A27 - potentially creating further highway issues. Parking is limited to the extent that residents need to park up the lane and close to the underpass. Any plans to create an opening in the lane would impact both the availability of parking and safety of residents looking to access the A27. I understand that Fitzalan Road is to be listed as buildings/ structures of character to Arundel Town. The space created by the Horses Field enhances this so visitors and residents can better appreciate the historical street. Open space like the Fitzalan Road Horses Field</p>
----------	---

01.10.18	<p>For the attention of the Steering Committee:</p> <p>Thank you for giving members of this community the opportunity to be involved in what direction our neighbourhood's future takes. It goes without saying that communication has been somewhat inadequate, such that residents have had to scramble to meet the deadline in this consultation with very little time to do so. However, the speed with which residents have rallied together to speak on the proposed developments demonstrates just how important this process is to us as stakeholders, and so I hope that comments made by residents of Fitzalan Road and its offshoots will not be in earnest.</p> <p>I will first address the localised environmental impact of developing Sites 7 and 8, and then also comment on the general plans proposed for the town overall. I will also include suggestions for alternatives I know to be possible.</p> <p>First of all, I wish to wholeheartedly, emphatically oppose to the development of any kind on the fields at Sites 7 and 8 on Fitzalan Road. I have been a resident of Fitzalan Road since 1994, and have spent most of my life sandwiched between the river and the cow field of Site 7. Every single year during inclement weather when the water table rises, the land around us absorbs most of it. However, it struggles, and at times overwhelms our infrastructure. The drains cannot cope, the land becomes utterly saturated, and residents here annually find themselves with rising water in the toilets, sewage-filled flooding in their garden, and regular alerts of flooding from the Environment Agency. We are all painfully aware of the risks we face living here. Insurance companies have declined my neighbours, house prices have been affected, and we have had to have costly repairs and preventative measures built in. Our infrastructure here is at capacity, and so over the years, we have rejected planning applications to plant dozens of new properties around this road, because we know that it will simply overwhelm the already struggling system here, and we will quite literally be up to our knees in sewage and storm run-off. I am not exaggerating when I describe the risks we face when a lovely external consultancy shows up and</p>
----------	--

01.10.19	<p>However, I do not want to oppose building in the town at all. I realise that there is a statutory duty to provide new housing, and as someone of the generation currently struggling to get into the housing market at all, I am absolutely in favour of building affordable housing in the town. We desperately need affordable homes more than we need yet another block of retirement flats (particularly when there is already a “retirement ghetto” clustered around the Causeway end of Fitzalan Road containing many empty flats). Affordable housing in Arundel would bring so much new life to the town, but it must be done sensibly. While Sites 7 and 8 should be out of the question based on the environmental pressures and lack of infrastructure here, there is a suitable site elsewhere. Site 11, up near Priory Road, does not bear any of the environmental concerns that the fields on Fitzalan Road do. In fact, it is ideal. It is uphill and so does not provide the all-important grazing marshland Site 7 does, it backs on to an already fairly recent (in Arundel terms) estate and would point towards new developments being proposed near Ford, and it is perfectly positioned to avoid putting any additional burden on the current access and parking woes we have in this area here. Further, developing in that direction will allow scope for the placement of new schooling or surgery amenities, which are so desperately need if we are to increase the housing in Arundel.</p> <p>On to the wider aspect of the town itself. Clearly there is a desire to develop the town’s capacity and draw for tourism, and I support this. However, I have concerns regarding LUC’s proposals as to the way in which this development should take place. I look to the proposed loss of short-term and accessible spaces in the middle of town, for example.</p> <p>With the increasingly aging population, this will do a great disservice to the residents in the more far-flung areas of the town and surrounding villages who need to reach local amenities with as little walking as possible. In addition to this, there will be many local businesses who rely on residents and visitors alike using short-term spaces to pop into the shops, grab what they need, and go. Some certain businesses will surely die without such</p>
----------	---

01.10.18	<p>Moreover, the notion of a shared space for pedestrians and cars is so dangerous to the point of absurdity. Currently, we have designated pavements and roads with signs and markings, but some more easily confused elderly residents and distracted visitors to the town still make mistakes and either cause or become involved in near-misses and accidents. To make the road system in town even more ambiguous by mixing pedestrians with cars and bicycles in a town where we have many visitors – particularly foreign nationals unfamiliar with our road system – is inviting serious injury and a hike in insurance costs for local residents when the incidence of collisions inevitably rises. I cannot object strongly enough to this particular feature in LUC's proposal.</p> <p>I urge planners to approach their designs for the town centre with a clear sense of safety and common sense here. What would make better sense, actually, would be better maintenance of the road surface – particularly on Tarrant Street – which is arguably more dangerous for its potholes than its separation from the pavement. Potholes kill and injure cyclists every year, damage cars, and trip pedestrians as they cross the road. If we could improve the current infrastructure there without also throwing pedestrians into the paths of moving cars by way of some nebulous “shared space” design, that would be ideal.</p> <p>I am honestly concerned that organisations with much greater involvement in the character and wellbeing of the town are being sidestepped, despite their plans being arguably better for the town. For example, the Norfolk Estate at Arundel Castle intends to drain two fields by the Mill Road carpark and build in more spaces, thereby expanding the town's parking capacity in a sensible and already-utilised area. It would make sense to prioritise this development and encourage parking in an area closer to town, thereby directing foot-traffic straight from Mill Road and either north towards Swanbourne Lake and the Wildfowl and Wetlands Trust, straight over to the Castle, or along towards the businesses of Tarrant Street and High Street (all of which are the town's main attractions). Should this extant parking area be expanded, it would not only absorb the impact of losing the High Street and</p>
----------	---

01.10.18	<p>Currently, we face being blocked from either entering or leaving our driveways, emergency vehicles cannot get access down the road, and the large Co-Op lorries and other HGVs which must use the road for its turning circle near the bypass bridge have trouble manoeuvring during high tourism seasons. Recently, a telephone pole was destroyed by a lorry which had no other option than to drive over it, as the alternative was driving into a vehicle left on the corner. Putting a paying carpark so close this road will absolutely worsen this situation by drawing so many visitors close enough to consider our road a handy free alternative. It is therefore sensible to avoid this increased risk to residents' access, wellbeing, and property by emphasising the value in more parking at the popular, perfectly positioned, and less environmentally impactful Mill Road carpark.</p> <p>In addition to my concerns regarding access, there is the question of the proposed footbridge and its potential impact on the residents of Fitzalan Road as well as the town overall. That footbridge is, first of all, an extraordinarily distressing prospect for the elderly residents of the Holmes Foundation, who were all thrown into a panic at the recent news that such a development was being proposed. The unwelcome news came only after an abject failure in communication to them or the Lillian Holmes Foundation trust that this was a possibility, and only by the grace of Fitzalan Road residents and friends pounding the pavement to ensure everyone knew of this weekend's deadlines did they learn of it.</p> <p>Secondly, the footbridge itself is an utterly pointless and extortionate structure, interrupting the famous view of the River Arun from either of the extant bridges. It will utterly destroy a key feature to the town's aesthetic appeal, and serves no purpose whatsoever when we already have 2 bridges that stand less than a 5-minute walk from one another and which both have more than enough pedestrian access each.</p> <p>On the subject of renowned aesthetic appeal of the town, I must be absolutely clear that this aspect will be permanently lost should such inappropriate developments go through at sites 7 or 8. It is this beauty inside the town and outside which draws in so much of</p>
----------	---

01.10.18	<p>My making this point is not to say that I object to development based on any shallow sense of nimbyism, as I know is often the driving force behind comments which comment on pretty views. I realise that there is more to worry about than having a nice view from the house; there is the need to preserve what Arundel is famous for and build upon that in an appropriate manner. To completely change Arundel's fundamental character is to diminish its charm and, consequently, reduce the revenue gained from visitors to the town. Houses, blocks of flats, car parks, and extraneous bridges dropped at the front of the town as is proposed with Sites 7 and 8 will absolutely spoil what Arundel is so famous for.</p> <p>All the development in the world can be done in Crown Yard carpark, but this will not negate the irreparable damage done to residents' quality of life, local businesses' accessibility, and the single greatest draw we have for visitors.</p> <p>I also remind you of the aforementioned points on the environmental impact of developing Sites 7 and 8, which cannot and must not be ignored, particularly as we march head-first into irreversible climate change and its consequences. This is going to be the legacy we leave to the generations that follow us (as well as my own, being one of the youngest residents to make comments here). We must start thinking about more sustainable and safe infrastructures, and doing so does not involve filling vitally important lowland and coastal floodplains with tarmac and toilets.</p> <p>I implore you to seriously consider supporting a safer, adequately differentiated use of pavement and road; the expansion of an extant carpark in the sensible location on Mill Road; and the provision of new houses – affordable houses especially – at the less environmentally impactful Site 11.</p> <p>Thank you so much for reading my comments. I'm sure you can understand how important this is to me and to my neighbours. I realise that it is not easy to undertake this work and please everyone, so I am grateful to you that you are putting so much time and work into this. I hope we can all come to a peaceable resolution that serves the community as best.</p>
30.09.18	<p>As the owner of Buttercup Cottage, 1 Fitzalan Road, Arundel, BN18 9JP (Picture attached) I am strongly opposed to any plans for the development of the field next to my house. One of the prime considerations when buying this house was because of the field/feeling of space/wonderful views/not being overlooked.</p> <p>I echo my partner's views in the email below and can't imagine why you would want to destroy the wonderful micro community we have on Fitzalan Road.</p> <p>The beautiful field (which often has wandering horses and is full of Buttercups in May/June) makes our road feel special and is part/heart of our community.</p> <p>If you were ever to get this ridiculous proposal accepted you would need to factor in the compulsory purchase of my property or adequate compensation for the chunk of depreciation that it would suffer....it would be a lot less desirable/valuable and wouldn't be Buttercup Cottage without the field next door.</p> <p>I also wish to complain about the way you've handled this. The council haven't made the residents of Fitzalan Road aware of proposal/plans or any deadlines.</p> <p>We found out about it from neighbours....it feels devious/as if you're trying to slip something through....why weren't all residents sent a letter explaining?</p>

ANP2 - Informal Consultation
Comments Received

30.09.18	<p>For the attention of the Steering Committee:</p> <p>Thank you for allowing interested stakeholders to make comments on the ANP2 Proposals. It does need to be said that, although as a resident I do need to make comment, my opportunity to make such, along with many others in Arundel, has been compromised by a poor communication protocol within the Town Council and a lack of relevant supervision to ensure such communication was being made effectively.</p> <p>Anyway, notwithstanding that complaint here we go.</p> <p>First of all, let me say that I understand the necessity for having an ANP to be able to exercise control over planning process. I also understand the pressure placed on ATC by ADC which I presume has to be blind in its ethos of requiring towns like Arundel to identify spaces for building. I also appreciate that the ANP2 also has to include community benefit plans.</p> <p>I do believe that the LUC Consultants that made suggestions for the use of certain spaces for housing and community use following their publication by landowners and their brief for community benefits were ill-informed despite the brief. Arundel is a small but dense community that over the centuries has grown up from a small but central core of buildings centered around the castle, the river crossing and latterly its dock areas. It has not unexpectedly expanded as time goes by but it has been slow and gradual with limited forward planning and opportunistic areas on which to build. As such it therefore does not and cannot contain any greenspaces or large community areas for the small town that it is. It is therefore unwise to attempt to make fundamental changes to the success and current structure of the town by major projects, even where no funding exists, that will allow significant changes that may destroy the nature and character of Arundel Town.</p> <p>External requirements for additional housing by for instance government policy, due to the already dense nature of the town and the implacable new presence of the SDNP, limit where any significant additional housing can be placed. New areas for housing can only use</p>
----------	--

30.09.18	<p>Sites 7 and 8 are both fields that lie to the south and east of Fitzalan Road. They sit right at the heart of the Arun flood plain which the Town Council's own maps identify as water meadows. Yet they are offered for housing and are still on the list. These fields regularly flood whenever it rains and take some time to drain off. The loss of these fields will have a number of effects;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Increasing overflow of storm water into the sewerage foul water systems, which are already under considerable strain. This overflow will also build up flood water elsewhere in the flood compartment giving increased risk to flooding of gardens and houses and potential mixing flood and sewerage water. This has already happened on the road within the past 10 years so the precedent is set. 2. Increase the probability of the 1 in 100 year flood event for the locality thus increasing the cost and affordability of house insurance and the devaluation of the current house values. New properties may remain unoccupied due to the inability raise mortgages and insurances against the location. 3. To build on these sites flies in the face of common sense, it being a flood plain, and also of other agency policy directives. You only have to look at the Town and District Councils to the Blastreat site planning permission to see the an already appreciable resistance by these two councils and also that of the Environment Agency who strongly advise not concreting more of the area. 4 Development on these sites may make the householders liable for a ripiary responsibility if any drainage ditches, culverts or streams are left on the plots as without a doubt, if a car park or houses are built on the se 2 sites, surface water must be removed. 5. The existing sewerage system cannot cope with even the current housing on Fitzalan Road, see the EA's report for the Blastreat site again. The impose even further housing and surface water run off demands on this system will completely break it at the expense and damage to any and all households on Fitzalan Road.
----------	--

30.09.18	<p>This is all evidenced under:</p> <p>Arun District Council Local Plan 2011-2031 (July 2018):</p> <p>Relevance: Section 7 Settlement Structure & Green Infrastructure</p> <p>Paragraph 7.4 and all under: Settlement Structure and Gaps Between Settlements, p53-54.</p> <p>Policy SD SP3 Gaps Between Settlements, p55.</p> <p>Paragraph 7.5 and all under: Landscape, p56.</p> <p>Policy LAN DM1 Protection of Landscape Character, p57.</p> <p>Policy LAN DM2 The Setting of Arundel, p58.</p> <p>Arun District Council Planning portal</p> <p>Blastreat application AB/36/18/PL</p> <p>4/9/2018 Arundel Town Council Objection numbers 2, 3, 9, 10, 12.</p> <p>Regrettably Arun DC failed to publish objections 4, 5, 6 & 7.</p> <p>31/8/2018 Outline Flood Risk Management Map.</p> <p>The next item to examine is not listed on the site list but is mentioned under the LUC Brief and that is the bridge over the Arun between Fitzalan Road and Arun Street. This bridge will be created as a 3rd bridge over the Arun in Arundel and would sit between the two existing bridges. It will therefore be an obstruction of the views and vista of the town whatever its physical qualities would be, and would be in contravention of Paragraph 7.5 and all under: Landscape, p56. Policy LAN DM1 Protection of Landscape Character, p57. Policy LAN DM2 The Setting of Arundel, p58 as laid out in the Arun District Local Plan 2011 - 2031, etc.</p> <p>The proposal of a bridge I can understand if it enhances the tourist's view of Arundel on a circular but the bridge crossing will not allow that. It has no recognisable benefit for residents. There is no walk on the north side of the river and that on the south side is very short. It also will compromise the river bank on that side which, if built up to a higher level, will encourage faster flowing water at high tide causing increased danger and rates of</p>
----------	---

30.09.18	<p>Finally Site 16 Crown Yard: the LUC Consultants made a lot of suggestion perhaps without knowing enough about Arundel trade and the behaviours of its local population. Cllr. Stewart made a lot of noise about what is currently good for the Town and what could also be better. He may be right in some areas but I am not so sure. The LUC recommend shared areas and yet the ever dwindling goods retail areas of the town are dependent upon footfall, often from short stay and persons of limited mobility. Most indigenous people rely on internet and supermarket deliveries nowadays as the retail capability is not economical sustainable on the Arundel High Street. They use their own vehicles when necessary and shop elsewhere.</p> <p>Arundel's local economy is increasingly dependent upon tourist footfall and those visiting to sample its various hostelrys, usually by car. The footfall through the town, especially during the summer months, is severely compromised by what I regard as the Duke's decision to close the Castle top gate, suck whatever cash can be had from visitors, then disallow the Castle's visitors the ability to walk back down through the town from the top gate before reaching the car park. In my opinion this policy is a restriction on retail and hostelry trade for the town and is downright hostile; I am staggered that the Town Council has not previously remonstrated with this policy.</p> <p>Crown Yard could be used as a shared space but it must retain a significant percentage of its parking capacity and increase the number of Disabled Bays from 2 which is inadequate. Shared space must also identify services and activities that the townspeople could use. Currently, the town dies at 1700 except for pubs and restaurants. A lot of work will need to be done to attract locals out of the home after they get back from work and into the town to be entertained long enough to spend money in local establishments. This idea I suspect will only be valid for high days, holidays and similar calendar events. Creating shared spaces on the High Street and Tarrant Street may work but will still need to allow vehicles to use and temporarily park i.e. pick up food from a takeaway, etc. If cars are to be regarded as</p>
----------	---

30.09.18	<p>First of all, I'd like to thank the Steering Group for all the work that's obviously gone into putting together the new Neighbourhood Plan proposals ... and a special thanks to James Stewart for twice delivering an excellent presentation on the proposals.</p> <p>However, I must also add that I have been horrified to discover how many Fitzalan Road residents were completely unaware of a revised Neighbourhood Plan and, consequently, I have personally spent a huge amount of time this last week galvanising friends and neighbours into helping me ensure that all our fellow residents were made aware that a) Proposals for a new Neighbourhood Plan are being put together and b) that the deadline for submitting comments on those proposals is today, Sunday 30 September 2018 (hence my own last minute submission!).</p> <p>I understand that an A5 flyer was distributed to every household in March (?) this year inviting interest in the Steering Group etc but I'm afraid I don't remember receiving one and I would suggest that if it arrived, then it probably ended up in the recycling, along with hundreds of others. Since then, no information has been circulated town-wide other than an email from Arundel Community Network which again, I would suggest, is not widely subscribed to or available to residents who are not online. Not everyone attends Farmers Markets or reads The Bell or stops to look at notice boards and I seriously believe that investment in a leaflet addressed to householders and giving simple outline information about the proposals and presentation date(s) would have made everyone's life easier, especially for our older or non-IT literate residents who have either found the the website hard to navigate or unavailable ... and a leaflet drop would have circumvented a lot of concern and last minute panicking.</p> <p>Now to the actual proposals ... I've lived at 84 Fitzalan Road in Arundel for almost 24 years and I happen to like the town pretty much as it is but I do appreciate that we have to move with the times and therefore would like the following comments to be considered:</p> <p>Sites to be Assessed for Development:</p>
----------	--

30.09.18	<p>Site 8: I live opposite the field commonly known as the 'horses field' and any potential development of this site worries me hugely, partly I'll admit for NIMBY reasons but mainly because this field has flooded regularly in the 24 years I have lived here and there are long periods during Winter when it is too waterlogged for the stable horses to be left there. During these periods a variety of wild birds take up residence on the temporary 'ponds', Little Egrets, Ducks etc. I appreciate that there are methods available for building on flood plains these days but I'm sure they're far more expensive than normal building methods and I really believe that any such development would alter the established character of the area completely and be a 'blot on the landscape'. Before my time here, this part of Fitzalan Road was known as South Marshes ... for good reason. When the horses are in the field, residents and their children routinely stop to pet the horses and there is a therapeutic quality to their presence there.</p> <p>Another factor which seriously concerns me is traffic flow and vehicular access to any new development, however small. Parking in Fitzalan Road is already very limited and difficult at times and the whole road is effectively a one-way street as there isn't room for two cars to pass simultaneously. This is largely manageable thanks to the consideration of residents but with the increasing amount of online delivery vehicles driving fast and some residents parking carelessly at pinch points, there are already concerns about the lack of room for emergency vehicles to pass. Residents of Daltons Place say they frequently have trouble getting in and out due to the sheer volume of cars using the Windmill end of Fitzalan Road and for all of us getting out onto the A27 is almost impossible at times so any extra housing in Fitzalan Road will make a difficult situation even worse.</p> <p>Site 11: In my opinion this is the best and only site suitable for development in terms of size, location etc and I would strongly urge the Steering Group to seriously consider putting it forward as having the least impact on existing established areas.</p> <p>Site 12: I understand that this site is no longer up for consideration.</p>
30.09.18	<p>However, I think the idea of altering the traffic flow on the section of the High Street that passes The Swan to two-way traffic in order to create a 'shared space' in the section on the other side of the 'island' is totally mad and dangerous. I simply can't see there being sufficient room to accommodate the buses & large vehicles that require access without an accident occurring. I would much prefer to see the traffic flow left as it is and the section of the road that passes The Swan to be narrowed to allow for the creation of an outside seating area there, leaving the existing parking bays outside Partners Cafe as they are.</p> <p>I think the development of Crown Yard is an interesting proposal but I am at a loss to know who would really benefit from it as Arundel already has a huge number of restaurants, pubs, cafes & 'artisan' shops, many of which struggle to survive in Winter months. Crown Yard is a very important car park for anyone who is unable to walk far and for anyone visiting traders such as hairdressers, beauty salons etc whose customers need longer than an hour's parking and therefore cannot use the street parking bays. I also worry that such a development would be more likely to attract 'out of towners' who would not show consideration to residents living around Crown Yard.</p> <p>Thank you for reading my comments and I apologise if they are largely negative but I love our little town and really don't want to see it spoiled by development which is not really for residents' benefit.</p>

30.09.18	<p>I would like to voice my opposition to the proposed development on Fitzalan Road (Site 8) The reasons for my opposition are thus;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Field is a floodplain that floods every year, this flooding already has negative consequences on individual property as well as on things like the cost of buildings and contents insurance. Should a development be authorised on this plain, thereby increasing the risk of flooding, the consequence for existing residents will be dire. • The road is one that already struggles with the levels of traffic (the road gives on to people's front gardens making it very unsafe to cross especially for those who have small children) and the number of car that need to park on it. Increasing this with a whole new development would be a real example of irresponsibility and lack of consideration to the existing residents of this street. • This ties in closely with my third problem which is the lack of robust and transparent consultation demonstrated so far. The local authority has failed, from what I can see, to appropriately engage the local residents in decisions that will directly affect them. This has come as an enormous disappointment and one that has challenged my previous belief that I am supported by a council that ensures fairness and robust representation in decisions affecting the town. <p>I would much prefer to see a development placed on existing sites such as the Blastreat site and other brownfield sites that would mean our green sites can remain just that, green. Preserved and unaffected for future generations.</p> <p>I remain confident that my views will be heard and fairly acted upon.</p>
30.09.19	<p>Thank you for your work on the neighbourhood plan to date.</p> <p>I write to express my opposition to the plans to build on "Sites 7 & 8" the fields on Fitzalan Road.</p> <p>Before listing the reasons for my opposition to this particular plan I would first like it noted that I am at once disappointed and concerned about the lack of consultation and resident engagement concerning these plans. Nearly the entirety of Fitzalan Road was left unaware of these plans until a week ago when one individual 'in the know' was able to alert the rest of the street. I understand that the street somehow got 'forgotten' in the leaflet drop that alerted residents of the proposed plans and consultation. Fair and proper consultation is enshrined in law and I would hope to see a council able to democratically adhere to this principle.</p> <p>Site 8 is a known floodplain that has seen a number of plans rejected due to the negative impact that a building development will have. Building on a floodplain will already endanger houses that are already deemed at risk. Moreover, should a development be agreed on a floodplain, we can expect the floodgates to be opened for further development. The consequences of this on the already significant flood risk to existing housing are obvious.</p> <p>Fitzalan Road is an old and small street that already struggles to deal with the modern demand placed upon it by multiple car families and general traffic. The struggle to find somewhere to park is a daily reality, one which with small children brings about an extra level of risk to the safety of children who have to walk on a road that has no pavement in order to get to their house. In addition to this there is a high risk to child safety brought about by the fact that the road is directly off the entrance to the houses without pavement to provide a safety buffer to children needing to cross the road and unaware of the danger of passing cars. An additional development would place a burden on existing housing already lacking in appropriate infrastructure to deal with the demands placed upon it.</p>

30.09.2018	<p>My main objections to the plan to build housing on site 8 is as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the area is a flood plain. what do you plan to do about the water drainage? In previous years when there has been serious flooding, houses on site 8 side of the road are already experiencing water drainage problems. I believe that the Environment Agency also have concerns about this allocated site for housing. - there are bats in the area that I frequently see. What do you plan to do about this? <p>While I understand the need for additional housing, I would suggest instead site 11 because it is NOT a flood risk area.</p> <p>I look forward to your response.</p> <p>My main objections to the plan to build housing on site 8 is as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the area is a flood plain. what do you plan to do about the water drainage? In previous years when there has been serious flooding, houses on site 8 side of the road are already experiencing water drainage problems. I believe that the Environment Agency also have concerns about this allocated site for housing. - there are bats in the area that I frequently see. What do you plan to do about this? <p>While I understand the need for additional housing, I would suggest instead site 11 because it is NOT a flood risk area.</p> <p>I look forward to your response</p>
30.09.2018	<p>I am registering my disbelief and upset of the plans for Fitzalan road. This is an area of outstanding natural beauty as well as being on a flood plain. We as residents will suffer if planning is given - extra cars on already busy roads and additional parking on a road which is already jam packed with cars and can be dangerous for getting emergency service vehicles through between parked cars.</p> <p>Additionally why have these plans been kept so quiet? it's a good job we have some very eagle eyed residents in Arundel.</p> <p>What with the plans for the by pass, plans for the old Blastreat site and now to have this additional plan on the table is surely another nail in the coffin for arundel residents.</p> <p>I strongly object to these proposed plans and would like to register my objections today.</p>
30.09.18	<p>I wish to express my extreme objections to the proposed plan for a building development on the farmland bounded by the present Arundel by-pass and Fitzalan Road.They are:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.The existing drainage system is inadequate for the houses which already form the residences in this area.Building an estate of houses would only make the situation far worse.I already have to put up with the noise of tankers emptying the drains day and night after any above average rainfall. 2.The traffic problem along this narrow road is considerable with parked cars blocking it on most days.Building more houses will only add to this problem,and building more accesses from the bypass - I think - would prove quite dangerous. 3.At present this land is for agricultural use,and I can see no reason why the position should be changed.

ANP2 - Informal Consultation
Comments Received

30.09.18	<p>Further to my previous views and having attended yesterdays presentation, I wish to add four more to my list. 1) Reopen the top Castle gate (for exit). This would encourage visitors to walk down the hill and in doing so they would pass shops, restaurants, coffee shops, etc, and hopefully spend some money in them. (By going in and out of the Castle in Mill Rd, visitors are not 'encouraged!' to go into the town. 2) If Mill House Barn is going to be a nursery, where will parents park when dropping off and collecting their children? 3) Blastreat/Greenhurst site. Retain as much of the old Swallow Brewery as possible and build affordable housing, not too dense or high in height. 4) The proposed foot/cycle bridge would be totally out of place and seriously impinge on the privacy of the elderly Lilian Holms Foundation residents and other Fitzalan Rd/ River Rd residents.</p>
30.09.18	<p>Although neither my wife and I are residents of Arundel, I have worked in and around the Town since mid 1996 and my wife and daughter both have businesses in Crown Yard, since 2001 and 2016 respectively. Primarily our concern is with regard to site 16 Crown Yard and the proposal that it its use be changed from a carpark to an area for entertainment and/or the establishment of an artisan craft centre. To describe the site as being used by "some" businesses and their patrons, and to state that alternative parking can be provided in another convenient location (down Fitzalan Road or in the extended Mill Road carpark controlled by the Castle), is a misrepresentation of the current situation and the phrase "another convenient location". Located close to the town centre Crown Yard is used not only by visitors to the town, but also patrons of the businesses in Crown Yard itself; those on Town Quay; the Swan Hotel; the high street restaurants, cafes, pub; and businesses along Tarrant Street during the day and also at night. It also provides the only 4 permanent registered disabled bays in the town centre. The alternatives sites suggested are far from being convenient in respect of the current use of Crown Yard car park for short term parking close to the town centre and its businesses. The Mill Road car park does not offer parking for periods of less than 3hrs and I believe also charges for use if its disabled bays. Any development in Crown Yard would also need to include provision to facilitate the continuation of deliveries to, and daily collection of waste from, the businessess in Crown Yard, and on High Street and Tarrant Street which back on to Crown Yard. The proposed shared space scheme in High Street also causes some concern. For instance, it would seem to gave an impact on access and egress from the Norfolk Arms car park; and the change to two way traffic on the western side of High Street from Tarrant Street to Town Quay and then on to Queen Street will prove to be extremely hazardous. Finally, in terms of the referendum at the end of the process, a straight Yes or No choice on the scheme as a whole is a concern: surely it could be broken down into a decision on each element/policy of the final version so that a fairer, broader consensus could be achieved.</p>
30.09.18	<p>I find this aPlan totally unnecessary and intrusive for like cal residents of Arun Road and Fitzalan rd.</p> <p>I see no reason why the existing car park by the Riverside Tea rooms cannot be extended into the field behind as a permanent car park rather than summer only. Thus eliminating costs to local residents for a very expensive bridge proposal .</p> <p>Linda Jones 6 Eagle Brewery Yard Brewery Hill arundel</p>

30.09.18	<p>Please find commented below our concerns and comments of the proposed plans regarding Housing and general changes to Arundel the Town.</p> <p>Firstly, want to say that the committee should give very careful consideration to effecting the view when coming into Arundel from Cross Bush, as this truly breath taking, for residents whom have seen it a thousand times and more so for visitors to our town.</p> <p>Housing – Proposed plots (7 & 8) both these plots are on a flood plains that continually become water logged with the winter months, this in turn brings abundance of wildlife to the fields. The road is currently very busy with traffic that would only increase with the two proposals. The lack of drainage would also be a grave concern and potentially lead to flooding and we remove a flood plain.</p> <p>The proposal (Plot 7) of adding car parking and a bridge into town would be a blot of the view from two current bridges, also have issues regarding the rivers tow path, which also floods daily with the tide. Also concerns of misuse of the car park at night. I would review the option in extending Mill Pond carpark, as the most logical and cheapest option.</p> <p>Looking at the proposal, I feel that it would be better approach to seriously look at adding to newer parts of the town as an extension, focus on plots 10 & 11, these would have the least environmental impact, regarding flooding, wildlife or aesthetics to the way our town looks.</p> <p>Before we encourage more retail into the town, we should ensure we can meet demand at present, too many times we see business come and go, to encourage even more is irresponsible. The Town (I) and our visitors don't mind that we are not pedestrianised, it's part of the charm.</p> <p>Before I end, just wanted to say the process of consultation needs a review, as it's NOT worked in informing the residents in Fitzalan Road.</p>
----------	--

27.09.18	<p>I am writing to fully oppose any development plans proposed for Fitzalan Road. As a resident living in the house next door to the site of the proposed area for new houses (1 Fitzalan Road next to the field), we purchased our property because of the open space; any development on that site would undoubtedly devalue this property by a substantial amount. As local residents are aware, the field for the proposed development site is a vast flood plain, surely building on the site will have an impact on other properties regarding the risk of flooding, especially being so close to the river?</p> <p>This end of Fitzalan Road has some of the oldest cottages on the street and to build new houses amongst them would most certainly affect the historic aesthetics of the road (unfortunately as in the case of numerous historic towns, new development initiatives have completely ruined the charm and character of historic places). Arundel is steeped in History and its aesthetic historical charm must be maintained for future generations.....this is why the town is kept alive and thriving; developments, new builds and car parks will be a step closer to it becoming completely ruined with new and unnecessary initiatives; the developments you propose would significantly overdevelop this small and peaceful town. Furthermore, new houses would mean a growing population and how would this accommodate the already oversubscribed doctors surgery, the pharmacy where customers have to already endure agonising queues and long waits for prescriptions? A new development will surely reverberate and have an effect on the wider local infrastructure of our public services (not to mention schools that are already to full capacity)?</p> <p>The community on Fitzalan road is a friendly and welcoming one, and we openly discuss issues; I can assure you that we are ALL opposed to a development project completely ruining the aesthetics of our historical road, not to mention the potential overcrowding!! You are our council and need to consider a) residents' wishes and b) Maintaining and protecting open spaces within our historical town. I have attached photos of this beautiful field that you want to destroy; it is outrageous!!!</p>
01.10.18	<p>I love the proposals of the future Neighbourhood Plan, a greener, more pedestrian/shared access Arundel, perfect. I think that focusing Arundel as a Food/Art/Walking Town is what is needed for the future to draw people in from further afield. I wondered if developing the library gardens to become a pleasant area to sit/ read or meet friends was on the plan. Maybe the prison helpers and locals could be involved. With regards to the town development, if the police station becomes available in the future, I feel this to be the first place to think of developing with buildings in the same style as those around. Well done for all the hard work you have put into this proposal.</p>

30.09.18	<p>I refer to the emails which you sent me on the 15 and 27 August 2018 respectively. I am sorry that I was not able to attend either of the meetings which you mentioned, on the 30 August or 4 September, but unfortunately other commitments and circumstances prevented this. I did try to read through the many documents referred to and attached to those emails, although as I am sure you will realise this was not an easy task, given the time constraints mentioned.</p> <p>I am, of course, assuming that your purpose in emailing me was in my capacity as a trustee of the Holmes Foundation which owns the eight bungalows in Fitzalan Road, Arundel. The only items which I could see in the documentation which might affect our land and the residents of the bungalows were</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">(a) Possible residential development on the south side of the road(b) Possible residential development of the site adjacent to and to the east of the Foundation's land (referred to as Site 15 in the various documents).(c) The possible provision of a new car park on the south side of the road for residents and visitors(d) The possible provision of a footbridge from the bottom of Arun Street on the north (town) side of the river landing on the site adjacent to the Foundation's land mentioned in (b) above. <p>My initial reaction to those proposals was as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">(i) I cannot see that residential development of the land on the south side of the road would detrimentally affect the Foundation's property and its use of the same, subject of course to the usual planning processes. The Foundation would be likely to object, for example, to three storey structures. I would have thought, however, that bearing in mind the low-lying nature of the ground, residential development of any consequence would be difficult.
----------	--

30.09.18	<p>(ii) I cannot see that the Foundation would have any objection to the residential development of the adjacent land to the east. Again, subject to planning issues, this would probably be better than the current use of the land from the Foundation's point of view.</p> <p>(iii) Whilst there may not be any objection to the provision of a car park for the use solely of residents, a car park for visitors would be undesirable. Fitzalan Road is primarily a residential street and will become almost exclusively so once the Blastreat site has been redeveloped. A visitors' car park would be entirely unsatisfactory for residents, there would be a danger that security both personal and to property would be compromised, and unacceptable congestion to the street would arise. In any event, it would seem that a much easier and generally more satisfactory solution to visitor car parking would be by way of extension to the existing car park in Mill Road. Land adjacent to the same is already, from time to time, used as an overflow car park.</p> <p>(iv) For the reasons mentioned in (iii) above, the Foundation would object to the construction of a footbridge across the river. In addition, such a structure would have a seriously detrimental affect on the visual enjoyment not only of the Foundation's land, but also of the neighbouring properties, and indeed of the residential properties in and around Arnn Street on the north side of the river. It would also be likely to compromise the security both personal and to property of residents in the area, particularly to our elderly residents who would be particularly vulnerable. We already have problems from time to time in this respect, and this would increase with the inevitable increase in footfall. Apart from these objections, a bridge running from Arun Street on the north side to the industrial site adjacent to the Foundation' s land. on the south, would involve a structure at an acute angle across the river which would create a structural eyesore for the town generally.</p>
30.09.18	<p>4. I am not aware of anything in the documents included in your emails referring to the footbridge terminating on land belonging to Holmes Foundation. Indeed, oneill homer' s File Note of 19 July 2018 at page 4 refers to "Site 15 - Industrial Units on Fitzalan Road - IO+ homes and an access to a new pedestrian/cycling bridge"; and again, on page 27 of their Initial Site Assessments Report of July 2018 in connection with the same site under the heading "Key issues". Neither you nor anyone else had notified me of any proposal involving the Foundation's land, and yet you chose to notify the public at the meeting on Saturday of such possible intention.</p> <p>Please ensure that my comments as set out in this letter concerning the various issues which might affect the Holmes Foundation, its residents and others are reported and taken into account in connection with the Arundel Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>Please take into account in particular my comments concerning the suggested footbridge. For the avoidance of any doubt whatsoever, the trustees of the Holmes Foundation will not allow any of its land to be used for the purposes of the construction of a footbridge or its termination thereon. Such use would be in breach of the Trust Deed which established the Foundation.</p> <p>In view of the fact that such short notice was given for comments to be lodged from yesterday' s meeting, this letter is being delivered today, Sunday 30 September 2018, by hand to Arundel Town Hall.</p>

ANP2 - Informal Consultation
Comments Received

30.09.18	<p>Congratulations on your handling of the meeting yesterday. It cold have been extremely fractious, but your ability to head off the potential difficulties with well judged pre-emptive remarks was admirable. I remain of the opinion that the late panic that set in last week (the size of the audience was significant) and spurned by the 30 September date for objections could have been avoided had set up communication of the advisers proposals been implemented after July.</p> <p>Just one issue which a resident touched on and which seemed eminently sensible re parking...A viable alternative to the withdrawal of some one hour parking and hence pressure on resident's parking could be to allow free parking for one/one and a half hours but chargeable thereafter in the proposed car park on the south bank.</p> <p>The is the the "Boris Bridge" ever comes about!</p> <p>All good wishes for a busy future and again congratulations viz Saturday</p>
29.09.18	<p>I would like to object to the planned proposals:</p> <p>Nos 7,8,15: The road is unsuitable with dangerous corners and too narrow. Also 7 & 8 are on a flood plain, and drainage is already a problem for some of the bungalows, No 15: we need businesses and employers, too many have now have to travel to work - more emissions.</p> <p>No16 Crown Yard: nearly always full, central, convenient, leave it alone.</p>
29.09.18	<p>I do not think our road can cope with more housing, the drainage is not good and when the river is high or we have excessive rain the water rises in my toilet.</p> <p>The road all along is called the third car park in Arundel. It is a nightmare where I've my bungalow I have a job to get in and out of.</p> <p>The flats to be built at Blastreat should be social housing flats for people not requiring 3 bedroom council houses could be transferred to.</p> <p>The lone house and grounds would make a nice complex for families to have social housing in not flats.</p> <p>Getting back to drainage there is often a pumping lorry down the allotment and getting rid of the water.</p> <p>We are wetlands down here and therefore our land is not good for any more housing.</p>

ANP2 - Informal Consultation
Comments Received

28.09.18	<p>Before any comment on the proposed plan, it seems fair to say that the council has not communicated with residents and businesses on the subject in the all-embracing way it deserves.</p> <p>Potentially, these proposals have the importance to Arundel residents and businesses that Brexit has to the nation! We feel that it is not good enough to rely on posting the terms on your website and hoping people will interact. Many older people do not have internet access and many of those who do, do not spend time regularly updating themselves on what is happening at Arundel Town Council.</p> <p>The last few days has seen a flurry of panic among residents when they heard what now seems to be unfounded rumours i.e. that the east end of Tarrant Street was to be closed off to traffic and that all one hour parking was to be discontinued on the High Street. They had not viewed your website nor had they received any written communication, so with a deadline for any objections set for 30th September, panic set in!</p> <p>We now understand, but only from an informal notice in Pallant's window, that a meeting is to be held at 2.30pm on 29th September concerning parking in the High Street.</p> <p>Residents and business owners, particularly in those areas affected by the plan, should have been alerted weeks ago with a simple leaflet referring them to your website or to the Town Hall for more information.</p> <p>Objections to the plan: None of major note - though details may give rise to specific matters as they become clear.</p> <p>Comment: As residents our major concern is parking and any reduction in 'visitor' parking puts pressure on space available for resident's parking. We trust the plan takes account of the need to maintain residents parking opportunities that currently exist and that visitors are given viable alternatives when one hour parking is withdrawn.</p>
----------	--

28.09.18	<p>I was surprised and disgusted to hear about the proposed development of houses and car parking on Fitzalan Road on Thursday 27 September at about 6.30pm.</p> <p>It appears to me that the people involved with the neighbourhood plan do not know that there are two ends of Fitzalan Road or alternatively choose to ignore that part from the windmill to the bridge including Daltons Place and Malthouse Close. It was the same when the planning application for for Greenfields and Blastreat was discussed. We know nothing about this or meetings until reading it the local paper so couldn't attend discussions or object.</p> <p>I would not wish to see any housing built at either end of Fitzalan Road which is subject to flooding. Also housing and car parking will cause problems with access from the Causeway and the present relief road. The Co-op vans delivering and other large vehicles and parked cars cause hold ups at the town end and traffic often has to go onto the relief road. It is difficult to get out of Fitzalan Road onto the relief road and extra housing and car parking will aggravate this.</p> <p>If as suggested, many years ago, by Neil Holland, that a field of "new" bungalows was used for car parking and a bridge built for pedestrians over the river to river road, it would be very costly and who is to pay? We already have a bridge with pedestrian access and a car park would be better suited at the other end of the suggested fields.</p> <p>There is no time for meetings to be arranged or objections by the day after the proposed meeting on Saturday 30th.</p> <p>I am 89, having difficulty in writing this, I have no email, nor do I want it and post would be too late.</p> <p>We need to be kept informed about proposals for development with plenary of notice.</p> <p>As I have no transport, I have had to get a neighbour to kindly deliver this to the Town Hall.</p>
27.09.18	<p>Having only recently been given details of the above, not being "online", I would like to comment on the following.</p> <p>I feel that there is a real need for affordable housing in Arundel; too much emphasis on retirement premises, and would suggest that the most sensible areas would be as close to the two schools as possible.</p> <p>With regard to the pedestrian friendly High Street and Tarrant Street, as a disabled driver who needs to park as close to shops and library as possible, I would personally find this a disadvantage, but can see the benefits for visitors, as long as off loading for businesses can be managed. This brings into question the idea of the Crown Yard development.</p> <p>I am concerned that the suggestion of another block of flats on the Blastreat site (the subject of previous correspondence) and further development on land adjacent to the allotments, plus a car park, with ruin the idyllic view of Arundel and give it a suburban outlook, completely alien to the character of the town.</p> <p>The idea of a pedestrian/cycling bridge is certainly not a sensible one from a practical or aesthetic point of view.</p> <p>Parking is a problem in Arundel, not easily solved, but sometimes I think there is too much emphasis on accommodating more and more visitors and a little less on the effect on residents.</p> <p>The Festival, Candlelit Xmas and other events seem to get more ambitious year on year, and if we are not careful, I think saturation point will be reached and the parking situation will be unsustainable.</p>

28.09.18	<p>In the last few days I heard of the Council's plan to possibly build a large number of houses in the horse's field in Fitzalan Road.</p> <p>While I appreciate that more housing is needed and that land is very limited in the Arundel area, we are on a flood plain area and this field already floods. It can be difficult to get house insurance because of the risk of flooding!</p> <p>Access to Fitzalan Road is also a concern. Entrance from the Town end is often congested due to deliveries to the shops and this is likely to get even more difficult if the Blastreat site goes ahead. Getting on the A27 is also very difficult especially if joining the Worthing (?) and the traffic is virtually non-stop.</p> <p>Please reconsider this idea of building in Fitzalan Road and take into account the fact that this is a flood plain area and the access to the road is very narrow and limited.</p> <p>I am a very concerned resident.</p>
27.09.18	<p>It has come to my notice that you wish to build between 50 - 150 new homes in Arundel on our horse field in Fitzalan Road and at areas in Arundel. We 100% wish to object against this as it will spoil the beauty of the area and town. If you want to build more houses build them on the A27 one mile westward where there are plenty of empty fields and leave our beautiful town alone. PS Build a bypass that's what we need instead of sitting 5 miles down the A27 west way.</p>
02.10.18	<p>This is an exciting and innovative consultation document, it has been well thought through and gives a tantalising view of what our beautiful and historic town can perhaps look and feel like into the future. There are many people however who believe that this is going to happen and they seem to have missed the point that it is only a consultation before any document is formalised. For example there is a sign in the garden at the bottom of Arun Street that states this is where the new pedestrian bridge will cross the Arun. People seem to think this is what is going to happen and I think it is important to highlight that this is just a consultation at the moment. I think and have always thought that the idea of the town becoming a shared pedestrianised and vehicular thoroughfare is brilliant! Greening up some of the spaces like the Crown Car Park is a wonderful idea, in my mind the car park is just dead space but this proposal will make it more inclusive to the town's people and visitors and will be a great asset. However, to achieve this there needs to be efficient and cheap parking nearby that will encourage people into the town, clear signage would be essential to guide people directly to the parking that is available. The idea of the bridge across the Arun is also a great idea allowing people to explore everything that is great about Arundel in a circular route. Along with a proposed cycling/walking path along the Arun going south, this gives people of all ages great choice. The greening of the western roundabout is another excellent innovation, it will join both sides of the town, which is and has been, since the splitting the town with the outdated relief road, a point of some very divisive and heated discussions and something that this idea will resolve. There are many good ideas for the identified building areas in the plan, but the police station wasn't mentioned and must be put into the plan as a possible site. To make a town vibrant and dynamic it is important to develop and change and not stagnate in the past. This proposal will make Arundel a great place to live and a great place to visit, which in turn will support local businesses and residents who live in this ancient and important town.</p>

ANP2 - Informal Consultation
Comments Received

28.09.18	Fitzalan Road Development plans. Should not be considered as a suitable site for more residential development. My major concern would be that the increased flood risk for all properties in this area, existing and proposed, would not be properly dealt with and residents will be left to shoulder the massive on-going financial burden.
----------	---